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• Overview of the promotion scheme & key changes for 2020
• Promotion process
• Setting yourself up for success:
  o Understanding criteria
  o Assessing your level of achievement
  o Tips for success
Overview of the promotion scheme

Prof Lesley Hughes, PVC (Research Integrity and Development)
Promotion scheme

BACKGROUND

• New promotion scheme implemented in 2017 is a strengths-based system that acknowledges and supports diverse and flexible career pathways
• Based on Ernest Boyer’s model of scholarship, plus the additional pillar of Leadership & Citizenship
• Designed to be:
  ✓ Strengths-based and flexible
  ✓ Fair and transparent
  ✓ More aligned with recruitment
  ✓ Less cumbersome for applicants and committees
  ✓ More embedded in Faculties
Promotion scheme

BOYER’S MODEL OF SCHOLARSHIP

- Academics have been doing more than research, teaching and service for some time
- A better recognition of the complexity and diversity of scholarship
- Concern that other approaches (e.g. different promotion streams) limit career pathways
- Scholarship at the core

Ernest L. Boyer: Scholarship Reconsidered, The Priorities of the Professoriate 1990
Review process 2019

Three successful promotion rounds completed in 2017, 2018 and 2019
Review after 2 years under the Policy Framework

OBJECTIVES
Considering data, outcomes and trends from the two rounds of promotion and any unintended or perverse outcomes
- Adapting for job families (including obligations under the EBA)
- Refining criteria and scoring
Considering and addressing any points of feedback/issues in the first two years
- Providing further clarification on the process in areas where ambiguity has arisen.

WORKING GROUP
Nicole Gower, Director, Human Resources
Professor Lesley Hughes, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research Integrity and Development)
Professor Mariella Herberstein, Chair of Academic Senate
Professor Dominique Parrish, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching)
Craig MacMillan, Senior Lecturer, Economics (NTEU representative)

PROCESS
- data analysis
- applicant and committee surveys
- interviews
- broader stakeholder consultations
## Review process 2019

### Key Changes for 2020 Round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional point in Teaching for Teaching &amp; Leadership job family</strong></td>
<td>Applicants who are appointed to the Teaching and Leadership job family can claim an additional point in the Scholarship of Teaching (i.e. can claim 4 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link between workload allocation and points</strong></td>
<td>Applicants need to demonstrate alignment between their workload allocation and areas in which they are claiming points. E.g. applicants on 40:40:20 workload allocation, are expected to demonstrate evidence of performance in Discovery and Teaching and will not be promoted if there is no achievement (i.e. 0 points) in either of these areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved referee requirements</strong></td>
<td>No peer or junior references required. Reduced number of applicant-nominated referees from 4 to 2. Applicant-nominated referees must include referees of national and international standing for more senior levels, and include referees external to MQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exemptions process (e.g. from 2 years of service rule)</strong></td>
<td>Applicants must attach evidence of exemption to their application. As a general rule, exemption to apply for promotion won’t be granted to applicants with less than 12 months of service at their current level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Promotion process

Svetlana Martynovich, EO to Vice-President, People & Services
Application numbers
## Success Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level D</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level E</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2020 key dates (updated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 April</td>
<td>Draft applications submitted to HoDs for preparation of HoD reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 May</td>
<td>Executive Deans receive applications and HoD reports for review and sign off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 June</td>
<td>Applications due date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September – November</td>
<td>Applicant interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 January 2021</td>
<td>Promotion effective date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Your promotion portfolio

KEY DOCUMENTS

Application

CV

Head of Department Report

Applicant nominated referee reports x 2

Levels D & E: Independent references x 2
## Referee requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>2 x referees nominated by the applicant (internal or external to the University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>2 x referees nominated by the applicant (at least one must be external to the University)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level D | 2 x referees nominated by the applicant (at least one must be external to the University, including referees of national standing)  
| | 2 independent referees nominated by HoD |
| Level E | 2 x referees nominated by the applicant (at least one must be external to the University, including referees of international standing)  
| | 2 independent referees nominated by HoD |
## Promotion committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>FPC – assessment and interview</th>
<th>UPC - assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level D</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level E</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Promotion Committee**  
**7 members**

- Executive Dean
- Associate Dean or Head of Department from the faculty
- External academic member from another faculty
- Member of Academic Senate
- 3 x academic members from the faculty
- HR representative in attendance

**University Promotion Committee**  
**10-11 members**

- Vice-Chancellor (Level E UPC only)
- DVC (Academic)
- DVC (Research)
- DVC (Engagement)
- Chair, Academic Senate
- External academic member from another university
- 4 x academic members representing each faculty
- HR representative in attendance
Setting yourself up for success

Professor Mariella Herberstein, Chair, Academic Senate
Promotion to B/C – 8 points (min 1 point from Leadership/Citizenship)
Promotion to D/E – 9 points (min 2 points from Leadership/Citizenship)
Outstanding in at least one category

- 0 = No achievement or n/a
- 1 = Achieved
- 2 = Superior
- 3 = Outstanding
- *4 = additional point in Teaching for T&L job family
Assessment against criteria

• Applicants self-assess in each category for which they claim achievement. Promotion Committee assesses whether the applicant’s case is justified, based on the evidence provided.

• The scoring system is flexible: applicants do not need to score across all 5 categories (except mandatory points in Leadership & Citizenship).

• The indicators/examples of evidence are indicative only and not a checklist – the focus is on quality of achievement, not on the number of indicators/examples covered by an applicant.

• Achieved vs Superior vs Outstanding
  • No hard definition
  • Difference is based on volume, quality and impact of work
  • Level of achievement /expectations may vary based on discipline
Discovery

The pursuit of new knowledge and understanding; the outcomes, process and passion that add value to discovery

- Research output (publications of original research, creative works)
- Research impact (citations, journal and publisher quality)
- Grant income
- HDR supervision (student completions and thesis examinations)
Integration

Linking and connecting disciplines; giving meaning and perspective to original research and/or research fields; connecting discovery with curriculum; illuminating and interpreting discoveries to bring new insight; changing practice at University

[Within University Sector]

- Synthesis of research and contribution to interdisciplinary research teams, publication and dissemination of research findings beyond disciplinary boundaries
- Embedding research activity or research into student learning and curriculum
- Media or community communications
- Contribution to tertiary education policy and practice
Teaching

Maintaining the continuity of human knowledge via a dynamic exchange of ideas to facilitate active learning; encouraging and equipping students with critical, creative thinking; instilling the ability and passion for learning, and actively shaping all forms of scholarship

- Curriculum or learning environment development and innovation
- Excellent student outcomes, properly moderated
- Peer and student review of teaching quality
- Reflective engagement with feedback
- Professional development and/or accreditation
- Broad and deep engagement with the scholarship of learning and teaching
**Application**

Activities that link universities with society; the translation and application of knowledge and discovery to the broader community; a two-way flow where knowledge can inform application and application can inform discovery; connecting students with, and embedding learning into applied practice

**[Outside University Sector]**

- Engagement with industry, government or community of value to the University
- Contributions to enhancing the employability of graduates
- Positive engagement and/or leadership within one’s profession or discipline outside the academy
Leadership & citizenship

Modelling the University values and leadership qualities; active contribution to the University and broader academic community

• Demonstration and modelling of University values of scholarship, integrity and empowerment through everyday behaviour and conduct

• Active service and contribution to University strategy and business through administrative and leadership roles, and to the broader academic and non-academic community

• Mentoring and development of others and self

• Reflective practice
Examples of rating

Teaching – Self rating – 3

• 2 University & 2 national teaching awards
  • Highlight student focused outcomes; well developed philosophy consistently applied, demonstrable improvement for students; broad implication beyond Department

Integration – Self rating – 1

• Written reviews; media releases and engagement; some interdisciplinary research

Research – Self rating – 2

• Good track record (papers, citations), some grant funding, HDR completions; no big prizes or medals or similar
Preparing to apply

**Long before application:**

- Engage with promotion criteria long before thinking of promotion
- Use as roadmap to align your activities
- Criteria tell you what the University wants you to do in your daily working life

- Review the Academic Promotion Policy, Procedure and Criteria
- Discuss your intention to apply with your HoD
- Contact your referees to seek their consent to act as your referee *(no need to organise any reports – HR will contact your referees and provide them with your application and referee questionnaire)*
- Draft your application and update your CV
Writing a strong application

- Verifiable claims with a focus on achievements since last promotion or appointment
- Evidence of quality and impact
- Clear, succinct, well-written and well-presented case for promotion
- Application specifically addresses relevant promotion criteria
- Avoid using overlapping evidence
- Demonstrated commitment to modelling the University’s values and reflective practice

A good application.....
- Makes me understand you as a person
  - What drives you and how you do things
  - Not just a list of activities
- Well written and compelling
- Makes me understand how a promotion will empower you further
Interview

WHAT TO EXPECT AND HOW TO PREPARE

• Understand who is on the FPC panel:
  o 7 members
  o chaired by Exec Dean
  o includes external representatives

• 20-30 minutes

• Mix of standardised questions (based on the points you claim) and targeted questions

• Be prepared to defend your claims for superior and outstanding

• Some questions to clarify claims you have made

• An opportunity to speak to your work and your achievements
For more information:  
Academic Promotion Policy, Procedure and Criteria  
Academic Promotion webpage

Contact:  
Catherine L.R. McDonald, Academic Promotions Coordinator on academicpromotions@mq.edu.au