



Faculty Promotions Report

1st September 2017 – 31st August 2018

INTRODUCTION

As set out in our strategy, UCD values excellence and understands that excellent performance requires excellent people working in a supportive environment. The strategy states that:

“UCD will continue to attract excellent and diverse students, faculty and staff from around Ireland and around the world and will put in place appropriate support measures to develop and retain the members of our community”.

The strategy commits to working to ensure that the University’s faculty and staff are enabled to achieve their full potential and are appropriately rewarded for their contribution.

The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the Faculty Promotion process for the period 1st September 2017 – 31st August 2018. The report is in 4 sections:

1. Outcomes of applications for promotion 1st September 2017 – 31st August 2018;
2. Recommendations from the Faculty Promotions Review Group;
3. Recommendations from the Faculty Promotions Policy Review Group;
4. Appeals Process

Membership of the Faculty Promotions Committee is outlined in Appendix I.

1 OUTCOME OF APPLICATIONS FOR PROMOTION 1st September 2017 – 31st August 2018

71 applications for promotion were assessed by the Faculty Promotions Committee during the period 1st September 2017 – 31st August 2018.

51 applicants were promoted (for a full list see Appendix II) which is 71.83% of the total number of applications.

Percentage of applications by decision from 1st September 2017 to 31st August 2018

Decision	Lecturer/Assistant Professor > Associate Professor	Associate Professor > Professor	Professor > Full Professor	Total
Successful	25 (62.5%)	25 (83.33%)	1 (100%)	51 (71.83%)
Unsuccessful (prima facia)	8 (20%)	3 (10%)	0%	11 (15.49%)
Unsuccessful (following extern assessor reports)	7 (17.5%)	2 (6.67%)	0%	9 (12.68%)
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

33 of the 71 applications for promotion were from women with the remaining 38 applications from men.

Percentage of total applications by gender from 1st September 2017 to 31st August 2018

Gender	Lecturer/Assistant Professor > Associate Professor	Associate Professor > Professor	Professor > Full Professor	Total
Female	23 (57.5%)	10 (33.33%)	0 (0%)	33 (46.48%)
Male	17 (42.5%)	20 (66.67%)	1 (100%)	38 (53.52%)
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Percentage of total applications by gender and decision from 1st September 2017 to 31st August 2018

Gender	Applications for Promotion to Associate Professor		Applications for Promotion to Professor		Applications for Promotion to Full Professor	
	F	M	F	M	F	M
Successful	13 (32.5%)	12 (30%)	8 (26.67%)	17 (56.67%)	0%	1 (100%)
Unsuccessful	10 (25%)	5 (12.5%)	2 (6.67%)	3 (10%)	0%	0%
Total	23 (57.5%)	17 (42.5%)	10 (33.34%)	20 (66.67%)	0%	1 (100%)

The **Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP)** introduced the following gender equality targets in promotion, with the measure being at least in proportion to the number of women at the grade below (cascade model) which is to be monitored on an annual basis. The GEAP targets for 2017 along with the percentage of actual promotions for female faculty using the cascade model are as follows:

	Promotion from Lecturer/Assistant Professor > Associate Professor	Promotion from Associate Professor > Professor	Promotion from Professor > Full Professor
GEAP Target / % Eligible Candidates	49.91%	39.92%	28.26%
Percentage of Promoted Female candidates	52%	32%	0%

For the period 1st September 2017 to 31st August 2018, the gender equality targets have been exceeded at level of promotion from Lecturer/Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. The gender equality targets have not been met for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor or Professor to Full Professor. One application was received for promotion from Professor to Full Professor during the period 1st September 2017 to 31st August 2018.

Percentage of successful applications by age from 1st September 2017 to 31st August 2018

Age	Lecturer/Assistant Professor > Associate Professor	Associate Professor > Professor	Professor > Full Professor
30 – 39 years of age	7 (28%)	4 (16%)	0 (0%)
40 – 49 years of age	11 (44%)	14 (56%)	1 (100%)
50 – 50 years of age	7 (28%)	6 (24%)	0 (0%)
60 – 69 years of age	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)

Percentage of unsuccessful applications by age up from 1st September 2017 to 31st August 2018

Age	Lecturer/Assistant Professor > Associate Professor	Associate Professor > Professor	Professor > Full Professor
30 – 39 years of age	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
40 – 49 years of age	7 (47%)	2 (40%)	100%
50 – 50 years of age	5 (33%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)
60 – 69 years of age	0 (0%)	1 20%	0 (0%)

Percentage of applications received broken down by College and gender from 1st September 2017 to 31st August 2018

College	Applications for Promotion to Associate Professor		Applications for Promotion to Professor		Applications for Promotion to Full Professor	
	F	M	F	M	F	M
Arts & Humanities	7 (87.5%)	1 (12.5%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Business	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Engineering & Architecture	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Health & Agricultural Sciences	8 (62%)	5 (38%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Science	2 (33%)	4 (67%)	2 (22%)	7 (78%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Social Sciences & Law	3 (33%)	6 (67%)	4 (50%)	4 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Percentage of successful applications by College and gender from 1st September 2017 to 31st August 2018

College	Promotion to Associate Professor		Promotion to Professor		Promotion to Full Professor	
	F	M	F	M	F	M
Arts & Humanities	4 (57%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Business	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0%	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Engineering & Architecture	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Health & Agricultural Sciences	3 (37.5%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Science	2 (100%)	3 (75%)	2 (100%)	5 (71%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Social Sciences & Law	3 (100%)	5 (83%)	3 (75%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

1.1 FACULTY PROMOTIONS PROCESS UPDATE

Each meeting of the Faculty Promotions Committee is broken down into three main areas:

1. Review of feedback for candidates for whom a recommendation has been made;
2. Assessment of applications for whom external assessor reports have been obtained;
3. Assessment of applications for prima facie case.

The pipeline of applications remains strong with an average of 7 applications being considered at each of the above stages at each meeting.

An average application takes approximately 8 months to process. The main causes of delays in the process are the time taken to obtain external assessor reports and high volumes of applications passing through the system.

2 Faculty Promotion Review Group

A Faculty Promotions Review Group (FPRG) was established and conducted a review of the current faculty promotion process in accordance with the terms of reference outlined in Appendix III. This review was sponsored by the Registrar. The FPRG made a series of recommendations as outlined in Appendix IV, through the Registrar, to the University Management Team, and changes in policy and procedure will be sent to the Governing Authority for approval in December 2018, following consultation with Academic Council at its meeting in November 2018.

The membership of the FPRG was as follows:

Professor Tom Bolger, School of Biology and Environmental Science (Chair)
 Professor Maria Baghramian, School of Philosophy

Professor Geraldine Butler, School of Biomolecular and Biomedical Science
Professor Robert Gerwarth, School of History
Professor Andrea Prothero, College of Business

The FPGR was asked to:

- Review the current faculty procedures including:
 - Prima facie case assessments;
 - The number of external assessors required;
 - The support to be provided to Heads of School and Candidate to avoid potential conflicts of interest.

- Review the current faculty promotions policy including:
 - Placing greater emphasis on the future plans of the candidate;
 - Putting more emphasis on achievements since last promotion;
 - Emphasising the difference in expectation around trajectory for each level of promotion;
 - Reapplication from unsuccessful applicants;

The FPRG consulted with the following key stakeholders on their experience of their process:

- The Faculty Promotions Committee
- Candidates, both successful and unsuccessful
- Heads of Schools
- College Principals
- External Assessors

To ensure that this review was as inclusive as possible, the Equality Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Group and the trade unions representing Faculty were invited to comment on the current process.

The recommendations from the Review Group are contained in Appendix IV.

3 Faculty Promotions Policy Review Group

One of the recommendations arising from the Faculty Promotions Review Group was to review the Faculty Promotions Policy and supporting documentation and make a number of changes. A Faculty Promotions Policy Review Group was established and met a total of five times between August and October 2018. The terms of reference of the Faculty Promotions Policy Review Group are listed in Appendix V. The Faculty Promotions Policy Review Group reviewed the following documents:

- Faculty Promotions Policy (Appendix VI)
- Faculty Promotions Procedures (Appendix VII)
- Conflict of Interest Guidelines (Appendix VIII)
- Development Framework for Faculty (Appendix IX)

4 Appeals

Revisions to the Appeals process were agreed on the 10th November 2017 and the Faculty Promotions Policy has been updated to reflect these revisions. The updated Policy was endorsed by the Academic Council (AC) at its November 2017 meeting and approved by the Governing Authority at its meeting in December 2017.

The FPAC will be composed of five members as follows and approved by the Governing Authority:

- A non-Governing Authority Full Professor Emeritus (recently retired) to be appointed as Chair from a short-list of potential candidates by agreement of UCD management and the trade unions;
- Two senior academic members of UCD faculty (at the rank of full Professor, one male and one female) to be appointed by the President;
- One member of UCD faculty (at the rank of full Professor) to be elected by Academic Council;
- One member of UCD faculty (at the level of full Professor) to be nominated by IFUT and SIPTU.

The small number of unsuccessful candidates who have indicated that they wish to appeal the outcome of their application for promotion will not be disadvantaged in relation to the proposed timeline for the appeals process.

The Appeals Committee was appointed in October 2018 with the term of office running from 1st February 2019 to 31st January 2024 as outlined in Appendix X.

APPENDIX I

Faculty Promotions Committee Membership 18th May 2016 – 31st August 2018

Faculty Promotions Committee Membership

Professor Mark Rogers, Chair	Registrar and Deputy President
Professor Geraldine Butler	Science
Professor Hugh Campbell	Engineering & Architecture
Professor Michael Gilchrist	Engineering & Architecture
Professor Alun Jones	Social Sciences and Law
Professor Margaret Kelleher	Arts & Humanities
Professor Grace Mulcahy	Health and Agricultural Sciences
Professor Ian O'Donnell	Social Sciences and Law
Professor Bill Roche	Business
Professor Vera Regan	Arts and Humanities

Faculty Promotions Committee Membership 1st September 2018 – 31st August 2019

Faculty Promotions Committee Membership

Professor Mark Rogers, Chair	Registrar and Deputy President
Professor Geraldine Butler	Science
Professor Michael Gilchrist	Engineering & Architecture
Professor Alun Jones	Social Sciences and Law
Professor Margaret Kelleher	Arts & Humanities
Professor Grace Mulcahy	Health and Agricultural Sciences
Professor Ian O'Donnell	Social Sciences and Law
Professor Robert Gerwarth	Arts & Humanities
Professor Andrea Prothero	Business
Professor Tadhg O'Keefe	Social Sciences and Law

Appendix II

Successful Promotions

1st September 2017 – 31st August 2018

Promotion to Full Professor

1. Professor Bill Watson, School of Medicine

Promotion to Professor

1. Professor Orina Belton, School of Biomolecular and Biomedical Science
2. Professor Oonagh Breen, School of Law
3. Professor Eoin Carolan, School of Law
4. Professor Tasman Crowe, School of Biology and Environmental Science
5. Professor Eamonn Delahunty, School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Sports Science
6. Professor Barbara Dooley, School of Psychology
7. Professor Geraldine Doyle, School of Business
8. Professor Andreas Hess, School of Sociology
9. Professor Christopher Jepsen, School of Economics
10. Professor William Mulligan, School of History
11. Professor Cormac Murphy, School of Biomolecular and Biomedical Science
12. Professor Keith Murphy, School of Biomolecular and Biomedical Science
13. Professor Kevin McDonnell, School of Agriculture and Food Science
14. Professor John O'Connor, School of Biomolecular and Biomedical Science
15. Professor Finola O'Kane Crimmins, School of Architecture, Planning and Environmental Policy
16. Professor Andrew Parnell, School of Mathematics and Statistics
17. Professor Deirdre Raftery, School of Education
18. Professor Brian Rodriguez, School of Physics
19. Professor Kenneth Stanton, School of Mechanical and Materials Engineering
20. Professor Regina Uí Chollatáin, School of Irish, Celtic Studies and Folklore
21. Professor Wenxin Wang, School of Medicine
22. Professor Paul Whyte, School of Veterinary Medicine

Promotion to Associate Professor

1. Associate Professor Rem Collier, School of Computer Science
2. Associate Professor Fintan Costello, School of Computer Science
3. Associate Professor Fionnuala Dillane, School of English Drama and Film
4. Associate Professor Peter Doran, School of Medicine
5. Associate Professor Suzanne Egan, School of Law
6. Associate Professor Jos Elkink, School of Politics and International Relations
7. Associate Professor Nicola Figgis, School of Art History and Cultural Policy
8. Associate Professor Emily Mark Fitzgerald, School of Art History and Cultural Policy
9. Associate Professor Brona Fullen, School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Sports Science
10. Associate Professor Marius Ghergu, School of Mathematics and Statistics
11. Associate Professor Thomas Grund, School of Sociology
12. Associate Professor Deirdre Healy, School of Law
13. Associate Professor Mary Catherine Lucey, School of Law
14. Associate Professor Barry McMahon, School of Agriculture and Food Science
15. Associate Professor Jonathan McNulty, School of Medicine
16. Associate Professor Máire Ní Chiosáin, School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics
17. Associate Professor Emma O'Neill, School of Veterinary Medicine
18. Associate Professor Karina Pierce, School of Agriculture and Food Science
19. Associate Professor Susan Quinn, School of Chemistry
20. Associate Professor Elizabeth Shotton, School of Architecture, Planning and Environmental Policy
21. Associate Professor Helena Smigoc, School of Mathematics and Statistics
22. Associate Professor Frank Walsh, School of Economics
23. Associate Professor Iarfhlaith Watson, School of Sociology

Appendix III

Terms of Reference for Faculty Promotions Review Group



UNIVERSITY COLLEGE DUBLIN

Faculty Promotions Review Group (FPRG)

Purpose and Function

As set out in our strategy, UCD values excellence and understands that excellent performance requires excellent people working in a supportive environment. The strategy states that:

“UCD will continue to attract excellent and diverse students, faculty and staff from around Ireland and around the world and will put in place appropriate support measures to develop and retain the members of our community”.

The strategy commits to working to ensure that the University’s faculty and staff are enabled to achieve their full potential and are appropriately rewarded for their contribution.

The Faculty Promotions Review Group (FPRG) will be responsible for conducting a review of the current faculty promotion process. The FPRG will make recommendations, through the Registrar, to the University Management Team, and changes in policy and procedure will be approved by the Governing Authority, following consultation with Academic Council.

The FPRG will:

- Review the current faculty procedures including:
 - Prima facie case assessments;
 - The number of external assessors required;
 - The support to be provided to Heads of School and Candidate to avoid potential conflicts of interest.

- Review the current faculty promotions policy with a view to:
 - Place greater emphasis on the future plans of the candidate;
 - Put more emphasis on achievements since last promotion;
 - Emphasise the difference in expectation around trajectory for each level of promotion;
 - Clarify the role of the feedback in the reapplication of unsuccessful applicants;

The FPRG will consult with the following key stakeholders on their experience of their process:

- The Faculty Promotions Committee
- Candidates, both successful and unsuccessful
- Heads of Schools
- College Principals

- External Assessors

To ensure that this review is as inclusive as possible, the Equality Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Group and the trade unions representing Faculty will be invited to comment on the current process.

Any revision to the Faculty Promotion Policy recommended by the FPRG as result of the review will be brought through the appropriate approvals processes

The Working Group will prepare a report on the findings and recommendations emanating from the review. Any revision to the Faculty Promotion Policy recommended by the FPRG as result of the review will be brought through the appropriate approvals processes

Appendix IV

Recommendations of the Faculty Promotions Review Group

Current Process

In general the feedback and commentary suggests that the current promotion process is a significant improvement on what has happened in the past, firstly because there is an ongoing process in place and, secondly, because of the rolling nature of the process. We therefore recommend that the process continues with some modifications.

The extensive feedback received from External Assessors indicated that, although differing in detail from other systems, the standards were broadly in line with those internationally. They found the Developmental Framework for Faculty to be particularly useful.

Discussions and recommendations from the Faculty Promotions Review Group, guided by its Terms of Reference, are under the following key themes:

- Timelines
- Prima Facie Cases
- Conflict of Interest Guidelines
- External Assessor Process
- Feedback Reports
- Mentoring
- Role of Head of School
- On-line system
- Faculty Promotions Policy
- Webpage and Supporting Documentation
- Disciplinary norms
- Definition of Public Engagement

Recommendation 1: Timelines

The time taken for some applications to be fully assessed in the process has caused considerable concern. The FPRG recommends that the expectation in relation to the length of the process is managed by:

- (i) Explaining, in the online documentation, the expected timeline for the assessment process is approximately eight months and providing an explanation of why this is the case;
- (ii) Describing the stage at which an application is at be provided in a more granular manner, i.e. a) application with Commentators, b) application received, c) Prima facie case accepted, d) With External Assessors, e) With FPC (decision normally takes approximately 3 months from receipt of external assessor reports)

It is recommended that the specific dates of the Faculty Promotions meetings be removed from the HR website as this currently puts undue pressure on Commentators. It can be confirmed that there are approximately 11 meetings held per year.

Recommendation 2: Prima Facie Cases

Concerns were raised that the FPC does not hold enough knowledge around disciplinary norms to make informed decisions on applications at the prima facie stage.

It is recommended by the FPRG that, College Executives should provide guidelines on what constitutes disciplinary norms. These guidelines would be submitted to the University Management Team (UMT) for consideration and approval.

Recommendation 3: Conflict of Interest Guidelines

The FPRG recommends that the conflict of interest guidelines be revised to provide additional details and clarification on situations where a conflict of interest might be considered to exist. Clearer guidelines on the type and scope of previous collaboration should be provided. In particular, further clarity should be provided on a perceived conflict of interest in relation to the role of external examiners in a school.

Recommendation 4: External Assessor Process

The FPRG recommends that the current required number of external assessors be maintained. In addition, it recommends that:

- Candidates and Heads of School are asked to complete a checklist indicating that they have followed the conflict of interest guidelines when nominating external assessors and that a Comment Boxes is used to justify their choices;
- A summary sheet entitled "Choosing your external assessor" is included in the online documentation for guidance to candidates and commentators. In time this should reduce the number of External Assessors required which could be reviewed once these and the new conflict of interest guidelines have been embedded in the process and have been tested in practice;
- Candidates are given the option to wait until a decision has been made by the Faculty Promotions Committee (FPC) on whether a prima facie case is established before contacting external assessors to ask them if they are willing to provide a report, if selected by the FPC. However, the candidates should be made aware this will add at least a month to the overall timeline.
- External assessors are provided with the Equality Diversity and Inclusion policy once this is approved. They will be asked to read and agree to the principles outlined.
- The current communications process to external assessors is reviewed.

Recommendation 5: Feedback Reports

There was general agreement that feedback to all candidates was greatly improved. However, many unsuccessful candidates expected that the feedback should contain clearer instructions as to what could be improved to support future applications. The FPRG recognises that feedback is designed

primarily to explain why applications were not successful and thus provides only broad directions as to potential areas of improvement.

The FPRG recommends that the purpose of the feedback from the FPC be made clearer to candidates and that they should continue to be advised to discuss their development with their Head of School and/or a mentor.

Recommendation 6: Mentoring

While many candidates had discussed their careers with their Head of School and/or mentor, a large proportion had not. Feedback indicated that informal mentoring was not consistently available to faculty.

The FPRG recommends that a consistent approach to mentoring of candidates for promotion is implemented across the university. This should link with the P4G process once this is established.

Recommendation 7: Role of Head of School

The FPRG recommends that:

- Further clarity is provided to Heads of Schools in terms of their role in the process including the provision of developmental support to candidates, both successful and unsuccessful.
- Heads of School are encouraged to take a proactive role to help faculty who feel that they are “stuck” in the system and believe that it might be difficult to get promoted if current work practices continued.
- Further clarity is provided to Heads of Schools and College Principals on the type of information that should be included in commentaries in the context of disciplinary norms.
- The Head of School ensures that unsuccessful candidates are offered developmental support.

Recommendation 8: Online system

The FPRG recommends that:

- Significant enhancement to the online system is necessary; specifically improvements on formatting and ability to include graphical information.
- Currently, candidates are requested to ensure that the pre-populated areas of the application form are up-to-date prior to submitting their application. It is common experience that a number of sections of the application require updates. A list of contacts be included in the FAQs should difficulties be experienced with the online system and pre-populated data:
- Enhancements are made in the integration of the various UCD systems to ensure a smoother application process.
- A section is added to the application form to allow the candidate to state explicitly what has been achieved since their last application/promotion.

Recommendation 9: Faculty Promotions Policy

The FPRG recommends that a new section be included in the Faculty Promotion Policy indicating that a promotion implicitly means taking on a more significant role in the university. The Faculty Promotion Policy should include guidance on the following:

- Type of evidence required to demonstrate an upward trajectory and forward looking agenda, and the different expectations at each level.
- Expectations of types of achievements to be demonstrated since the last successful promotion.
- Linking with role of the Head of School/Career development conversations and mentorship

It is also a recommendation of the FPRG that the Faculty Promotions Policy be reviewed and amended in line with the above recommendations.

- Option to wait until prima facie is established before contacting external assessors
- Further detail on who/how to choose external assessor
- Link to the detailed conflict of interest guidelines

Recommendation 10: Faculty Promotions Webpage and Supporting Documentation

The FPRG recommends that:

- The current Faculty Promotions webpage is reviewed to make it easier to locate relevant support documentation.
- Greater clarity should be provided in the Developmental Framework for Faculty around the expectations of what is required for each level applied for under the three main headings; Teaching and Learning, Research, Scholarship and Innovation, Leadership and Contribution.
- Greater guidance and clarity should be provided on the types of achievement required since the candidate's last promotion and demonstration of upward trajectory.

Recommendation 11: Public Engagement

- It is a recommendation from FPRG that in relation to objective 6 of the UCD strategy to "build our engagement locally, nationally and internationally", a clear definition of public engagement be developed and included as Impact under the activities in the development framework under the heading Research, Scholarship and Innovation.

Recommendation 12: Further Considerations

The FPRG recommends that the FPC:

- Further consider potential EDI issues around the inclusion of student feedback;
- Review the current way that module coordination is considered as part of the process;
- Provide clarity on how the administration workload that contributes to teaching and research is taken into account by the FPC when assessing an application.

Recommendation 13: Faculty Promotion Policy (Clause 6 Performance for Growth)

This recommendation is not made as a result of the review of the Faculty Promotion process but rather from the University's consultation with the Trade Unions in relation to the Performance For Growth process.

It is recommended that the current wording of Clause 6 of the Faculty Promotion Policy, as stated below, is replaced with the wording in italics.

6. Performance for Growth

When the Performance for Growth process is established, candidates must have engaged, and be up to date with, their Performance for Growth review in advance of an application being submitted.

The Performance for Growth process provides a framework which, amongst other things, is explicitly intended to support members of faculty who are considering promotion. It includes reviewing readiness using the criteria laid out in the Faculty Development Framework, and where necessary putting a development plan in place in order to address any gaps. In this context it is intended that applicants will utilise the P4G framework to support their preparation and related development.

Appendix V

Terms of Reference for Faculty Promotions Policy Review Group



Faculty Promotions Policy Review Group (FPPRG)

Purpose and Function

As set out in our strategy, UCD values excellence and understands that excellent performance requires excellent people working in a supportive environment. The strategy states that:

“UCD will continue to attract excellent and diverse students, faculty and staff from around Ireland and around the world and will put in place appropriate support measures to develop and retain the members of our community”.

The strategy commits to working to ensure that the University’s faculty and staff are enabled to achieve their full potential and are appropriately rewarded for their contribution.

The Faculty Promotion Policy Review Group will be responsible for conducting a review of the current faculty promotion policy and associated supporting documentation including, but not limited to, the:-

- Development Framework for Faculty
- Conflict of Interest Guidelines
- Faculty Promotions Procedures

The Faculty Promotion Policy Review Group will make recommendations, through the President, to the University Management Team, and changes in policy and supporting documentation will be approved by the Governing Authority, following consultation with Academic Council.

The Faculty Promotion Policy Review Group will review the current faculty promotions policy and associated supporting documentation with a view to establishing how the Faculty Promotions Committee can be supported through the policy, particularly in relation to:

- Reapplications
- Clarity on what establishing a prima face case means
- Clarity on the authority of the Faculty Promotions Committee to seek additional external assessor reports and the implications in relation to appeals.

The Faculty Promotion Policy Review Group will consult with the key stakeholders as required.

The Faculty Promotion Policy Review Group will prepare a report on the changes emanating from the review as part of the Faculty Promotions Annual Report.

Proposed Membership of the Faculty Promotions Policy Review Group

President (Chair)

Members of the original Faculty Development, Reward and Recognition Working Group (who are not members of the FPC)

Prof Orla Feely	Vice President for Research, Innovation and Impact / Chair of the UCD Athena Swann Steering Group / Chair, Gender Equality Action Group
Prof Pat Guiry	College of Science (Former UCAATP)
Prof Niamh Brennan	College of Business (Former Appeals Committee)
Prof Imelda Maher	College of Social Sciences and Law
Prof Tom Bolger	College of Science (Chair of Faculty Promotions Review Group and former member of appeals committee under previous Faculty Promotions process)

Newly promoted through the rolling Faculty Promotions policy

Prof Dympna Devine	College of Social Science and Law
Prof Gary McGuire	College of Science
Prof Helen Roche	College of Health and Agricultural Sciences

Outgoing Members of FPC (2016 – 2018)

Prof Hugh Campbell	College of Engineering and Architecture
Prof Vera Regan	College of Arts and Humanities

The Working Group will be supported by UCD HR Promotions, Grading and Reward.

Frequency of meetings

The Review Group will meet as required to deliver the work programme.

Indicative Timeline

Date	Task
Late August 2018	Initial Faculty Promotion Policy Review Group Meeting
Mid – late September 2018	Second/Third meeting of the Faculty Promotion Policy Review Group Meeting
October 2018	Faculty Promotion Policy Review Group recommendations to be considered by the UMT
November 2018	Faculty Promotion Policy Review Group recommendations UMT feedback to be considered by Academic Council
December 2018	Recommendations to be submitted to Governing Authority for approval

1 Introduction

As set out in our strategy,

“UCD values excellence and understands that excellent performance requires excellent people working in a supportive environment”.

The strategy also states that:

“UCD will continue to attract excellent and diverse students, faculty and staff from around Ireland and around the world, and will put in place appropriate support measures to develop and retain the members of our community”.

The strategy commits to working to ensure that the University’s faculty and staff are enabled to achieve their full potential and are appropriately rewarded for their contribution.

2 Key Principles

Applications for promotion are considered on a rolling basis by the Faculty Promotions Committee. All applications are judged on an individual basis against the UCD Development Framework for Faculty. There is no internal quota system in place for Faculty promotions.

3 Equality and Diversity

The University is committed to advancing equality of opportunity and in sustaining an environment that values and celebrates the diversity of its faculty and is steadfastly committed to non-discrimination and promotion of equal opportunity on the grounds of age, civil status, disability, family status, gender, race, sexual orientation, religion, and membership of the Traveller community.

The mechanism and process for determining academic excellence in promotions shall uphold the University’s commitment to Equality, Diversity and Inclusion.

Consideration is given to any personal, family or non-academic circumstances since the candidate’s last promotion or appointment, brought to the attention of the Committee, which may have impacted on performance for a limited period.

The University welcomes applications from both full-time and part-time faculty.

Recognising the objective of the University Strategy 2015-2020 to promote gender balance and equality of opportunity among students and employees of the University, the University acknowledges that females are under-represented at Professor and Full Professor level and encourages female academics to apply for promotion, at their discretion.

4 Eligibility to Apply for Promotion

Candidates for promotion will not have reached the normal retirement age¹ prior to the effective date of promotion. Normally, a period of continuous employment of three years at UCD is expected prior to applying for promotion. Simultaneous applications for promotion to different levels are not permitted. Candidates applying for promotion through the standard rolling promotions process may only apply for promotion to the level above their current level.

5 Frequency

Candidates may submit an application online at any time following consultation and input from their Head of School and College Principal. Normally, the Faculty Promotions Committee will meet on a monthly basis nine times a year.

The Faculty Promotions Committee, normally processes applications in the order they are received, but delays may result from the time taken to obtain external reviews and at certain times of the year if application numbers are high².

6 Performance for Growth

The Performance for Growth process provides a framework which, amongst other things, is explicitly intended to support members of faculty who are considering promotion. It includes reviewing readiness using the criteria laid out in the Faculty Development Framework, and where necessary putting a development plan in place in order to address any gaps. In this context it is intended that applicants will utilise the P4G framework to support their preparation and related development.

7 Assessment of Applications

All candidates for promotion are assessed under the following 3 criteria:

- Research, Scholarship and Innovation
- Teaching and Learning
- Leadership and Contribution

Candidates are assessed against the UCD Development Framework for Faculty. Candidates are expected to make a clear and unequivocal case that they are currently performing at the level to which they are applying, with a clear upward trajectory, and that they have the drive and capacity to continue performing at that level. Candidates should refer to the Development Framework for Faculty when making this case, and should place emphasis on achievements since their last promotion or since arriving at UCD, whichever is most recent.

¹ A candidate should refer to their contract of employment for details on their retirement age.

² Applications for promotion under Academic Retention may be processed and assessed ahead of applications made through the standard promotion route.

On receipt of an application for promotion, the Faculty Promotions Committee determines if there is a prima facie case to assess the application.

The purpose of the prima facie test is to exclude a candidate who, in the view of the Faculty Promotions Committee, has failed to meet the satisfactory standard in one or more dimension or where it is the view of the Faculty Promotions Committee that the candidate has not provided evidence in the aggregate of meeting the standard required for promotion to the appropriate grade.

If the Faculty Promotions Committee determines that:

- a prima facie case does not exist, feedback is provided to the candidate;
- a prima facie case exists, the application is advanced to External Assessors.

8 The Role of the Candidate

8.1 Prior to Submission

Prior to submitting an application for promotion, the candidate must ensure that they have completed the following steps in the promotional process: -

- Candidates will discuss their application with their Head of School³. Part of the conversation with the Head of School should be in relation to the candidate's overall development. When the Performance for Growth process is established, an agreed development plan will form part of the submission for promotion.
- Candidates nominate three External Assessors as per the guidelines outlined in the section "The Role of the External Assessor".
 - *Note: It is the responsibility of the candidate to ensure that each External Assessor cited is available and willing to respond to requests from the University.*
- Candidates may include the names of up to two external assessors that they do not wish to be considered as external assessors.

8.2 Application Process

Applications may be submitted on a rolling basis at the candidate's discretion.

Candidates who wish to apply for promotion are required to submit their application through UCD's InfoHub. Applications should be effectively

³ *In the case of candidates with joint appointments, this is the Head of School to which the candidate was assigned following the award of tenure. Where the candidate is a Head of School, they should discuss their application with their College Principal. Where the candidate is a College Principal, they should discuss their application with the President or his nominee.*

presented; thorough yet concise, and comply with the word or length limits where indicated. Where a candidate has previously applied unsuccessfully for promotion, a statement detailing how the feedback from that application has been addressed must be provided.

Candidates must provide details of their employment history. A template document, for this purpose can be found on the HR website. The completed document is to be uploaded through InfoHub.

Re-application within one year of an unsuccessful application will only be permitted in cases where there are substantial new achievements since the previous application. Candidates are strongly advised to engage with the Performance for Growth process before resubmitting an application for promotion.

The Head of School and College Principal will provide a commentary, via InfoHub on the candidate's application (see sections 9 and 10). Each candidate is entitled to submit a response to these commentaries.

9 The Role of the Head of School

The Head of School will: -

- Provide a short commentary on the candidate's application for promotion. The Head of School will also comment on the candidate's engagement with the Performance for Growth process. The Head of School should consult and seek comments from senior members of Faculty in the candidate's discipline prior to providing this commentary⁴.
- Discuss the application with the potential candidate. This conversation should also focus on the developmental needs of the candidate.
- In the case that the candidate has previously applied unsuccessfully for promotion, the Head of School will comment on the extent to which the feedback on that application has been addressed.
- The Head of School will nominate
 - Five External Assessors for applicants applying for promotion to Professor or Full Professor;
 - Four External Assessors for applicants applying for promotion to Associate Professor.
- The Head of School should liaise with senior members of Faculty in the candidate's discipline when compiling the list of External Assessors and ensure that all of the proposed assessors are not of the same gender. The

⁴ *In the case of a candidate whose teaching and contribution are carried out in another School or College, the Head of School and/or College Principal will seek advice from that School or College on the candidate's teaching and/or contribution.*

Head of School's list of nominees will not be shared with the candidate. Further details are contained in the section relating to External Assessor reports.

- In the case where the candidate is a Head of School or the College Principal also undertakes the Head of School function, the College Principal will nominate a senior member of Faculty to undertake the role of Head of School with respect to this Policy. In the case of the candidate being a College Principal, the President will nominate a senior member of Faculty to undertake this role.

10 The Role of the College Principal

The College Principal will: -

- Review the application for promotion and the Head of School's commentary and provide further commentary on the application for promotion. This commentary will be available to the candidate for comment. The candidate has a right to reply to the commentary. All three commentaries will be included in the application.
- Review the list of nominated External Assessors provided by the Head of School and may comment on or add to this list taking gender representation into consideration. The list of nominees from the Head of School and College Principal will not be shared with the candidate. The College Principal may liaise with senior members of Faculty in the candidate's discipline but should not discuss the list with the candidate.
- In the case where the candidate is a College Principal, the President will nominate a senior member of Faculty to undertake this role.

11 The Role of the Faculty Promotions Committee

The Faculty Promotions Committee will:

- Approve the final list of potential External Assessors submitted by the candidate and Head of School/College Principal taking gender representation into consideration. The Faculty Promotions Committee may add further names to the list, at its discretion.
- Select External Assessors from the approved list submitted by the candidate and Head of School/College Principal taking gender representation into consideration.
- Assess all applications for promotion to Full Professor, Professor, and Associate Professor. In its assessment, the Faculty Promotions Committee will consider all evidence provided by the candidate and is informed by, but not bound by, the comments of the Head of School and College Principal and the reports of External Assessors.

- Following assessment, forward its recommendations to the President for review and final approval.
- Consider any observations made by the President and engage in dialogue with the President where necessary to ensure all relevant aspects of each application have been taken into account and addressed in the feedback.

12 The Role of the President

The Governing Authority has delegated authority to the President to:

- Establish the Faculty Promotions Committee and approve its membership;
- Review all documentation associated with a candidate's application;
- Engage in dialogue with the Faculty Promotions Committee where necessary to ensure all relevant aspects of each application have been taken into account and addressed in the feedback;
- Approve the recommendations of the Faculty Promotions Committee.

13 Membership of the Faculty Promotions Committee

Membership of the Faculty Promotions Committee is proposed by the President and approved by the Governing Authority. The list of approved names is published on the HR website.

Title	No
Chair Registrar and Deputy President (ex officio)	One
1 Full Professor from each College (excluding College Principals)	Six
President's Nominees	Three
The Faculty Promotions Committee will be supported by HR	

The membership term of the FPC is 3 years which may be renewed, in exceptional circumstances, for up to a further 3 years to ensure consistency and continuity. Membership of the FPC is subject to review by the President and approval by the Governing Authority. Membership of the Committee is subject to review by the President, as required.

The selection of the President's nominees ensures that there is gender representation on the Committee. It is the University's commitment to have a minimum of 40% of either gender on the Faculty Promotions Committee on a comply or explain basis.

The quorum for a meeting of the Faculty Promotions Committee is 7.

14 The External Assessor

External Assessors should be: -

- At the level of Full Professor, or in the case of Associate Professor promotions, at least, at the level of Professor (or the corresponding equivalence to the level of a Professor at UCD)
- In a leading academic institution, or have retired from such a position within the past five years
- A leading academic with an international profile
- Cognisant of the norms within the candidate's academic discipline and be qualified to comment on the candidate's achievements and her/his suitability for promotion⁵
- Have no apparent conflict of interest.⁶

14.1 The Role of the External Assessor

External Assessors are required to give an assessment of the applications for promotion sent to them for review and not provide a reference for the candidate.

External Assessors are required to comply with the principles of the UCD Equality, Diversity and Inclusion policy as they undertake their assessment. External Assessors are asked if they have undertaken Unconscious Bias training and encouraged to do so if they previously have not.

External Assessors are required to assess the overall academic performance of the candidate. They are invited to provide an independent, unbiased assessment of the level of the candidate's achievements in Research, Scholarship and Innovation, Teaching & Learning and Academic Leadership and Contribution, with reference to the UCD Development Framework for Faculty, taking into account the norms for the discipline.

In addition, External Assessors are invited to comment on:

- Whether there is clear evidence of an upward trajectory
- Whether the case meets international standards for promotion to the relevant level
- How the application compares with recent successful applications for promotion to the equivalent level within the assessor's own institution

⁵ This does not require that the external assessor be active in precisely the same discipline or sub-discipline as the candidate. Rather, the requirement is to be familiar with standards of excellence in that discipline and thus qualified to assess the candidate against the criteria.

⁶ An external assessor is deemed to have a conflict of interest if he/she has a professional or personal relationship with the candidate that could reasonably call into question an assessor's ability to give an objective assessment of the application. This would include a supervisor/student relationship, past membership of the same school/research group, and/or close/repeated co-authorship.

14.2 The External Assessor Nomination Process

A candidate nominates three potential external assessors for approval by the Faculty Promotions Committee. The candidate must confirm that each External Assessor nominated is available and willing to undertake this duty. Candidates should ensure that all of the proposed assessors are not of the same gender. Candidates may include the names of up to two external assessors that they do not wish to be considered as external assessors.

The Head of School/College Principal will nominate:

- Five External Assessors for applicants applying for promotion to Professor or Full Professor
- Four External Assessors for applicants applying for promotion to Associate Professor

Prior to the application being submitted, the Head of School/ College Principal must confirm that each External Assessor nominated is available and willing to undertake this duty.

Applications for promotion to Associate Professor

Where it is satisfied that a prima facie case for promotion has been established, the Faculty Promotions Committee will approve two external assessors, including one nominated by the candidate. External Assessors are requested to provide a written report on the candidate's application for promotion.

Applications for promotion to Professor and Full Professor

Where it is satisfied that a prima facie case for promotion has been established, the Faculty Promotions Committee will approve three external assessors, including one nominated by the candidate. The approved External Assessors are requested to provide a written report on the candidate's application for promotion.

The Head of School and College Principal should seek advice from senior academic colleagues when forming the long list of potential External Assessors. In larger Schools, a Head of School may nominate a Section Head to provide a list of potential External Assessors, if appropriate.

Please note: An application for promotion cannot be considered until the required number of External Assessor reports for the candidate, has been received.

15 Conclusion of the Assessment Process

Following the Faculty Promotions Committee meeting:

- The Faculty Promotions Committee's recommendations are forwarded to the President for approval.

- Candidates are informed in writing of the decision in respect of their application and the reason/s for that decision.
- If candidates require copies of their External Assessor reports they should contact the Freedom of Information Office.
- College Principals and Heads of Schools are informed of the outcome of the assessment process in relation to candidates from their School/College.
- A list of promoted candidates is forwarded to the Academic Council and Governing Authority for noting, annually.
- External Assessors are advised of the outcome for the candidate for whom they provided a reference.
- The effective date of promotions is the date that the Faculty Promotions Committee's recommendation for promotion is approved by the President.

16 Feedback

Accurate notes are taken as part of the process that reflect the basis of the decision made. In the interests of transparency, best practice and staff development, at the conclusion of the process, all candidates are given written feedback on their application, by the Faculty Promotions Committee. In addition, unsuccessful candidates will be given the opportunity for oral feedback from the Chairperson, or nominee, and one other member of the Faculty Promotions Committee.

These notes support the communication of the promotion decision so that an applicant has sufficient clarity and a link is developed between the feedback received and the Performance for Growth process, when established, so that feedback is incorporated into an individual's development plan.

Candidates attending a feedback meeting may be accompanied by either a UCD colleague or a representative from their union, if applicable. The name of the colleague/representative, and their relationship to the candidate, must be forwarded to the HR Promotions and Grading Office 3 working days prior to the feedback meeting.

17 Confidentiality

Confidentiality, by all participants, is maintained throughout the process. All discussion during the assessment process and any data generated remains confidential to the members of the Faculty Promotions Committee. The names of promoted candidates will not be released until the President has approved the recommendations of the Faculty Promotions Committee and the candidates have been advised accordingly.

18 Freedom of Information

The University comes under the terms of the Freedom of Information Act 2014. This legislation confers on individuals a legal right of access to information held by the University concerning them and a legal right to receive reasons for decisions that have materially affected them.

However, without recourse to the Freedom of Information Act, candidates will at the conclusion of the assessment process, receive a detailed written note that supports the communication of the promotion decision so that the applicant has sufficient clarity as to the basis of the decision. Other assessment records, with the exception of those of the external assessor, such as minutes, personal notes, discussion documents, and correspondence will also be made available if requested.

All assessment records should therefore be sufficiently clear and detailed to fulfil a request for the reasons for the decisions.

Other documents are available if required through the Freedom of Information process.

19 Appeals (Text as agreed between UCD and SIPTU, IFUT on 10th November 2017)

- I. The Faculty Promotions Appeals Committee (FPAC) will be established as an independent committee. Once membership has been proposed as set out in clause ii, it will be approved by the Governing Authority.
- II. The FPAC will be composed of five members, to be appointed as follows:
 - A non-Governing Authority Full Professor Emeritus (recently retired) to be appointed as Chair from a short-list of potential candidates by agreement of UCD management and the trade unions;
 - Two senior academic members of UCD faculty (at the rank of full Professor, one male and one female) to be appointed by the President;
 - One member of UCD faculty (at the rank of full Professor) to be elected by Academic Council;
 - One member of UCD faculty (at the level of full Professor) to be nominated by IFUT and SIPTU.

The term of office of the FPAC will be co-terminus with the Governing Authority. A short transition period may be required prior to the appointment of the next Governing Authority to facilitate continuity.

The members of the FPAC will not be members of the Faculty Promotions Committee (FPC).

- III. All parties will seek to ensure that there are at least two members of each gender on the FPAC.

IV. The FPAC will be supported by UCD Legal.

Candidates who have not been recommended for promotion by the FPC shall be afforded the opportunity to receive written and oral feedback in relation to their applications. An appeal shall only be considered by the FPAC after the candidate has attended for oral feedback. Appeals must be lodged with the University no later than sixty days following the meeting at which oral feedback is provided.

V. The FPAC shall hear appeals made, in writing, by candidates for promotion to be based on alleged defects in the application of the procedures for promotion set out in the university's policies and procedures. The only basis of an appeal shall be an alleged failure by the FPC to observe due process, which is defined as:

- Failure to follow in due manner University policy and procedures for the consideration of applications for promotion. All University policies and procedures are subject to statutory/anti-discriminatory requirements;
- Denial of natural justice;
- Unfair or unreasonable application of the criteria for the granting of promotions.

VI. The appellant is required to specify the grounds of the appeal and to demonstrate why the promotions process was so defective as to influence the decision. In making the appeal, the appellant may provide reasonable additional information to substantiate their claim. Any such new material should be germane to, and substantiate, the procedural defect and the FPAC may accept or reject this new information.

VII. In considering an appeal, the FPAC shall provide the FPC with the opportunity to comment on the appeal.

VIII. The FPAC will determine whether any of the alleged procedural defects could have influenced the outcome. They will have available to them all the materials available to the FPC.

IX. While the setting of academic standards to be used in the promotion process is a matter for the exclusive competence of the FPC, the application of those standards in a case may be reviewed by the FPAC. Nothing in this process shall have the effect of substituting a differing academic judgement arrived at by the FPAC for the academic judgement validly arrived at by the FPC following review.

X. The FPAC may come to one of the following conclusions:

- No procedural defects. **The appeal is not upheld.** The FPAC should provide the appellant and the FPC with a clear rationale for its decision in writing;
- Procedural defects are found to have occurred, but they are found not to have influenced the outcome. **The appeal is not upheld.** The FPAC should

- provide the appellant and the FPC with a clear rationale for its decision in writing. The attention of the FPC is drawn to the defects and they are asked to ensure that a remedy is put in place. The FPC should inform the FPAC of the intended remedial action;
- Procedural defects are found to have occurred and they are deemed to have had the potential to influence the outcome. **The appeal is upheld.** The FPAC should inform the appellant of its decision and of its consequences in writing. The FPAC request that the FPC rectifies the defects and recommends that the FPC reconsider the decision or decisions affected. The FPAC shall supply the FPC with sufficient detail of the procedural defect to allow the FPC to understand the basis of the decision.
- XI. Where an appeal is upheld, the FPC is required to rectify the defects found by the FPAC and to re-examine the application or applications affected.
- XII. The FPC will provide the FPAC with a report outlining the steps taken to rectify the defects and the outcome of the reconsideration of the application.
- XIII. The reconsideration of the application(s) may come to one of the following conclusions:
- **Reject the original outcome.** The re-examination of the application results in a recommendation to promote the candidate. This recommendation is forwarded to the President according to procedure, but the effective date of promotion will be the date of the original decision of the President. The FPC will provide the rationale and inform the FPAC of its decision;
 - **Accept the original outcome.** The FPC will respond to the FPAC outlining in detail the basis of its decision.
- XIV. The FPAC, having considered this explanation, may;
- Return the application to the FPC for additional clarification on stated grounds.
 - Make a recommendation directly to the President for promotion of the appellant. In taking this step, the FPAC must provide the President with its judgement including addressing:
 - o Why the response of the FPC was not sufficient to address the basis of the appeal;
 - o How this recommendation complies fully with clause IX of this document.
- XV. The President will normally accept the recommendation of the FPAC. The President will provide an explanation for his decision to the FPAC and the FPC.
- XVI. At the conclusion of the appeals process, the FPAC will communicate its decision to the appellant providing a clear basis for the final determination.
- XVII. The FPAC should provide Governing Authority with an annual report on its activities.

20 Academic Retention

The University retains the capacity, in the following specific circumstances to act to retain high calibre faculty.

20.1 Competitive Retention

Where a candidate is offered a professorial position (at the level of Associate Professor, Professor or Full Professor or appropriate equivalence) in a comparable institution, following interview for a post that has been advertised internationally.

Following consideration of the application, and the views of the External Assessors, the Faculty Promotions Committee may recommend promotion at the level of Associate Professor, Professor or Full Professor.

20.2 European Research Council (ERC) Grant⁷:

A candidate is in receipt of the following European Research Council (ERC) funding:

- Advanced Grant;
- Consolidator Grant; or
- Starting Independent Researcher Grant.

Following consideration of the application, the Faculty Promotions Committee may recommend promotion at the level of Associate Professor, Professor or Full Professor.

20.3 Prestigious International Award

A candidate has received a prestigious international award with the following characteristics;

- A unique award, with a small number of recipients, annually or less frequently than annually;
- An elite award that distinguishes its recipients as international leaders in their discipline;
- An award that affirms rather than establishes the recipient's international standing in the discipline;
- An award that is recognised across disciplines as an elite award;
- Awarded by an internationally-esteemed institution associated with the advancement of science, technology, medicine, the arts, humanities, social sciences and related activities;

⁷ ERC awards are emerging as the elite brand in European research both for the individual faculty and for the institution. This pathway provides the University the opportunity to recognise faculty in receipt of these prestigious awards and mitigates against the potential for these individuals to be recruited away from the institution.

- Awarded on merit, in recognition of a singular and/or lifetime contribution in advancing the disciplinary field;
- Awarded selectively from a pool of candidates reflecting a world-wide/international search of leaders in the discipline.

Following consideration of the application, the Faculty Promotions Committee may recommend promotion to the level of Full Professor only.

20.4 Application Process for Academic Retention Candidates

Promotion via Academic Retention requires that:

- The candidate meets the criteria for promotion to the relevant grade; and
- The strategic relevance and alignment with the needs of the School/College/University is clearly established

Where the strategic relevance standard has not been established, the applicant will be advised that they should seek promotion through the normal process.

20.4.1 Competitive Retention

Candidates who wish to apply for promotion under Competitive Retention pathway will complete the online application process outlined in Section 8. In addition, candidates will be required to email the following additional documents to promotions@ucd.ie:

- Details of the appointment process for the professorial post at the comparable institution (to include a copy of the advertisement for that post) along with written evidence of having received an offer following competitive interview.

To facilitate the efficient and timely handling of competitive retention applications:

- The FPC will review the application electronically to determine if a *prima facie* case is established;
- The FPC will select the External Assessors electronically;
- The selected External Assessors will be informed of the urgency of the request to provide a written report.

20.4.2 ERC Grant

Candidates who wish to apply for promotion under the ERC Grant pathway will complete the online application process outlined in Section 8 but are not required to identify External Assessors. In addition, candidates will be required to email the following additional document to promotions@ucd.ie:

- Evidence of the receipt of an ERC grant.

20.4.3 Prestigious International Award

Candidates who wish to apply for promotion under the Prestigious International Award pathway will complete the online application process outlined in Section 8 but are not required to identify External Assessors. In addition, candidates will be required to email the following additional document to promotions@ucd.ie:

- Evidence of receipt of an internationally-renowned, disciplinary award.

20.5 Role of the External Assessor

Where required, the role of the External Assessor will follow the process as outlined in the Faculty Promotions Policy. In addition, the External Assessor will be required to give an opinion as to the level of promotion for applications made under the competitive retention pathway.

20.6 Role of the Head of School and College Principal

The role of the Head of School and College Principal will follow the process as outlined in Sections 9 and 10 above. In addition, the Head of School and College Principal will include a statement on the strategic relevance of the candidate's area as cross referenced against objectives in the school plan, and of the individual and their strategic importance to the University. At the request of the FPC, the relevant College Principal may be asked to attend the FPC to comment on these issues.

20.7 Role of the FPC

On receipt of all documentation (including External Assessors' reports for candidates applying through the competitive retention pathway), a candidate's application including supporting documentation will be considered at the next meeting of the FPC, or where necessary, and exceptionally, at an additional meeting of the FPC to consider the application.

The FPC will assess the application against the Development Framework for Faculty. In addition, the FPC will take into account the strategic relevance of the candidates' area and its importance to the University. Where necessary, the FPC may invite the relevant College Principal to attend the meeting to comment on these issues.

The FPC will make a recommendation to the President. The President's decision is final. There is no appeal mechanism in relation to Academic Retention applications.

Policy Revision History

Version	Date	Description	Author
---------	------	-------------	--------

Appendix VI - Faculty Promotion Policy

UCD Human Resources
Acmhainní Daonna UCD

1.0	February 2016	Creation of Policy	UCD HR
2.0	March 2016	Revisions following consultation	UCD HR
3.0	May 2016	Further revisions and Governing Authority approval	UCD HR
4.0	November 2016	Remove Tenure as a criterion for eligibility to apply for promotion. Add procedures for Academic Retention applications. Endorsed by Academic Council 10 th November 2016. Approved by Governing Authority 20 th December 2016.	UCD HR
5.0	November 2017	Section 18 of the Policy updated with agreed Appeals process as of 10 th November 2017. Academic Council (28 th November 2017) Governing Authority (13 th December 2017)	UCD HR
6.0	November 2018	Faculty Promotions Policy reviewed and updated following review by Faculty Promotions Policy Review Group. Academic Council (22 nd November 2018) Governing Authority (12 th December 2018)	UCD HR

Appendix VII - Faculty Promotions Procedures

1 Introduction

As set out in our strategy, UCD values excellence and understands that excellent performance requires excellent people working in a supportive environment. The strategy states that:

“UCD will continue to attract excellent and diverse students, Faculty and staff from around Ireland and around the world and will put in place appropriate support measures to develop and retain the members of our community”.

The strategy commits to working to ensure that the University’s Faculty and staff are enabled to achieve their full potential and are appropriately rewarded for their contribution.

Faculty who are considering applying for promotion should read this document in conjunction with the following documents:

- Faculty Promotions Policy
- Development Framework for Faculty
- Conflict of Interest Guidelines

2 Faculty Promotions Committee (FPC)

2.1 Membership

Title	No
Chair, Registrar and Deputy President (ex officio)	One
1 Full Professor from each College (excluding College Principals)	Six
President’s Nominees	Three
The FPC will be supported by HR	

The membership term of the FPC is 3 years which may be renewed, in exceptional circumstances, for up to a further 3 years to ensure consistency and continuity. Membership of the FPC is subject to review by the President and approval by the Governing Authority.

Members of the FPC are required to undertake training on Unconscious Bias and Giving Effective Feedback. They are also required to attend Workshops for candidates and Heads of Schools/College Principals, as required on a rota basis.

A meeting of the FPC is quorate when there are at least 7 members (including the Chair), and at least 2 members of each gender in attendance. If only one member of either gender is available for a meeting, the meeting will be re-scheduled. The Chair is responsible for ensuring that the meeting is quorate. In exceptional circumstances if the 60/40 gender balance requirement is not met the reason for non compliance should be recorded. If non compliance becomes an ongoing issue steps must be taken to address the issue.

2.2 Summary of the Role of the Faculty Promotions Committee

The FPC:

- Assesses all applications, considering the evidence provided, taking impact on performance due to personal or family circumstances into account, in accordance with the Faculty Promotions Policy;
- Selects External Assessors based on the following criteria:
 - The expertise and reputation of the nominee and their institution;
 - The geographical spread of the selected nominees;
 - Appropriate gender representation;
- Is informed by, but not bound by, the Head of School and College Principal commentaries and External Assessor Reports;
- Forwards its recommendations to the President for approval;
- Provides written feedback to all candidates;
- Provides oral feedback to unsuccessful candidates, when requested.
- Considers any observations made by the President and engage in dialogue with the President where necessary to ensure all relevant aspects of each application have been taken into account and addressed in the feedback.

The Order of Business at an FPC meeting is, normally, as follows:

- Review and agree Feedback Reports;
- Reassess applications where the Faculty Promotions Appeals Committee has asked the FPC to review its original decision;
- Full assessment of applications including External Assessor reports;
- Assessment of prima facie cases and, where applicable, selection of external assessors.

3 Equality

It is University policy to give equal consideration to promotion applications regardless of whether the candidate is employed on a full-time, part-time, temporary or indefinite basis.

Consideration of equality issues is critical to the effective operation of the University's promotion procedure which is designed to ensure consistency and fairness in decision-making.

The FPC is committed to non-discrimination and promotion of equality of opportunity on the 10 University grounds of gender, civil status, family status, socio-economic status, sexual orientation, religion, age, disability, race, or membership of the traveller community. The FPC considers any equality issues in line with the University's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion policy.

The Committee will not raise or discuss any equality issues that are not explicitly referred to by the candidate in their application for promotion. Therefore, applicants are encouraged to freely describe any personal or family circumstances that may relate to equality issues, with the assurance that UCD offers its full support and understanding of the impact that many personal circumstances can have on performance.

In considering applications from candidates undertaking part-time work on an ongoing basis, the FPC recognise that the quantity of work undertaken is affected on a pro rata basis but expect that the quality of the output is comparable to that of full time Faculty.

The FPC should monitor gender statistics and success rates and report to UMT as necessary so that actions may be taken at a local level as appropriate.

4 Conflict of Interest

4.1 Faculty Promotions Committee

The role of the FPC is to ensure that impartial, fair and consistent consideration is given to each application.

At the start of each FPC meeting, members of the Committee must declare any relationship with a candidate that might be perceived as creating a conflict of interest as indicated by the Conflict of Interest Guidelines for Faculty Promotions cases.

Where an application is being considered from a candidate from the same School as a member of the FPC, the member will not be involved in the decision in relation to the candidate.

Where a member of the FPC is conflicted on an application, and as a result, the meeting is not quorate in relation to this specific application, it will not be considered at the meeting but at a subsequent meeting.

Members of the FPC do not represent Colleges/Schools and their advocacy of individual cases is not permitted.

4.2 External Assessors

The onus is on External Assessors to declare any conflict of interest in assessing an application. External Assessors are invited to positively express that there is no actual or perceived conflict of interest in relation to their acting as an External Assessor to the candidate in question. A copy of the Conflict of Interest Guidelines for Faculty Promotions Cases is provided to External Assessors.

5 The Role of the Candidate

Faculty who are considering promotion should have an open and constructive discussion with their line manager on whether:

- Their application is ready for submission and if not, where the gaps appear to be;
- What is needed in general terms for it to be supported and how the candidate may address these issues.

A candidate may apply for promotion without agreement from their Head of School/Unit but should inform the Head of School of their intention to apply. The Head of School/Unit is obliged to provide a commentary as part of the process but can reference that a candidate did not discuss their intention to apply with the Head of School.

Candidates are also encouraged to talk to someone who has recently made a successful application for promotion and understands the process.

Applications for promotion may be submitted at any time during the year to the FPC, via InfoHub.

Promotion is based on the written evidence submitted to the FPC and the importance of the quality of this submission cannot be overstated.

The UCD Development Framework for Faculty (DFF) should be used as a guide for Faculty seeking promotion. Faculty members applying for promotion are expected to demonstrate that they meet the standard for promotion during their period of appointment at UCD. Emphasis is placed on the candidate's performance since their last promotion or since arriving at UCD, whichever is most recent. However, consideration is given to a candidate's entire track record. This framework identifies a number of dimensions under each of the category of achievement and should be used by candidates to reflect both personally and within the context of a development conversation on their strengths and opportunities for growth.:

- **Research, Scholarship and Innovation**
 - Qualifications
 - Publication and Profile
 - Research Funding
 - Research Supervision and Management

- Innovation and Impact
- **Teaching and Learning**
 - Engagement with Student Learning
 - Enhancement of Practice: Personal and Professional Development
 - Module/Programme Design and Enhancement
 - Scholarship Dissemination and Esteem
- **Leadership and Contribution**
 - Administration and Leadership
 - Recruitment and Outreach
 - Building Community
 - Building Support
 - Professional Service

Faculty can assess their current position on the framework across the various dimensions. The framework has been developed on the basis that all Faculty including Lecturers/Assistant Professors are expected to be working, at a minimum, at the level of satisfactory achievement across each of the dimensions¹ listed. The Development Framework for Faculty provides indicative guidance on the evidence that may support the demonstration of meeting a standard of achievement against a particular dimension. It is not intended to be definitive or proscriptive. Taken in the round, with due consideration for discipline differences, Associate Professors are expected to be working at the level of substantial achievement, Professors at the level of outstanding achievement and Full Professors at the level of exceptional achievement. It is not expected that Faculty at higher grades would necessarily be working at levels of substantial, outstanding or exceptional achievement across all dimensions but that activity at a higher level in one area would balance against less activity in another dimension.

5.1 External Assessor Nomination

Candidates nominate 3 External Assessors for consideration by the Faculty Promotion Committee.

Candidates should:

- Provide contextual information about their nominees.
- Ensure that nominees:
 - Are at the level of Full Professor (or equivalent) or, in the case of applications for promotion to Associate Professor (or equivalent), at the level of Professor at a minimum;
 - Are geographically spread;
 - Ensure that the proposed external assessors are not all of the same gender;
 - Have no perceived conflict of interest as specified in the Conflict of Interest guidelines.
 - Provide clarification as to why each external assessor has been selected.

For further information, see Sections 8.1 and 13.2 of the Faculty Promotion Policy.

¹ The professional/clinical service dimension is only applicable to Faculty who provide professional/clinical services that benefit the University.

6 The Role of the Head of School

6.1 Head of School Commentary

A commentary by the Head of School should neither be a Reference nor a Recommendation.

Where a Head of School submits a reference or recommendation the FPC reserves the right to return the application to the Head of School which may result in a delay in assessment.

The development conversations that Heads of Schools, or other senior colleagues, may have with candidates prior to their submission are an important feature of the Faculty Promotions process. Ensuring potential candidates have critically considered their readiness for promotion is a key step in preventing premature applications which are difficult for all involved and have the potential to undermine confidence of the candidate and the process. It is equally important to ensure that those who are ready for promotion are encouraged to apply for promotion. Reporting on the content of these conversations in the Head of School commentary provides appropriate contextual information to the FPC where the Head of School, as the commentator, can report on the agreed strengths and areas of development recognised in these meetings and the actions that the candidate has, or has not, taken in addressing them.

The commentary is an important component of the process and a key element that is used both by the FPC and External Assessors in their consideration. It supports the committee by providing relevant disciplinary and School context in relation to statements made by the applicant and is an opportunity for the Head of School, as commentator, to provide sensible and relevant comparator information in relation to workload, disciplinary norms and expectations and to inform the committee of any information that the applicant has not provided or has under or over stated.

6.2 External Assessor Nominations

The selection of appropriate External Assessors is important for the efficient management of applications. The Head of School should:

- Provide contextual information about their nominees and encourage candidates to do the same in relation to their nominees.
- Ensure that the nominated External Assessors:
 - Are a leading academic in their field;
 - Are at the level of Full Professor (or equivalent) or, in the case of applications for promotion to Associate Professor (or equivalent), at the level of Professor at a minimum;
 - Are geographically spread;
 - Are not all of the same gender;
 - Have no conflict of interest as per the Conflict of Interest Guidelines
- Ascertain if an External Assessor has a conflict of interest as part of the selection process.

For further information, see Sections 9 and 13.2 of the Faculty Promotion Policy.

6.3 Performance for Growth and Feedback

Faculty should be provided with advice through the Performance for Growth process about their promotion aspirations and the timing of their application and encourage applications from those they consider ready, particularly female candidates, for senior posts.

Heads of Schools may follow up with unsuccessful candidates to address the feedback received following their assessment and support them in addressing this feedback for future applications.

7 The Role of the College Principal

A commentary by the College Principal should neither be a Reference nor a Recommendation.

Where a College Principal submits a reference or recommendation the FPC reserves the right to return the application to the College Principal which may result in a delay in assessment.

Like the Head of School commentary, the College Principal commentary is a key component of the process that is used both by the FPC and External Assessors in their consideration. The College Principal commentary should:

- Endorse or clarify the commentary of the Head of School;
- Where relevant, provide additional context to that commentary;
- Where applicable, comment on any work undertaken by the candidate within the College.

For further information see sections 10 and 13.2 of the Faculty Promotion Policy.

8 The Role of the External Assessor

The External Assessor role contributes significantly to the overall assessment of the candidate.

An External Assessor does not act as a referee but, rather, assesses the overall academic performance of the candidate and provides the FPC with an independent, unbiased assessment of the level of the candidate's achievements in Research, Scholarship and Innovation, Teaching & Learning and Academic Leadership and Contribution, with particular reference to the UCD Development Framework for Faculty, taking into account the norms for the discipline. The

External Assessor should be made aware of the University's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy.

In addition, an External Assessor comments on:

- Whether there is clear evidence of an upward trajectory;
- Whether the case meets international standards for promotion to the relevant level;
- How the application compares with recent successful applications for promotion to the equivalent level within the External Assessor's own institution.

They are also required to indicate:

- In what capacity they are acquainted with the candidate;
- That a conflict of interest could not be perceived between themselves and the candidate as defined by the conflict of interest guidelines.

9 Assessment Process

9.1 General Information

- The FPC normally processes applications in the order that they are received. The Assessment process takes on average 8 months to complete. Delays may occur from time to time because of the time taken to receive the requisite number of suitable external assessor reports and at certain times of the year if application numbers are high. (See the HR website for further information).
- Each member of the FPC attending the meeting reads each application prior to the FPC meeting and contributes to the discussion on each application.
- The FPC works by consensus.
- If a member of the FPC is not present at the meeting where a recommendation is made they confirm their agreement or disagreement with the decision at the subsequent FPC meeting when the feedback is reviewed, agreed and signed off by the FPC.²

9.2 Assessment Meetings

There are 3 stages to the Assessment Process:

Stage 1 – Establishing a Prima Facie Case

- Each member of the FPC reviews each application against the Development Framework for Faculty to determine if a prima facie³ case has been established.
- A prima facie case is not established if the candidate fails to provide evidence, in the round, of meeting the standard required for promotion to the appropriate grade.

² Members of the Committee on research sabbatical or absent due to circumstances such as illness etc. will not be required to contribute to the decision.

³ A prima facie case will exist, *if following consultation, the FPC decides that the body of evidence across the promotion criteria merits further assessment.*

- The purpose of the prima facie test is to exclude a candidate who, in the view of the FPC, has failed to meet the satisfactory standard in one or more dimension or where it is the view of the FPC that the candidate has not provided evidence in the aggregate of meeting the standard required for promotion to the appropriate grade.
- If a prima facie case is established, a candidate should not assume that satisfactory external assessors reports are all that is required to assure promotion. The FPC may use external assessor reports to receive assurance of particular excellence in one area which would on aggregate bring the candidate above the standard required for promotion to the appropriate grade.
- Following consideration by the full committee, a collective decision is made on whether the candidate provided sufficient evidence in their application to establish a prima facie case.
- Where the FPC determines that a candidate has not established a prima facie case, a member of the FPC prepares a draft feedback report for consideration and approval by the FPC at its next scheduled meeting. This report should include a clear rationale for the decision. Candidates are encouraged to consider this feedback with their Head of School and discuss how they may be supported to further develop their profile.
- When the feedback report is agreed, the report along with the candidate's application and the FPC's recommendation is forwarded to the President for decision.

Stage 2 – Applications are forwarded to External Assessors

Where the FPC is satisfied that a prima facie case for promotion has been established, applications are forwarded to selected External Assessors. The establishment of a prima facie case does not guarantee that an application will be successful.

Process for obtaining External Assessor Reports

In relation to the consideration and selection of external assessors, members of the FPC (in pairs):

- Are assigned a number of applications;
- Review the list of nominated external assessors provided by the candidate and Head of School/College Principal.
- Agree a ranked list of external assessors for recommendation to the full FPC.

The FPC agrees a ranked list of External Assessors from the list of nominees. The FPC reserves the right to exclude External Assessors. External Assessors may not be selected by the FPC e.g. where:

- The External Assessor is not at the correct level i.e. Full Professor or in the case of applications for promotion to Associate Professor, Professor;
- There is little or no geographical spread;
- There is insufficient gender representation;
- Where there is an actual or perceived conflict of interest that has not been addressed satisfactorily by the nominator

It is possible that all of a candidate's nominees could be excluded due to a combination of the above reasons.

HR contacts the selected External Assessors in order of ranking by the FPC. Where necessary, HR moves to the next selected external assessor on the list until the requisite number of reports have been received;

The application is forwarded to the FPC for assessment when the requisite number of External Assessor reports is received.

Where an External Assessor indicates a conflict of interest (as outlined in the Conflict of Interest guidelines), the FPC will consider whether the External Assessor's report should be excluded, and additional reports obtained.

Where an External Assessor does not respond to the invitation to act or indicates that they are unable to provide a report, HR contacts the next External Assessor as selected and ranked by the FPC.

If, for any reason, more than the requisite number of reports is submitted to HR, (for example, when an External Assessor does not respond to an invitation to act but subsequently provides a report) HR forwards the external assessor reports to the FPC in the ranked order as agreed by the FPC.

Assessors who do not respond to the invitation to act are advised that their participation is no longer required following the President's decision.

Where the FPC seeks additional assessors' reports, the application will be considered at the first opportunity when the additional reports are available.

Stage 3. Assessment of Applications following receipt of the required number of External Assessor reports.

When the required number of External Assessor reports are received the FPC fully reassesses the evidence provided in each application including the Development Workspace and the external assessors' reports against the Development Framework for Faculty, to determine if, in its opinion, the candidate has provided sufficient evidence for promotion to the required level.

The Chair selects a member of the FPC to initiate the discussion on the assessment of each application. The FPC determines if a candidate has provided sufficient evidence for promotion to the required level.

A member of the FPC prepares a feedback report on a candidate's application for consideration and approval by the FPC at its next scheduled meeting. The report should include a clear rationale for the decision and where appropriate outline any areas of note for special mention.

In the case of unsuccessful applications, the report should also outline what actions the candidate might take to ensure that a subsequent application would have a higher likelihood

of success. The feedback should provide a broadly indicative timeframe for achieving these actions.

When the feedback report is agreed, the FPC will finalise the list of recommendations to be forwarded to the President for approval.

10 Conclusion of the Process

Following the conclusion of the process:

- The names of candidates recommended for promotion by the FPC are forwarded to the President for approval.
- The FPC considers any observations made by the President and engages in dialogue with the President where necessary to ensure all relevant aspects of each application have been taken into account and addressed in the feedback. Candidates are informed in writing of the decision in respect of their application and the reason/s for that decision.
- A candidate who requires copies of their External Assessors reports should contact the Freedom of Information Office.
- All other documentation in relation to a candidate's application is available from the Promotions & Grading Office, on request.
- College Principals and Heads of Schools are informed of the outcome of the assessment process and are provided with a copy of the feedback report in relation to candidates from their School/College.
- The HR Leadership Team and the relevant HRP is informed of the outcome but are not provided with the feedback report
- All candidates are given written feedback on their application. In cases where a candidate's application for promotion has been unsuccessful they are given the opportunity for oral feedback by the Chairperson, or nominee, and one other member of the FPC. Normally, the member of the FPC who drafts the feedback report also provides oral feedback to the candidate with the Chair or his nominee.
- Following oral feedback, a short note of the oral feedback is drafted and retained as a record of the meeting. The note is sent to the candidate for their review and agreement following the oral feedback meeting.
- UMT is notified of successful candidates as an item of routine business.
- A list of promoted candidates is forwarded to the Governing Authority and Academic Council, at the final meeting of the calendar for noting.
- External Assessors are advised of the outcome for the candidate for whom they provided a reference.
- External Assessors who were available to give assessments but were not required will be informed that their assessment was not required but will not be informed of the outcome.
- The effective date of promotion is the date when the FPC's recommendation for promotion is approved by the President.

11 Notes and records

Each member of the FPC is expected to make notes in relation to their assessment of each application.

Notes should be impersonal, factual and clear as to the comment being made. They should not compare candidates but should reference back to the Development Framework for Faculty or to statements made by the candidate, the Head of School, College Principal, or External Assessors.

. Notes and relevant minutes are available to candidates on request following the conclusion of the process including written and oral feedback.

External assessor's reports are provided in confidence (within the framework of FOI legislation) and as such are retained by HR and candidates may apply for them under FOI.

Individual notes are held by HR for a minimum of 12 months

12 Incomplete applications

It is a candidate's responsibility to ensure that a complete application for promotion is submitted to the FPC via InfoHub. The FPC will not assess incomplete applications.

13 Reapplications

Repeat applications are assessed and determined on the same basis as first applications. Candidates must ensure that they include evidence of how they have addressed the feedback given following their previous submission.

The Head of School and College Principal commentaries should comment on whether the candidate has addressed the previous feedback.

The Feedback letter(s) provided to the candidate on their previous submission is reviewed by the FPC as part of its consideration.

Where a previously unsuccessful candidate reapplies for promotion the assessor reports from the previous application cannot be resubmitted.

14 Appeals Process

Unsuccessful candidates may appeal against a promotion decision an alleged failure by FPC to observe due process, which is defined below, can be demonstrated:

- Failure to follow in due manner University policy and procedures for the consideration of applications for promotion. All University policies and procedures are subject to statutory/anti-discriminatory requirements;
- Denial of natural justice;
- Unfair or unreasonable application of the criteria for the granting of promotions.

An appeal is only considered by the FPAC after the candidate has attended for oral feedback. Appeals must be lodged with the University no later than sixty days following the meeting at which oral feedback is provided.

Procedures for the Appeals process to be further developed.

For information on the Appeals process, see Section 18 of the Faculty Promotion Policy.

Appendix VIII

Conflict of Interest Guidelines for Faculty Promotions Cases

A fair, transparent and academically rigorous process of Faculty Promotions is crucial to the reputation and good-standing of the University. The FPC must be satisfied that no evidence of an actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest exists in the selection of External Assessors. An External Assessor is deemed to have a conflict of interest if they have a professional or personal relationship with the candidate that could reasonably call into question the Assessor's ability to give an objective assessment of the application and have a material effect on the decision. In practice, there are a number of situations in which a conflict of interest might be considered to exist actually, potentially or perceptually. In each of these situations the proposed External Assessor is deemed unsuitable to serve in this capacity and therefore must not be proposed by the candidate, Head of School/College Principal or selected by the FPC.

External Assessors with the following relationships with a candidate are seen to have a conflict of interest under these guidelines:

1	Where the External Assessor has had a formal (paid or unpaid) affiliation with the candidate at UCD or elsewhere within the last 5 years e.g. is a former close colleague or associate of the School/Unit or is a past member of a School/Unit/Research Group.
2	Where a Ph.D. or Post-Doctoral Supervisory relationship has existed between the candidate and the External Assessor in either direction.
3	Where there has been close collaboration, including significant co-authorship, co-presentational, co-editorial activities (excluding co-membership of editorial boards) or mentorship between the candidate and the External Assessor within the last 5 years.
4	Where a close personal relationship e.g. friendship, business, professional partnership or family relationship, exists, or has existed, between the candidate and the External Assessor.
5	Where a known professional or personal conflict exists between the candidate and the External Assessor.
6	Where the External Assessor holds strong negative opinions on the work presented or research conducted by the candidate that could prevent her/him from providing a fair and balanced review of the candidate's application.

Adherence to these guidelines will help to safeguard the academic integrity, administrative effectiveness and strict impartiality of the Faculty Promotions process.

Appendix IX - Development Framework for Faculty

Research, Scholarship and Innovation	Applicant Comments				
Dimensions		Indicators of Satisfactory Achievement	Indicators of Substantial Achievement	Indicators of Outstanding Achievement	Indicators of Exceptional Achievement
Qualifications		Ph.D. or equivalent doctoral qualification, or equivalent evidence of high-level research (or, in exceptional circumstances, professional) achievement.	→	→	→
		For clinical academics, relevant Board certification.	→	→	→
Publication and Profile (Demonstration of publication quality and impact may include, but is not limited to, citations, journal impact factors, reviews and prizes, all as appropriate to the discipline. In the case of multi-authored publications, there must be a clear and outstanding personal contribution.)		A sustained record of publication in leading international journals and conferences, peer-reviewed book chapters, books and/or monographs, as appropriate to disciplinary norms.	A substantial and sustained record of publication in leading international journals and conferences and in peer-reviewed book chapters, books and/or monographs from leading publishers. This record will be appropriate to disciplinary norms, and will include sole, major or senior authorship of high-impact publications.	An outstanding and sustained record of publication in leading international journals and conferences and in peer-reviewed book chapters, books and/or monographs from leading publishers. This body of work will have had significant impact within the discipline, marking the individual out as a leader in a particular area or areas of research.	An exceptional and sustained record of publication in leading international journals and conferences and in peer-reviewed book chapters, books and/or monographs from leading publishers. The body of publications will have an impact, coherence and an intellectual signature that has earned the individual a widespread reputation as a leader in their discipline.
		Indicators of esteem in research and scholarship, as appropriate to the discipline.	Indicators of substantial esteem in research and scholarship, as appropriate to the discipline. Examples include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A track record of invited lectures and visiting appointments, along with prizes and honours. 	Indicators of outstanding esteem in research and scholarship, as appropriate to the discipline. Examples include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invited lectures and visiting appointments at leading international institutions, keynote lectures at major international conferences, major prizes and honours. 	Indicators of exceptional esteem in research and scholarship, as appropriate to the discipline. Examples include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly prestigious invited lectures and visiting appointments, keynote lectures at the leading international conferences, and particularly prestigious prizes and honours.
		Active membership of national or international societies or committees, where these relate to the research and scholarly work of the individual.	Membership at an elevated grade (e.g. senior membership or equivalent) and participation in leadership activities of leading national or international societies or committees, where these relate to the research and scholarly work of the individual.	Membership of prestigious selective societies or elevation to leadership positions, fellowship or equivalent in leading international societies or committees, based on outstanding performance in research and scholarship.	Membership of the most prestigious selective societies or elevation to key leadership positions, fellowship or equivalent in leading international societies or committees, based on exceptional performance in research and scholarship.
		Contribution to the organisation of research through activities such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regularly serving as a reviewer for journals and conferences Contributing to the organisation of conferences and workshops 	Significant contribution to the organisation of research, through activities such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> External examining of research degrees at national and international universities Regularly serving as a reviewer for leading journals Contributing to the organisation of national and international conferences Participating in international collaborations Participating in advisory and review panels 	Effective leadership in the organisation of research, through activities such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Editorial positions in leading international journals Organising and hosting major conferences Leadership roles within international research collaborations Participation in international advisory and review panels 	Senior and effective leadership in the organisation of research, through activities such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senior editorial positions in leading international journals Chairing major conferences Leading international research collaborations Leading international advisory and review panels
Research Funding		Engagement with the process of initiating peer-reviewed research funding, consistent with opportunities available.	Peer-reviewed competitively-won national or international funding as a principal investigator or co-investigator, funding a substantial project or programme.	Peer-reviewed competitively-won national or international funding as principal investigator (or as a co-investigator in very large national and international collaborations), from funding sources that are recognised within the discipline to be particularly prestigious and/or competitive.	Peer-reviewed competitively-won national or international funding as principal investigator of a national or international collaboration of the highest prestige, competitiveness and scale.

Dimensions		Indicators of Satisfactory Achievement	Indicators of Substantial Achievement	Indicators of Outstanding Achievement	Indicators of Exceptional Achievement
Research Supervision and Management		Successful involvement in the supervision and examination of research at Masters and/or PhD level as appropriate to disciplinary norms.	A substantial track record of research supervision, particularly of PhDs (or equivalent doctoral degrees) and postdoctoral researchers. Contribution to research supervision and examination more broadly within the university.	A record of research supervision, particularly of PhDs (or equivalent doctoral degrees) and postdoctoral researchers, that is outstanding in scale and/or quality. This may be demonstrated by , for example, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awards and positions secured by doctoral and postdoctoral researchers Invitations to host visiting doctoral and postdoctoral researchers Steps taken in support of career development of doctoral and postdoctoral researchers within the group and within the university. 	A record of research supervision, particularly of PhDs (or equivalent doctoral degrees) and postdoctoral researchers, that is exceptional in scale and/or quality. This may be demonstrated by , for example, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prestigious mentorship awards won by the individual, highly competitive awards and positions secured by doctoral and postdoctoral researchers Invitations to host visiting doctoral and postdoctoral researchers Steps taken in support of career development of doctoral and postdoctoral researchers within the group and within the university that advance best practice in supervision.
		Where appropriate, taking steps to build a structured research group/team.	Leading and managing a successful and structured research group/team.	Leading and managing a successful and structured research group/team that is outstanding in success and/or scale.	Leading and managing a research group/team in a manner that is exceptional in success and/or scale, and advancing best practice in research leadership and management.
		Satisfactory engagement in collaborative research.	Substantial involvement in research collaborations that have delivered defined outcomes and impact.	Outstanding involvement in research collaborations that have delivered strong outcomes and impact.	Exceptional achievement in leading research collaborations that have delivered important outcomes and impact.
		Where appropriate, taking steps to develop research infrastructure to the benefit of the university.	Substantial involvement in the successful development of research infrastructure to the benefit of the university.	Outstanding involvement in the delivery and successful management of research infrastructure to the benefit of the university	Exceptional leadership in the delivery and successful management of major research infrastructure to the benefit of the university.
Innovation		Engagement with research-driven innovation, as appropriate to disciplinary norms	A substantial record of research driven innovation, which may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Successful engagement with the patenting or licensing of intellectual property Involvement in a campus company development programme, with successful outcomes Consultancy pursued through University channels 	An outstanding record of research driven innovation, which may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Award of patents with notable impact Licensing of intellectual property with notable impact Formation and successful running of a campus company with notable impact Consultancy pursued through University channels with notable impact 	An exceptional record of research driven innovation with particular significance or scale, which may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Award of patents with exceptional impact Licensing of intellectual property with exceptional impact Formation and successful running of a campus company with exceptional impact Consultancy pursued through University channels with exceptional impact
Impact		Delivering cultural, economic, environmental, health, intellectual, political, social or technological impact based on research and scholarly activity. Pathways to impact may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informing and contributing to policy debate Active involvement in professional, cultural or community organisations Professional/clinical practice Delivering creative works of particular repute 	Delivering substantial cultural, economic, environmental, health, intellectual, political, social or technological impact based on research and scholarly activity. Pathways to impact may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informing and contributing to policy debate at a high level or scale Providing expert advice to government, industry and other organisations Contribution at a senior level to professional, cultural or community organisations Informing professional/clinical practice Delivering creative works of national repute 	Delivering outstanding cultural, economic, environmental, health, intellectual, political, social or technological impact based on research and scholarly activity, earning for the individual a reputation for leadership. Pathways to impact may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing expert advice to government, industry and other organisations, at a very high level or scale Leadership of professional, cultural or community organisations Significantly advancing professional/clinical best practice nationally or internationally Delivering creative works of international or major national repute 	Delivering exceptional cultural, economic, environmental, health, intellectual, political, social or technological impact based on research and scholarly activity, earning for the individual a widespread reputation as one of the international leaders in their discipline. Pathways to impact may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing expert advice at the highest level to government, industry and other organisations Leadership of the most significant international professional or cultural organisations Transforming professional/clinical best practice internationally Delivering creative works of the highest international repute
Teaching and Learning					
Dimensions		Indicators of Satisfactory Achievement	Indicators of Substantial Achievement	Indicators of Outstanding Achievement	Indicators of Exceptional Achievement

Dimensions		Indicators of Satisfactory Achievement	Indicators of Substantial Achievement	Indicators of Outstanding Achievement	Indicators of Exceptional Achievement
Engagement with Student Learning		Engagement with and delivery of effective teaching, learning and assessment (including projects and minor theses). For example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement in curriculum design/innovation Facilitating the integration and successful progression of students into programmes Significant contribution to delivery of modules appropriate for the discipline and the workload framework of the School Assessment of experiential learning activities including supervision and assessment of work placements/internships. 	Sustained and substantial commitment to effective teaching, learning and assessment (including projects and minor theses). For example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achievements in curriculum design/innovation to overcome special challenges (breadth of courses, difficulty of material, student engagement, enabling student access etc.) Creation of entirely new modules, programmes or curricula, especially when driven by new disciplinary and/or research developments Awareness and application of important external developments and/or international developments in pedagogy and research in higher education. 	Substantive and successful innovations in curriculum design and delivery (face-to-face, blended and online), recognised as making a major contribution to the subject or discipline. For example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The establishment of a successful new area of teaching Leadership or major role in initiation and completion of major course reviews Contribution to developments in pedagogy and research in higher Education beyond the university (nationally and/or internationally). 	Successful innovation, leadership and implementation of major teaching and learning innovations, with significant impact recognised internationally
		Consistent record of effective engagement with the student body within the School.	Substantial record of engagement with the student body at School or Programme. For example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involvement in academic advising and/or supporting and mentoring students within or beyond the School; Creating opportunities for students to engage in co-curricular activities 	Leadership in engagement with the student body. For example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementing structured academic advising and/or mentoring programmes for students Creating a significant staff - student partnership initiative 	Transformational leadership in engagement with the student body recognised externally.
		Engagement with the delivery of continuing professional development activity or lifelong learning initiatives particularly within one's discipline.	Substantial and sustained contribution to the delivery of continuing professional development or lifelong learning initiatives.	Effective leadership in the development and delivery of continuing professional development or lifelong learning initiatives.	Sustained record of leadership in the development of successful market leading continuing professional development programmes of study.
Enhancement of Practice: Personal and Professional Development		Ongoing satisfactory performance as an effective university teacher.	Substantial and validated performance as an effective university teacher. For example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal or external recognition such as significant professional awards or prizes College Level Teaching and Learning Award 	University or national level recognition. For example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fellowships in Teaching & Learning University-level Teaching * Learning Awards National teaching awards. 	Recognition as a leader in university teaching and learning
		Participation in CPD in university teaching and learning. For example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attendance and participation in appropriate and relevant courses in or related to teaching and learning within or outside the university Regular participation and contribution in seminars and/conferences in teaching and learning. 	Active, ongoing and substantial participation in CPD in university teaching and learning. For example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attainment of accredited qualification specific to teaching in higher education Development activity which has had clear and substantial impact on own teaching. 	Successful and sustained involvement in other professional development activities, in discipline-specific education and/or specialist educational approaches, which has impacted on teaching.	Exceptional contribution to national and/or international networks to support improvements in the quality of teaching and learning.
		Commitment to ongoing evaluation and enhancement of teaching, drawing on various sources of feedback and self-reflection and an appreciation of contemporary pedagogical theories.	Demonstration of incorporation of contemporary pedagogical theories in teaching.	Sustained, high quality understanding of and engagement with and to, the scholarship of teaching and learning and/or pedagogic innovation in the subject/ discipline. Enhancement of teaching and learning standards at School/College level.	Demonstration of an exceptional, high quality understanding of and engagement with and to, the scholarship of teaching and learning and/or pedagogic innovation in the subject/ discipline.
Module & Programme Design & Enhancement		Effective engagement with quality enhancement processes in relation to design or revision of modules. Supported by for example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student/peer feedback External examiner feedback Quality reviews. 	Application of quality enhancement processes for effective innovation in the design or revision of modules/programmes. Leadership at school level, for example School Head of Teaching and Learning	Outstanding leadership at College and/or Programme level in the delivery of substantive and lasting programme change. For example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean or Associate Dean for a programme Vice Principal Teaching and Learning. 	Creation of internationally recognised programmes of scale which have enhanced the international educational reputation of the university.

Dimensions		Indicators of Satisfactory Achievement	Indicators of Substantial Achievement	Indicators of Outstanding Achievement	Indicators of Exceptional Achievement
Scholarship, Dissemination and Esteem		Application of relevant scholarship/research in teaching and learning to the design and delivery of modules. Participation and contribution in College/University teaching and learning events	A substantial and sustained record of dissemination of excellence and best practice in teaching. For example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation and substantial contribution in College/University teaching and learning events Preparation of textbooks or sustainable/reusable learning resource which are used effectively within the University Publication in peer reviewed journals, conferences and books. 	An outstanding and sustained record of dissemination of excellence and best practice in teaching. For example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation and outstanding contribution in University teaching and learning events Preparation of textbooks or sustainable/reusable learning resource which are widely adopted outside the University Publication in peer reviewed journals, conferences and books which achieve demonstrable impact. <p>This body of work will have had significant impact within the discipline, marking the individual out as a leader in pedagogy and practice.</p>	An exceptional and sustained record of dissemination of excellence and best practice in teaching. For example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation and exceptional contribution in University teaching and learning events Preparation of textbooks or sustainable/reusable learning resources which become international standards for the discipline Award-winning publications in peer reviewed journals. The body of work will have an impact, coherence and an intellectual signature that has earned the individual a widespread reputation as a leader in pedagogy and practice.
			Indicators of substantial esteem. For example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A substantial track record of invited lectures to present on Teaching and Learning Prizes and honours in Teaching and Learning. 	Indicators of outstanding esteem. For example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invited lectures and visiting appointments at leading international institutions Keynote lectures at major international conferences Major prizes and honours. Invitations to participate in international teaching and learning fora. External assessor for institutional reviews Demonstrable record of Professional Consultation 	Indicators of exceptional esteem. For example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly prestigious invited lectures and visiting appointments Awards/prizes for internationally recognised, significant teaching/pedagogic innovation and leadership
Leadership and Contribution					
Dimensions		Indicators of Satisfactory Achievement	Indicators of Substantial Achievement	Indicators of Outstanding Achievement	Indicators of Exceptional Achievement
Administration and Leadership		Contribution to the effective administration and functioning of the university, for example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active membership of school/college/ institute/university committees and boards. 	Substantial and sustained commitment to the university through active and successful membership of major committees and boards. Leadership within the university, demonstrated by, for example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chairing committees and boards. 	Outstanding contribution to the university through a significant, sustained and successful leadership role at the level of Head of School or equivalent	Exceptional contribution to the university through a significant, sustained and successful leadership role at UMT level, or through exceptional success as a Head of School or equivalent.
Recruitment		Participation in open days and other recruitment activities	Substantial and sustained commitment to recruitment activities, for example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective organisation of open days and student recruitment activity Representing the university internationally and supporting the recruitment of students, particularly international and under-represented student cohorts. 	Outstanding commitment to recruitment, outreach activities, through sustained commitment to and leadership in activities such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student recruitment at significant scale, particularly international students and under-represented students 	Exceptional commitment to recruitment, outreach activities, through sustained commitment to and leadership of activities such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transformational initiatives in student recruitment Activities that advance international best practice and achieve international recognition for the individual and for the university
Building Community		Sustained commitment to enhancing the university community, for example through <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for students and student activities Participation in conferring ceremonies and other major events for the university community. 	Substantial and sustained commitment to enhancing the university community, for example through <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership in the support of students and student activities Engagement with the development of faculty and staff Contributing to the organisation of major events for the university community. 	Outstanding and sustained commitment to enhancing the university community, delivering significant progress towards the university's objectives and advancing best practice nationally.	Exceptional and sustained achievements in enhancing the university community, delivering transformational results that advance international best practice and achieve international recognition for the individual and for the university
Building Support		Representing the university at meetings with agencies, industry, visitors and potential donors if and when required.	Substantial involvement in building support among external partners for university developments, leading to outcomes such as scholarships, funded positions, infrastructure or other developments that benefit the university.	Outstanding involvement in a leadership team that secures funding for, and successfully delivers, a major development within the university outside the individual's own research area.	Exceptional leadership of a team that secures funding for, and successfully delivers, a major development within the university outside the individual's own research area.

Dimensions		Indicators of Satisfactory Achievement	Indicators of Substantial Achievement	Indicators of Outstanding Achievement	Indicators of Exceptional Achievement
Professional/ Clinical Service		<p>Providing professional/clinical services that benefit the university by, for example, working as a member of clinical team, providing referral services that contribute to educational objectives, research and clinical income generation</p>	<p>Substantial and sustained provision of professional/clinical services that advance best practice within the university. This may be demonstrated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serving as Discipline Leader • Achieving new or continued recognition for specialist training programmes • Leading clinical outcomes assessment • Development of new clinical services 	<p>Development and delivery of professional/clinical services that advance best practice nationally and measurably advance progress towards university objectives. This may be demonstrated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invitations to deliver keynote presentations • Serving in senior positions in international clinical speciality organisations • Awards and Prizes • Major Involvement in clinical infrastructure development • Developing strategy for clinical services 	<p>Development and delivery of transformational professional/clinical services that advance international best practice and achieve international recognition for the individual and for the university. This may be demonstrated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Award of major international prizes or distinctions • Regular invitations to provide specialist clinical training internationally • Exceptional and sustained contribution to clinical income generation • Research-led development of major new clinical practices or procedures
Public and Professional Engagement		<p>I Participation in public engagement activities through which research, teaching and scholarly activity are influenced by and shared with the public for mutual learning I Participation in engaging with professional organisations and groups such that knowledge deriving from research and teaching contributes to the professional discipline</p>	<p>I Substantial and sustained commitment to public engagement activities through which research, teaching and scholarly activity are influenced by and shared with the public for mutual learning I Substantial and sustained commitment to engagement with professional groups and organisations at a national level, such that knowledge from research and teaching contributes to the development of the professional discipline. Participation in professional engagement at international level.</p>	<p>I Outstanding achievement in public engagement based on research, teaching or scholarly activity, through sustained commitment to and leadership in public engagement activities that have transformational impact at the national scale I Outstanding achievement in professional engagement, through leadership role or directing of major initiatives and projects within a professional organisation at a national level, such that knowledge from research and teaching contributes to the development of the professional discipline.. Substantial and sustained commitment to professional engagement with an international organisation.</p>	<p>I Exceptional achievement in public engagement based on research, teaching or scholarly activity, through sustained commitment to and leadership in public engagement activities that have substantial impact at the international scale and have earned the individual a widespread reputation as a leader in their discipline I Exceptional achievement in professional engagement at an international level, through leadership roles or directing major projects with initiatives with leading organisations, such that knowledge from research and teaching contributes to the development of the professional discipline.</p>

Appendix X

Faculty Promotions Appeals Committee

1st February 2019 – 31st January 2024

Professor Patricia Kelly, Professor Emeritus, School of Irish, Celtic Studies and Folklore (Chair)

Professor Alan Baird, School of Veterinary Medicine (President's Nominee)

Professor Niamh Brennan, College of Business (President's Nominee)

Professor Liam Murphy, School of Computer Science (Academic Council Representative)

Professor Patrick Paul Walsh, School of Politics and International Relations (Union Representative)