# DOCUMENT 9B PRO FORMA FPC MINUTES

###### Strictly Confidential

Promotions Committee for the Faculty/Department of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**SECOND MEETING, 1 October 2017 Exercise**

The second meeting of the Promotions Committee for the Faculty/Department of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

was held at [ ] am/pm) on [date] in [venue \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_].

Present: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (in the Chair), names of members appointed in accordance with paragraph [ ] of the guidance by the Faculty Board or other comparable authority, by the General Board.

Apologies for absence: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **Minutes**

The Minutes of the first meeting of the Committee held on (date) were approved.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

The Committee were reminded of the following declarations of interest:-

**3. Guidance**

It was noted that the purpose of the second meeting of the Committee was to agree collectively in the terms of the relevant criteria an evaluation of the cases for promotion in respect of the offices to which applicants sought promotion.

1. **Documentation**

The Chair confirmed the additional documentation that the Committee agreed at their first meeting should be sought had been received and in accordance with paragraphs 8.22 and 13.23 of the Guidance was complete in respect of each applicant.

**5. Applications for personal Professorships**

**Dr X.**

[Summary assessment of the evidence in relation to the criteria below:

* *Research/Scholarship*

There must be established international leadership in the relevant subject with reference to:

(i) originality

(ii) contribution to the advancement of knowledge

(iii) reputation

* *Teaching*
* *General Contribution]*

The summary should indicate whether the application has been treated as interdisciplinary and/or whether allowance has been made for any additional considerations, indicating in each case what action has been taken and the reasons for this.

It was agreed that, on the basis of the references and on the other evidence before the Committee,

Dr X should be awarded as follows for each of the evaluative criteria.

[Comment, if any: *please note that the Faculty Promotion Committee should also provide comment in relation to each criterion on Document 7A which is disclosable for the purpose of feedback. Such comments should be anonymised. (8.24 of the guidance)].*

**Others**

Repeat as for Dr X.

**Summary List**

The following list provides a ranking of the relative strengths of the cases for promotion to personal Professorships considered above:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Applicant** | **Ranking** | **Ra** | **Overall Score** |  | **Banding\*** | | | **Score** | | |
| **(max 50)** |  | **R/S** | **T** | **GC** | **R/S (1-30)\*\*** | **T (1-10)** | **GC (1-10)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **X** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* Performance Descriptors: OE, SE, CE, IE, CU

\*\* Score range of 1-30 will be applied

**6. Applications for personal Readership**

**Dr Y.**

[Summary assessment of the evidence in relation to the criteria below:

* *Research/Scholarship*

There must be international recognition in the relevant subject with reference to:

(i) originality

(ii) contribution to the advancement of knowledge

(iii) reputation

* *Teaching*
* *General Contribution]*

The summary should indicate whether the application has been treated as interdisciplinary and/or whether allowance has been made for any additional considerations, indicating in each case what action has been taken and the reasons for this.

It was agreed that, on the basis of the references and on the other evidence before the Committee,

Dr Y should be awarded as follows for each of the evaluative criteria.

[Comment, if any: *please note that the Faculty Promotion Committee should also provide comment in relation to each criterion on Document 7B which is disclosable for the purpose of feedback. Such comments should be anonymised. (8.24 of the guidance)].*

**Others**

Repeat as for Dr Y.

**Summary List**

The following list provides a ranking of the relative strengths of the cases for promotion to personal Readerships considered above:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Applicant** | **Ranking** | **Ra** | **Overall Score** |  | **Banding\*** | | | **Score** | | |
| **(max 50)** |  | **R/S** | **T** | **GC** | **R/S (1-30)\*\*** | **T (1-10)** | **GC (1-10)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Y** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* Performance Descriptors: OE, SE, CE, IE, CU

\*\* Score range of 1-30 will be applied

**7. Applications for University Senior Lectureship**

**Dr Z.**

[Summary assessment of the evidence in relation to the criteria below:

* *Research/Scholarship*

There must be achievement in research/scholarship that allows the Faculty or Department to count the applicant as research-active.

* *Teaching*

Note - the necessary evidence of teaching contribution cannot normally be accumulated within a period of less than 3 years (see 7.15).

* *General Contribution]*

[The summary should indicate whether the application has been treated as interdisciplinary and/or whether allowance has been made for any additional considerations, indicating in each case what action has been taken and the reasons for this.]

It was agreed that, on the basis of the references and on the other evidence before the Committee, Dr X should be awarded as follows for each evaluative criteria. [Comment, if any: *please note that the Faculty Promotion Committee should also provide comment in relation to each criterion on Document 7C which is disclosable for the purpose of feedback. Such comments should be anonymised. (8.24 of the guidance)*].

**Others**

Repeat as for Dr Z.

**Summary List**

The following list provides a ranking of the relative strengths of the cases for promotion to personal University Senior Lectureships considered above:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Applicant** | **Ranking** | **Ra** | **Overall Score** |  | **Banding\*** | | | **Score** | | |
| **(max 24)** |  | **R/S** | **T** | **GC** | **R/S (1-4)\*\*** | **T (1-10)** | **GC (1-10)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Z** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* Performance Descriptors: OE, SE, CE, IE, CU

\*\* Capped at 4

**8. Applications for Contribution Increments**

It was agreed that, on the basis of the evidence before the Committee, a contribution award should be made to the candidates listed below according to the strength of their case:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Applicant** | **Department/Faculty** | **Ranking**  **Ra** | **Number of**  **Increments**  **Applied for**  **(1 or 2)\*** | **Number of**  **Increments**  **Approved**  **(1 or 2)\*\*** |
| Dr A |  | 1 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Dr B |  | 2 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

*[Note:*

*\*Most successful proposals will result in the award of one contribution increment. Exceptional cases need to be made for the award of more than 1 increment.*

*\*\*If the number approved differs from that proposed, the reasons for this variance should be set out in the comments concerning this candidate]*

In deciding on the rank order of priority the Committee agreed that the following comments should be recorded:

Dr A

*[Summary Assessment against criteria:*

* *Outstanding and sustained excellence in teaching*
* *Outstanding and sustained general and/or administrative contributions]*

Dr B etc, *[as appropriate]*

On the basis of the evidence before the Committee it was agreed that the candidates listed below did not meet the criteria for a contribution award:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Applicant** | **Department/Faculty** | **Ra** |
|
| Dr C |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Dr D |  |  |
|  |  |  |

In reviewing these applications, the Committee agreed that the reasons that these candidates were assessed as not meeting the minimum criteria for a contribution reward were as follows:

Dr C

*[Summary Assessment against criteria:*

* *Outstanding and sustained excellence in teaching*
* *Outstanding and sustained general and/or administrative contributions]*

Dr D etc

**9. Forwarding documentation**

The Committee agreed, in accordance with 8.25 of the guidance, that the Minutes of the first and second meetings of the Promotions Committee, together with the documentation for each applicant as supplemented by completed Documents 7A/7B/7C and 8 for each applicant be forwarded to the relevant HR Business Manager in the Human Resources Division. It was noted that copies of Documents 7A/7B/7C and 8 were disclosable on request to applicants at this stage of the process.

The Committee also agreed that the documentation for all applicants under the Contribution Reward Scheme (Section 13) would be forwarded to the relevant HR Business Manager.

**10. Comments on the Operation of the Scheme**

The Committee agreed to draw the General Board’s attention to the following comments on the operation of the scheme:

(i)

(ii)

etc

**ATTACHMENTS:**

For each applicant in alphabetical order, arranged under category of office:

* Complete documentation for each applicant as received for the Second Meeting
* Part 1 of Documents 7A/7B/7C as completed by the Faculty Promotions Committee
* Part 1 of Document 8 as completed by the Faculty Promotions Committee