

# GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION TO AND WITHIN THE NEW RESEARCH STAFF CAREER

**2024-2025**

## **Contents**

1. Introduction to the Guidelines
2. Criteria for Promotion
3. Role of the Head of Department in the Promotion Process
4. Candidates' Submitted Writings in Support of Case
5. External Peer Review
6. Procedures of the Promotion Process
7. Decisions of the Promotions Committee

Heads of Department are advised to read these Guidelines in their entirety. These Guidelines, and associated Template Forms, are also available on the [Human Resources website](#). Should there be the need to amend these Guidelines, Heads of Department will be informed accordingly.

Queries on NRSC promotions should be directed to the following member of staff in Human Resources in the first instance:

Nikhil Kalghatgi, HR Manager, Review and Promotion (Secretary to the Appointments Committee)  
Human Resources Division  
Email: [hr.reviewandpromotion@lse.ac.uk](mailto:hr.reviewandpromotion@lse.ac.uk)

# CONTENTS

<b>CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION TO THE GUIDELINES</b> .....	<b>4</b>
1.1 Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee (VCAC) .....	4
1.2 Impact of the Covid-19 Pandemic on Promotion .....	5
1.3 Self-Sponsored Promotion Route .....	5
1.4 Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances .....	5
1.5 Disability and the Promotion Process .....	6
1.6 Part-Time Staff .....	7
1.7 Interviews .....	7
1.8 Submission of Documentation and Deadlines for Submission .....	7
1.9 GDPR and Data Protection - Confidentiality of Promotion and the Review Process .....	8
1.10 Research Staff Review Development Scheme and Mentoring .....	8
1.11 General .....	9
<b>2. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION</b> .....	<b>10</b>
2.2 Timing of Promotions .....	10
2.3 Out-of-phase Retention Promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow or Promotion to Professorial Research Fellow Cases .....	10
2.4 Criteria for Promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow .....	10
2.5 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow .....	12
2.6 Criteria for Promotion to Professorial Research Fellow .....	13
2.7 Unsuccessful promotion proposals .....	16
<b>3. ROLE OF THE HEAD OF DEPARTMENT IN THE PROMOTION PROCESS</b> .....	<b>17</b>
3.2 Responsibility for Submission of the Case to the Promotions Committee .....	17
3.3 Departmental Support for Promotion Candidates: Views of the Departmental Professoriate .....	17
3.4 Content of the Head of Department's Statement .....	18
3.5 Responsibility for Submission of the Self-Sponsored Case for Promotion to the Promotions Committee .....	19
3.6 Self-Sponsored Candidate's Statement .....	20
<b>4. CANDIDATES' SUBMITTED WRITINGS IN SUPPORT OF CASE</b> .....	<b>21</b>
4.1 Work cited on the CV .....	21

4.2	Work submitted for Promotion .....	21
<b>5.</b>	<b>EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW.....</b>	<b>23</b>
5.1	Role of External Referees in the Promotions Process .....	23
5.2	Criteria for Selection of External Referees .....	24
5.3	Confidentiality .....	25
<b>6.</b>	<b>PROCEDURES OF THE PROMOTION PROCESS .....</b>	<b>26</b>
6.1	Consideration of Promotion Cases .....	26
6.2	Consideration of Self-Sponsored Promotion Proposals .....	27
6.3	Emergency Promotion Procedures .....	27
<b>7.</b>	<b>DECISIONS OF THE PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE .....</b>	<b>29</b>
7.1	Notification of Decisions.....	29
7.2	Salary Determination .....	29

**Annexes**

Annex A: Promotions Committee: Terms of Reference and Membership

Annex B: Membership of the Promotions Committee 2024-2025

Annex C: Timetable for Promotion to or within the NRSC 2024-2025

Annex D: Reference Guide to Deadlines for Promotion Documentation

Annex E: Reference Guide to Peer Reviewers (External & Internal)

Annex F: Recipients of Documentation within the Promotion Process

## 1. INTRODUCTION TO THE GUIDELINES

These guidelines provide information about the processes and criteria governing promotion to the New Research Staff Career (NRSC) and promotion within the NRSC.

Since the 2016-2017 session, there has no longer been a promotion route within the old research staff career structure beyond promotion to Research Officer (band 6) and Research Fellow (band 7). For research staff from band 6 upwards on the old career structure as well as for staff on the policy fellow career track, promotion to the NRSC is to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow (from Research Officer or Research Fellow and from Policy Officer or Policy Fellow), to Associate Professorial Research Fellow (from Senior Policy Fellow or Distinguished Policy Fellow) or to Professorial Research Fellow (from Distinguished Policy Fellow). Promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow is normally from Research Fellow and from Policy Fellow. However, in exceptional circumstances, a Research Officer or Policy Officer can be promoted to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow at the discretion of the Promotions Committee. In very exceptional circumstances, a Research Fellow or Policy Fellow can be promoted directly to Associate Professorial Research Fellow and a Senior Policy Fellow can be promoted directly to Professorial Research Fellow.

Promotion within the NRSC is to Associate Professorial Research Fellow from Assistant Professorial Research Fellow or to Professorial Research Fellow from Associate Professorial Research Fellow. In very exceptional circumstances, an Assistant Professorial Research Fellow can be promoted directly to Professorial Research Fellow.

The Promotions Committee (a sub-committee of the Appointments Committee of which the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development) is the Chair) is the formal School body that reaches decisions about the success of all review and promotion proposals.

**Conditional on funding confirmation and entitlement to work in the UK, decisions about success for promotion proposals are made solely on merit**, as gauged by the staff member's research and scholarship, and the contribution they are making to the work of the Department/Centre/Institute and the School. Promotion considerations will take account of the School's Policy Statement on Equality and Diversity and will recognise the existence of non-standard and interrupted careers.

Confirmation of available funding from the relevant central function (e.g. email evidence from the Research and Innovation Division or Finance Division) will need to be provided when putting forward staff for promotion, or for self-sponsored applications.

The Promotions Committee's terms of reference and membership for the current session, are set out at **Annex A** and **Annex B** to these Guidelines as well as being available on the [Human Resources website](#).

Please note that where the Guidance refers to "normally" or "in an exceptional case", it is at the discretion of the Vice Chair of the Appointments Committee, in the first instance, whether the rules can be waived. Heads of Department must consult with the Vice Chair of the Appointments Committee as early as possible if they think they are dealing with an exception to any part of the Guidance.

If any member of staff has concerns about the promotion process, whether at School or Department level, he or she is entitled to raise this formally or informally with the Vice Chair of the Appointments Committee who will take appropriate further steps to investigate and act upon those concerns.

### 1.1 Vice Chair of Appointments Committee (VCAC)

Professor Niamh Moloney is the Vice Chair of the Appointments Committee (VCAC). The VCAC may be contacted at [n.moloney@lse.ac.uk](mailto:n.moloney@lse.ac.uk) for advice on specific cases throughout the session. The VCAC works closely with the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development), Professor Charles Stafford.

## 1.2 Impact of the Covid-19 Pandemic on Promotion

The Promotions Committee is aware that the Covid-19 pandemic continues to have an impact on the work of colleagues in the School. Where relevant information about this is provided, it will be taken into account in the evaluation of review and promotion cases. This can be provided on the *Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1*; on the *CV template NRSC/2* (in a dedicated section that has been added for the declaration of Covid-19 impacts), as well as on the addenda to the CV – that is, the additional statements on research achievements, research trajectory, past and ongoing research grants and management and leadership of research; on the *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances NRSC/5* (in particular, where the impacts to be declared are confidential in nature); and on the *Self-sponsored Promotion Proposal – Candidate's Statement NRSC/7* in cases of self-sponsorship.

## 1.3 Self-Sponsored Promotion Route

A candidate may propose their own promotion, if their Department/Centre/Institute does not intend to recommend them. All members of research staff are notified of the annual Promotion timetable and corresponding deadlines for submission of promotion proposals by Human Resources.

Research staff contemplating a self-sponsored promotion route are reminded that all promotions of research staff are contingent on the availability of funding and entitlement to work in the UK.

Candidates electing to proceed under the self-sponsored route are encouraged to seek a meeting with the VCAC to discuss their case.

A reference guide to the deadlines and documentation required can be found at **Annex D**, and the process is dealt with in detail in **Section 6 – Procedures of the Promotions Process**. Template forms, along with a full copy of this Guidance, can also be found on the [Human Resources website](#)

## 1.4 Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances

The School expects that if staff members' individual circumstances are affecting their day-to-day activities or performance the individual would have raised these at the earliest opportunity with their Department or, where applicable, Research Centre or Institute and the Department, Centre or Institute will have addressed these issues, with the advice of Human Resources, as soon as reasonably possible. Furthermore, the School expects that most circumstances do not need to be stated on the *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form NRSC/5* as these can be resolved through local discussion. For advice please consult the relevant HR Partner in the first instance.

If the circumstances are exceptional then the Promotions Committee will, where necessary, consider the effect of a candidate's individual circumstances on their career progression where information has been provided by the candidate and, where the candidate so wishes, the Head of Department or Research Centre / Institute Director.

The following are examples of individual circumstances that might apply where these have had a significant impact on progress and performance:

- Disability as defined by the Equality Act 2010, for example conditions such as cancer, chronic fatigue syndrome and mental health conditions

- Other instances of ill health or injury not covered above
- Constraints relating to pregnancy, maternity, breastfeeding, adoption, paternity or childcare in addition to periods of parental leave taken. This could include, for example, pregnancy related illness or the health of a child.
- Other caring responsibilities (for example caring for an elderly, ill, or disabled relative)
- Other significant life event, for example gender reassignment or bereavement of a family member

Please note that periods of interruptions in service due to maternity leave, adoption leave, additional paternity leave, shared parental leave, secondment or special leave buyout should be declared on the *Curriculum Vitae Template G/2*.

The *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form NRSC/4* should be completed and signed by the candidate and, where the candidate so wishes, the Head of Department or Research Centre / Institute Director. The information provided on this form, with advice from the Department's HR Partner, will inform the VCAC's advice to the Promotions Committee as to the nature of the circumstances, the support being provided and whether any other adjustments are necessary (e.g. reasonable adjustments in case of a disability). The details of the circumstances will not be disclosed to the Promotions Committee.

Please note that if there are personal circumstances that are affecting the day-to-day activities or performance of the candidate which are not declared on the form by the deadline on the form, the Promotions Committee may not be able to take account of them in its decision on the case.

In cases where the *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form NRSC/4* has been submitted, the VCAC and Human Resources may begin gathering further information on the background of the case.

Human Resources may then, if the candidate has informed the Head of Department or Research Centre / Institute Director of the individual circumstances, request a more detailed statement from the Head of Department or Research Centre / Institute Director to aid advice to the VCAC (this information **will not** be shared with the Promotions Committee), and this may include information such as the following:

- A description of the situation
- The effect it has had on the candidate's ability to carry out their duties
- Details of any Doctors notes, OH referral recommendations, specialist reports etc. (where applicable)
- Action taken by the Department, including any reasonable adjustments made to the candidate's role in the Department, flexible working arrangements, mentoring, Departmental commitments including administration
- The effectiveness of those adjustments in increasing the candidate's ability to carry out their duties
- Career advice given in Career Development Review (CDR) Meetings and agreed actions.

The Promotions Committee will give careful consideration to the VCAC's indication of the severity and impact of the circumstances and may make recommendations to the Department and/or the candidate regarding the candidate's future career progression at the School.

Please refer to **Annex C** for the deadline of submission of the *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form NRSC/4*.

## 1.5 Disability and the Promotion Process

The School's commitment to providing and developing a positive, supportive and enabling

environment for all staff extends to the promotion process in particular and the career development of staff in general. As part of this commitment, a disability which is having a significant impact on an individual's progress and/or performance may be raised and considered under **1.4 Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances**.

In addition, Heads of Department (and other individuals with management and/or oversight responsibilities) have a role to play in ensuring that New Research Staff Career staff with disabilities are supported throughout the promotion process, including the agreement and implementation of reasonable adjustments. Similar expectations apply to the Career Development Review process. The relevant HR Partner can provide guidance about what could be considered 'reasonable' in a given situation.

As outlined in 1.4, the impact of a disability on an individual's progress will be relayed to the Promotions Committee by the VCAC along with any recommended adjustments to process. A decision on the case will take the information into account when considering the requirements for promotion as outlined in **Section 2**. The information provided by the VCAC will be based on discussions with the Head of Department and/or the HR Partner and will take into account the need for reasonable adjustments to be made based on the individual circumstances.

In order to ensure that departmental promotions processes also take account of any reasonable adjustments which might be made for an individual, Heads of Department should contact the VCAC to ask for advice where an individual with a disability is being considered for promotion within their department.

Prior to a case reaching the Promotions Committee, it is expected that both individuals and departments will have received support and advice in helping a member of NRSC staff with a disability to progress in their career. Further information can be found in the [Career Development Review Guidance](#).

## **1.6 Part-Time Staff**

The Promotions Committee expects that part-time staff will have an academic profile of equivalent quality to that of full-time staff. However, the Committee accepts that the quantity across the range of academic activities will be commensurate with the part-time appointment. The VCAC may be contacted for advice on specific cases.

## **1.7 Interviews**

Consideration of promotion proposals by the Promotions Committee is a documented process based on evaluation of written reports and materials.

There is no entitlement to interview for either the candidate or the Head of Department, although in exceptional circumstances the Promotions Committee may invite a Head of Department or, for self-sponsored promotion cases, the candidate to attend – if, for example, there is a need for factual clarification in a particular case. Wherever possible, Heads of Department (and in the case of self-sponsorship, the self-sponsored candidate) should be in the School and available on the dates the Promotions Committee meets (in the Winter Term) to consider promotions (dates of this session's meetings are available at **Annex C** of these Guidelines and on the [Human Resources website](#)).

## **1.8 Submission of Documentation and Deadlines for Submission**

The current session deadlines for submission of documentation to Human Resources are set out in the Promotion Timetable and Reference Guide to Deadlines for Promotion Documentation (**Annex C** and **D** of these Guidelines, respectively).

Heads of Department are ultimately responsible for forwarding all documentation to Human Resources by no later than the specified dates. However, it is important to note that NRSC staff may be based in Centres and Institutes, and line managed in these research units rather than in Departments. In such cases, submission for NRSC promotion must still come with the support of a relevant departmental professoriate and with the endorsement of a Head of Department. The relevant academic department will either be the one in which the research unit of the candidate is based or the one that is in the strongest position to evaluate the candidate's research portfolio, i.e., based on disciplinary specialism. If there is uncertainty about which department should evaluate a given case, the Vice President (Faculty Development) can advise.

Given that all submissions require departmental support, it is essential that Research Centre/Institute Directors communicate in a timely manner with HoDs about NRSC cases that are in the pipeline.

In cases of self-sponsored promotion, the individual may submit the promotion documentation directly to Human Resources (or via their Head of Department if desired), in accordance with the deadlines for submission.

Failure to submit materials by the due date may preclude consideration of the case.

## **1.9 GDPR and Data Protection - Confidentiality of Promotion and the Review Process**

The Promotions Committee complies with the GDPR and Data Protection Act 2018 as amended, in processing personal data in relation to consideration of individual promotion cases.

All persons asked to provide statements, references and reports about candidates for promotion are advised that their documentation is confidential to the Promotions Committee and will be used solely for the purposes of the School's Promotion processes. However, in circumstances such as a grievance or legal proceedings, reports may have to be disclosed to a third party. In the interests of fairness, the Promotions Committee will not accept comments, either written or verbal from third parties (those from whom comments had not been formally solicited).

## **1.10 Research Staff Career Development Review Scheme and Mentoring**

The School expects that all research staff and particularly those in the early stages of a research career at the School should receive constructive advice on career development from senior colleagues.

The School has in place two approaches to structuring career development conversations for research staff:

- A Mentoring Scheme for junior staff
- A Career Development Review (CDR) Scheme, which is designed to support all research staff (apart from Professorial Research Fellows) throughout their LSE career.

Both aim to give staff guidance on how to make most effective use of their career within LSE both for their own development and to ensure their contribution to the School as a whole.

Further information on the Research Staff Career Development Review (CDR) and Mentoring schemes can be found on the Human Resources website.

All research staff may access the training and development opportunities available within the School and in most cases this is at no cost to the individual or the project. Principal

Investigators/Managers should actively encourage research staff to attend relevant courses/workshops available at the School.

#### **1.11 General**

These Guidelines are subject to periodic review and may be amended or updated as the School considers necessary.

## 2. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

### 2.2 Timing of Promotions

Promotions are considered annually in the Winter Term of each session. Heads of Department, Research Centre / Institute Directors and Principal Investigators should ensure that research staff who are expected to go forward for promotion are given sufficient time to prepare their application in the period leading up to the deadlines specified in **Annex C** and **Annex D**.

After an unsuccessful promotion attempt, there will be a period of two years before another proposal will be considered by the Promotions Committee, unless the Promotions Committee itself decides to waive this rule in its decision on a given case. There is no limit on the number of occasions on which a candidate may be put forward for promotion. When considering a promotion proposal, the Promotions Committee will not have before it information about any previous unsuccessful promotion proposal(s) from that candidate.

### 2.3 Out-of-phase Retention Promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow or Promotion to Professorial Research Fellow Cases

The Promotions Committee is aware of the pressures created when urgent retention issues arise and seeks to work with Heads of Department to deal with such matters expeditiously, without threatening the integrity and quality of the School's established procedures.

### 2.4 Criteria for Promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow

The criteria for promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow are as follows:

#### *Research productivity and excellence*

A candidate should demonstrate intellectual originality and valuable contributions to research-based knowledge, with evidence of an emerging research programme and trajectory that is likely to result in the development of a body of outstanding quality publications in well recognised peer reviewed outlets. This will normally be evidenced by:

- Research outputs that are, at least, internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour. Candidates should present two research outputs. The Promotions Committee welcomes if these research outputs have been published as peer reviewed journal articles and/or books but is willing to accept unpublished writings.
- Contribution to recent success in obtaining external research funds, especially in peer-reviewed processes
- Supportive external assessments by competent external peer reviewers
- A detailed and convincing written research statement showing the intellectual agenda guiding the candidate's work, its likely importance to her or his field and/or the public, and its future potential, and how it fits with the research agenda of the Department or Centre / Institute in which they are employed.

Whilst not a requirement, it may also be additionally evidenced by:

- Indicators of influence in the candidate's scholarly field, for example reviews and citations of work

#### *Knowledge, Engagement and Impact*

Candidates should normally be able to evidence the following or be able to show that they

are suitably qualified and competent to carry out the following (subject to the opportunities available, the contractual obligations imposed by the external funding agency and with the agreement of the grant-holder, Principal Investigator, Centre/Institute Director and/or Head of Department, in accordance with established line management arrangements and commensurate with their current post):

- Actively developing strategies to ensure that research outputs have demonstrable impact and inform the public debate
- Engaging with non-academic audiences

#### *Management and leadership of research projects*

Candidates should normally be able to evidence the following or be able to show that they are suitably qualified and competent to carry out the following (subject to the opportunities available, the contractual obligations imposed by the external funding agency and with the agreement of the grant-holder, Principal Investigator, Centre/Institute Director and/or Head of Department, in accordance with established line management arrangements and commensurate with their current post):

- Ability to lead small research projects that may involve co-ordinating the work of others
- Training and supervising the work of research assistants and/or of research officers
- Contributing to the development of teams, through supervision and peer support

#### *Activities relating to centre/institute/departmental/School management and administration*

The Promotions Committee will also take account of contributions to the management, administration or other activities of the Centre, Department or Institute where the candidate is based or service in School governance roles, and the extent to which candidates have sought to develop their own skills and/or those of others through receiving or delivering training, mentoring and other similar activities.

The Promotions Committee bases its decision on its view of the evidence presented in the following documentation on template forms available from Human Resources:

- A CV presented on the standard template including a statement from the candidate on their research achievement record, a statement of planned research and a statement on past and ongoing research grants and management and leadership of research
- A statement from the candidate's Head of Department reporting on the candidate's progress in research and contributions to the Department and/or the School. The statement from the candidate's Head of Department should also comment on the operation of the Career Development Review process
- A Report from an Internal Reader (normally a member of the Promotions Committee) and comments of a Monitor (also normally a Committee member) on the pieces of work nominated by the candidate and submitted to Human Resources
- Evidence from external peer review

#### *Citation Evidence in Promotion cases:*

The Promotions Committee will accept citation evidence in subject areas where this is a useful measure of research quality. The availability of such evidence will be taken into account by the Promotions Committee in the promotions process but it will not be a determining factor in promotion. The Promotions Committee will be made aware that citation records can suffer from gender and other biases. Candidates are *permitted* to provide their citation count and encouraged to put this into context. Where candidates provide their citation count, Heads of Department or Research Centre / Institute Director are expected to comment on the citation count and its context (e.g., average citation counts in a field of study, the candidate's academic age).

The Committee may also seek such other evidence as it deems appropriate.

## **2.5 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow**

The criteria for promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow are as follows:

### *Research productivity and excellence*

A candidate should demonstrate intellectual originality, a high level of productivity in work of significant interest, and valuable contributions to research-based knowledge. A candidate should have a research programme and trajectory that is likely to result in a body of publications of outstanding quality in top quality and well recognised international peer reviewed outlets. This will normally be evidenced by:

- Publication of research including articles in peer reviewed journals and/or books that is, at least, internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour. Candidates should normally present four research publications, though this is not a binding requirement and overall quality is more important than quantity
- Indicators of influence in the candidate's scholarly field, for example reviews and citations
- A coherent and viable programme of future research and intellectual contributions
- Recent success in obtaining external research funds, especially in peer-reviewed processes
- Supportive external assessments by competent experts
- A detailed and convincing written research statement showing the intellectual agenda guiding the candidate's work, its likely importance to her or his field and/or the public, and its future potential, and how it fits with the research agenda of the Department, Centre or Institute in which they are employed

### *Knowledge, Engagement and Impact*

Candidates should normally be able to evidence the following or be able to show that they are suitably qualified and competent to carry out the following (subject to the opportunities available, the contractual obligations imposed by the external funding agency and with the agreement of the grant-holder, Principal Investigator, Centre/Institute Director and/or Head of Department, in accordance with established line management arrangements and commensurate with their current post):

- Advising or participating in government/international committees, private sector organisations, international bodies, the non-profit sector, or in other governmental or non-governmental organisations, in order to bring research-based knowledge to broader publics
- Actively developing strategies to ensure that research outputs have demonstrable impact and inform the public debate
- Engaging with non-academic audiences.

### *Management and leadership of research projects*

Candidates should normally be able to evidence the following or be able to show that they are suitably qualified and competent to carry out the following (subject to the opportunities available, the contractual obligations imposed by the external funding agency and with the agreement of the grant-holder, Principal Investigator, Centre/Institute Director and/or Head of Department, in accordance with established line management arrangements and commensurate with their current post):

- Applying for, negotiating and managing large research projects, grants and/or research centres

- Co-ordinating a number of teams or projects on a longer-term basis, ensuring that the team are collectively producing outputs that are of outstanding quality and published in top quality and well recognised international peer-reviewed outlets and/or producing significant research impacts
- Determining the overall direction of major research projects
- Playing a leading role in the development of the host unit's strategic research policy and driving the intellectual agenda
- Leading the monitoring and enhancement of quality in research within the centre/institute/department
- Managing teams of researchers
- Training and supervising the work of more junior researchers
- Contributing to the development of teams, through supervision and peer support

*Activities relating to centre/institute/departmental/School management and administration*

The Promotions Committee will also take account of contributions to the management, administration or other activities of the Centre, Department or Institute where the candidate is based or service in School governance roles, and the extent to which candidates have sought to develop their own skills and those of others through receiving or delivering training, mentoring and other similar activities.

The Promotions Committee bases its decision on its view of the evidence presented in the following documentation on template forms available from Human Resources:

- A CV presented on the standard template including a statement from the candidate on their research achievement record, a statement of planned research and a statement on past and ongoing research grants and management and leadership of research
- A statement from the candidate's Head of Department reporting on the candidate's progress in research and contributions to the Department and/or the School. The statement from the candidate's Head of Department should also comment on the operation of the Career Development Review process
- A Report from an Internal Reader (normally a member of the Promotions Committee) and comments of a Monitor (also normally a Committee member) on the pieces of work nominated by the candidate and submitted to Human Resources
- Evidence from external peer review

*Citation Evidence in Promotion cases:*

The Promotions Committee will accept citation evidence in subject areas where this is a useful measure of research quality. The availability of such evidence will be taken into account by the Promotions Committee in the promotions process but it will not be a determining factor in promotion. The Promotions Committee will be made aware that citation records can suffer from gender and other biases. Candidates are *permitted* to provide their citation count and encouraged to put this into context. Where candidates provide their citation count, Heads of Department or Research Centre / Institute Director are expected to comment on the citation count and its context (e.g., average citation counts in a field of study, the candidate's academic age).

If citation evidence is provided, three sets of citation counts -- Google Scholar, Scopus and Web of Science (formerly Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI)) counts -- must be provided. The Library can assist candidates in putting their citation counts together (please contact Paul Flannery, Research Information Analyst at [Library.Bibliometrics@lse.ac.uk](mailto:Library.Bibliometrics@lse.ac.uk)).

The Committee may also seek such other evidence as it deems appropriate.

## **2.6 Criteria for Promotion to Professorial Research Fellow**

Promotion to Professorial Research Fellow status comes in recognition of major

accomplishments in research and publications combined with excellence in research leadership and growing participation in administration and governance.

Candidates should be internationally recognised leaders in their fields. Their research should be influential and known not only in their specialty area but more widely in their discipline or interdisciplinary area.

In addition to research leadership, weight will also be given, as appropriate to different fields, to success in entrepreneurial activities, public engagement, informing public policy, and providing service to fields of professional practice.

All candidates for promotion to Professorial Research Fellow should demonstrate significant contributions to departmental and School-wide strategic management and governance and should show potential to contribute to the mentoring and career development of junior members of staff.

The relevant criteria for promotion are:

*Research productivity and excellence*

- A substantial body of published research including articles in peer reviewed journals and/or books. Candidates should present four research publications selected from their publication portfolio, all of which must be published or have been accepted for publication. (For research monographs, an acceptance letter from the publisher stating it is going to publish the work at some future point is not sufficient; instead, the manuscript must be in its finished form.) All submitted items must be at least internationally excellent and two of the submitted items must be world leading in terms of originality, rigour and significance. Consistent with the School's emphasis on quality of publications as a pre-eminent criterion, candidates may exceptionally submit fewer than four publications. In such cases, a statement of justification from the Head of Department is required. Submitted publications should, other than in exceptional circumstances, not have been used as outputs submitted for promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow (or at the equivalent time in their previous appointment for candidates appointed to the School as Associate Professorial Research Fellows). Invoking such exceptional circumstances requires a statement of justification from the Head of Department.
- An international reputation as evidenced by reviews of publications, citations, prizes and honours, and assessments by peers.
- Planning and directing research activities and programmes of outstanding quality and international significance
- Leading major peer reviewed funding bids and achieving substantial success in attracting
  - such funding
- A strong record of securing significant amounts of peer-reviewed research funds and where appropriate, contributions to School Research Centres, Departments or Institutes
- A coherent and viable programme of future research and intellectual contributions and a demonstration of how that agenda fits with that of the Research Centre, Department or Institute where the candidate is based.

*Knowledge Engagement and Impact*

Candidates should normally be able to evidence the following or be able to show that they are suitably qualified and competent to carry out the following (subject to the opportunities available, the contractual obligations imposed by the external funding agency and with the agreement of the grant-holder, Principal Investigator, Centre/Institute Director and/or Head of Department, in accordance with established line management arrangements and commensurate with their current post):

- Evidencing research leadership and expertise through advising or participating in government/international committees, private sector organisations, international bodies, the non-profit sector, or in other governmental or non-governmental organisations
- Leading scholarly initiative in relevant disciplinary or inter-disciplinary communities – e.g. editorial of journals, membership of committees in professional associations, appointment to significant research bodies
- Ensuring that research impact and engagement with wider audiences is at the heart of research strategy within the centre/institute/department.
- Engaging with non-academic audiences.

### *Research leadership and management*

Candidates should normally be able to evidence the following or be able to show that they are suitably qualified and competent to carry out the following (subject to the opportunities available, the contractual obligations imposed by the external funding agency and with the agreement of the grant-holder, Principal Investigator, Centre/Institute Director and/or Head of Department, in accordance with established line management arrangements and commensurate with their current post):

- Co-ordinating a number of teams or projects on a longer-term basis, ensuring that the team are collectively producing outputs that are of outstanding quality and published in top quality and well recognised international peer-reviewed outlets and/or producing significant research impacts
- Determining the overall direction of major research projects
- Leading and managing teams of researchers
- Financial management of research projects and maintaining productive, ongoing relationships with funders
- Training and supervising the work of research staff
- Providing leadership to the development of teams

### *Activities relating to centre/institute/departmental/School management and administration*

The Promotions Committee will also take account of contributions to the management, administration or other activities of the Centre, Department or Institute where the candidate is based or service in School governance roles, and the extent to which candidates have sought to develop their own skills and those of others through receiving or delivering training, mentoring and other similar activities.

The Promotions Committee bases its decision on its view of the evidence presented in the following documentation on template forms available from Human Resources:

- A CV presented on the standard template including a statement from the candidate on their research achievement record, a statement of planned research and a statement on past and ongoing research grants and management and leadership of research
- A statement from the candidate's Head of Department reporting on the candidate's progress in research and contributions to the Department and/or the School. The statement from the candidate's Head of Department should also comment on the operation of the Career Development Review process
- A Report from an Internal Reader (normally a member of the Promotions Committee) and comments of a Monitor (also normally a Committee member) on the pieces of work nominated by the candidate and submitted to Human Resources.
- Evidence from external peer review

### *Citation Evidence in Promotion cases:*

The Promotions Committee will accept citation evidence in subject areas where this is a useful measure of research quality. The availability of such evidence will be taken into

account by the Promotions Committee in the promotions process but it will not be a determining factor in promotion. The Promotions Committee will be made aware that citation records can suffer from gender and other biases. Candidates are *permitted* to provide their citation count and encouraged to put this into context. Where candidates provide their citation count, Heads of Department or Research Centre / Institute Director are expected to comment on the citation count and its context (e.g., average citation counts in a field of study, the candidate's academic age).

If citation evidence is provided, three sets of citation counts -- Google Scholar, Scopus and Web of Science (formerly Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI)) counts -- must be provided. The Library can assist candidates in putting their citation counts together (please contact Paul Flannery, Research Information Analyst at [Library.Bibliometrics@lse.ac.uk](mailto:Library.Bibliometrics@lse.ac.uk))

The Committee may also seek such other evidence as it deems appropriate.

## **2.7 Unsuccessful promotion proposals**

The process following the Promotions Committee's decision is discussed in **Section 7 – Decisions of the Promotions Committee.**

### 3. ROLE OF THE HEAD OF DEPARTMENT IN THE PROMOTION PROCESS

#### 3.1 Responsibility for Submission of the Case to the Promotions Committee

Heads of Department are responsible for the electronic submission of all documentation for promotion proposals to the Promotions Committee via Human Resources. For research staff located in Research Centres or Institutes, the Head of Department should collaborate, in a timely manner, with the relevant Research Centre / Institute Director in preparing the documentation. It follows that Heads of Department, in collaboration with Research Centre / Institute Directors (as relevant; Directors should accordingly coordinate with Heads of Department in a timely manner as regards potential promotion cases), are expected to take an active role in advising candidates on presentation of their CVs on the *CV Template NRSC/2*, ensuring that information is set out clearly and that there are no omissions. Heads of Department and, where applicable, Research Centre / Institute Directors are also expected to sign off on these forms.

Documentation submitted directly to Human Resources by candidates will not be accepted (unless for self-sponsored promotion cases).

A reference guide to the deadlines and documentation required can be found at **Annex D**, and the process is dealt with in detail in **Section 6 – Procedures of the Promotions Process**. Template forms can be found on the [Human Resources website](#).

Documentation for the Promotion process (including writings) should be **electronically submitted** to Human Resources. Should this be impossible please contact Human Resources in good time to arrange an alternative.

#### 3.2 Departmental Support for Promotion Candidates: Views of the Departmental Professoriate

As noted above, Heads of Department are ultimately responsible for forwarding all documentation to Human Resources by no later than the specified dates. However, NRSC staff may be based in Centres and Institutes, and line managed in these research units rather than in Departments. In such cases, submission for NRSC promotion must still come with the support of a relevant departmental professoriate and with the endorsement of a Head of Department. The relevant academic department will either be the one in which the research unit of the candidate is based or the one that is in the strongest position to evaluate the candidate's research portfolio, i.e., based on disciplinary specialism. If there is uncertainty about which department should evaluate a given case, the Vice President (Faculty Development) can advise.

Given that all submissions require departmental support, it is essential that Research Centre/Institute Directors communicate in a timely manner with HoDs about NRSC cases that are in the pipeline.

For NRSC candidates based in departments, the Head of Department must have consulted professorial colleagues regarding the candidate, and the Head of Department's Statement should be based on the information submitted to and considered by the department's Professoriate. For research staff located in Research Centres or Institutes, HoDs should collaborate, in a timely manner, with the relevant Research Centre / Institute Director and should consult with the Department's Professoriate (with the lead Department's Professoriate in case the Research Centre / Institute is associated with more than one Department). The Head of Department should also have consulted with any other relevant colleague (e.g. Principal Investigator or research group leader).

The *Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1* should make clear which members of the Professoriate (e.g. Professors on leave) were involved in the discussion leading to the decision to recommend promotion. The Committee expects that a decision will be taken on

the basis of a vote by all serving Professors, and that the *Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1* will indicate the numbers voting for and against as well as those abstaining. A candidate cannot normally be put forward for promotion unless they have majority support of those voting. The Promotions Committee does not regard unanimity of the departmental Professoriate as a *sine qua non* of a successful case, but does expect that if there are differing opinions these will be explained in full in the *Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1*.

Departments may solicit external references to inform their decision on whether to support a candidate for promotion. Where Departments do so, the following rules apply:

- The list of referees needs to be approved by the VCAC who will apply the same criteria as listed in **Section 5.2 – Criteria for Selection of External Referees**.
- Candidates should be invited to nominate up to 50 per cent of the referees.
- The soliciting letter/email needs to be approved by the VCAC. To maximise the usefulness of references, referees should be sent the writings that would be submitted to the School's Promotions Committee and ask referees to comment in detail on the quality of these writings.
- All soliciting emails should be copied to Human Resources and all references received must be made available to the VCAC and Human Resources.
- Where the case comes to the Promotions Committee for decision, all reference letters solicited by the Department will be made available to the Promotions Committee.
- Where the case comes to the Promotions Committee for decision, the VCAC has the right to allow the reference letters solicited by the Department to substitute for some or all of the reference letters that would otherwise be solicited by the Promotions Committee.

### 3.3 Content of the Head of Department's Statement

For research staff located in Departments, this statement should be drafted by the Head of Department; for research staff located in Research Centres or Institutes, this statement should be drafted by the Head of Department in collaboration with the Research Centre / Institute Director.

The Head of Department's statement should provide a full evaluative commentary on the candidate's academic profile, across the range of research, service and administration and other professional activities, as evidenced by the curriculum vitae, ensuring detail is provided to inform the Promotions Committee's decision. The Promotions Committee expects Heads of Department to address the following areas in their reports on candidates:

#### 1. *Research Productivity and Excellence*

The Head of Department, in collaboration with the Research / Institute Director (where applicable), should indicate their opinion of the quality of the candidate's research, published outputs, and future trajectory - including, where appropriate, the candidate's success in publishing in the top journals or with the top presses in the field. Heads of Department should indicate any issues where journal lead-times may be a factor affecting the quantity of published output. **The Head of Department, in collaboration with the Research / Institute Director (where applicable), is expected to comment in detail on the quality of each of the publications submitted to the Promotions Committee.** Where possible, they should comment specifically on the originality of the candidate's intellectual contribution (noting that this may be especially important in cases where work is co-authored and the individual contribution of the candidate may not be obvious to readers).

The Head of Department, in collaboration with the Research / Institute Director (where applicable), should outline the Departmental view on the assessment of research quality including, where appropriate:

- Prestige publishing outlets which may include the titles of the top journals and top presses in the field

- The relative weighting, if any, given to articles over books or vice-versa
- Whether co-authorship is the norm within the field, and comment on any joint-authored work submitted
- Clarifying the significance of conference contributions in the candidate's field
- A definition of what is regarded as international standing in the candidate's discipline.

The Promotions Committee recognises that variations exist and it will not be seeking to compare approaches across disciplines.

The Promotions Committee may use the Departmental Journal Lists and Publishing Norms documents, which are submitted to the Promotions Committee at its first meeting of the session, to inform its decision-making and evaluation of candidates.

*Citation Evidence:*

The Promotions Committee will accept citation evidence in subject areas where this is a useful measure of research quality. The availability of such evidence will be taken into account by the Promotions Committee in the promotions process but it will not be a determining factor in promotion. The Promotions Committee will be made aware that citation records can suffer from gender and other biases. Candidates are *permitted* to provide their citation count and encouraged to put this into context. Where candidates provide their citation count, Heads of Department are expected to comment on the citation count and its context (e.g., average citation counts in a field of study, the candidate's academic age).

*2. Knowledge Engagement and Impact*

The Head of Department, in collaboration with the Research / Institute Director (where applicable), should provide their opinion of the candidate's contribution to knowledge engagement and impact with reference to the relevant criteria listed in **Section 2 – Criteria for Promotion**.

*3. Management and leadership of research projects*

The Head of Department, in collaboration with the Research / Institute Director (where applicable), should provide their opinion of the candidate's contribution to management and leadership of research projects with reference to the relevant criteria listed in **Section 2 – Criteria for Promotion**.

*4. Activities relating to centre/institute/departmental/School management and administration*

The Head of Department, in collaboration with the Research / Institute Director (where applicable), should provide their opinion of the candidate's contribution to the work of the School, whether at Departmental, Centre or Institute level or in the wider School context.

*5. Career Development*

The Head of Department, in collaboration with the Research / Institute Director (where applicable), should confirm that Career Development Review Meetings (CDR Meetings) have taken place and outline the career development advice provided to the candidate and the Department's expectations for future career progression.

**3.4 Responsibility for Submission of the Self-Sponsored Case for Promotion to the Promotions Committee**

Candidates wishing to propose themselves for promotion on a self-sponsored basis are strongly encouraged to discuss this with the VCAC well in advance of the relevant deadlines.

A reference guide to the deadlines and documentation required can be found at **Annex D**, the Criteria can be found at **Section 2** and the process is dealt with in detail in **Section 6**. Template forms, along with a full copy of this Guidance, can also be found on the [Human Resources website](#).

In all cases, Human Resources will write to the candidate's Head of Department requesting a full written statement about the work of the self-sponsored candidate to be submitted by the HoD Deadline 2 as listed in **Annex D**. The Head of Department, in collaboration with the Research / Institute Director (where applicable), will be asked to state their opinion of the quality of the research and published output and to set out clearly and unambiguously the full range of opinions amongst the Departmental Professoriate. If the self-sponsored proposal is submitted through the Head of Department, the Head of Department is free to submit their statement on the work of the candidate with the promotion documentation.

### **3.5 Self-Sponsored Candidate's Statement**

The Promotions Committee expects self-sponsored candidates to frame their reports with the criteria for promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow, promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow or promotion to Professorial Research Fellow in mind.

## **4. CANDIDATES' SUBMITTED WRITINGS IN SUPPORT OF CASE**

### **4.1 Work cited on the CV**

Candidates should note that the Promotions Committee reserves the right to request copies of any work cited on the *CV Template NRSC/2*. It follows that all work should be available, preferably in electronic form, in case the Promotions Committee should request it.

The dated electronic signatures of the candidate and Head of Department and, where applicable, the Research Centre / Institute Director on the electronic version of the *CV Template NRSC/2* are required as confirmation that the information provided is accurate.

### **4.2 Work submitted for Promotion**

A central part of the Promotions Committee's process is that written work submitted with a review and/or promotions case will be read and commented on in detail; Referees are also asked to read and comment in detail on the submitted writings. As a consequence, very careful consideration should be given by candidates to the selection of writings, and it is strongly recommended that they should seek advice from senior colleagues about this selection.

The Promotions Committee will consider the quality of writings of Promotion candidates. The candidate should submit to Human Resources the required number of writings which they believe best represent their qualities as a scholar.

Careful consideration should be given to the selection of writings in support of the case. Candidates are asked to explain on their CV the rationale for selecting the writings submitted in support of promotion and how the selected items relate to one another.

#### *Stage of Publication*

For promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow or Professorial Research Fellow, the expectation is that, normally, writings submitted will be published or have been accepted for publication (accompanied by a confirmation letter or email from the editors/book publishers). For research monographs, an acceptance letter from the publisher stating it is going to publish the work at some future point is not sufficient; instead, the manuscript must be in its finished form.

All candidates are asked to state clearly on the CV the stage all their publications have reached – e.g. whether work submitted for publication has finally been accepted, conditionally accepted, is in revise and resubmit status or is submitted. Evidence of acceptance (whether final or conditional) will be required in all cases – i.e. for all work on the CV not just the submitted pieces. For all publications on the CV in revise and resubmit status, candidates are required to submit evidence of the editors' confirmation email inviting the candidate to revise and resubmit the piece. Any reviews, whether favourable or not, which have appeared on any the candidate's books, whether submitted as part of the writings or not, should also be submitted.

#### *Co-authorship*

Where possible, candidates should give priority to writings where they have made the leading or major contribution as candidates should recognise that the Committee is looking for evidence of a leading or major contribution across all publications submitted.

The Promotions Committee recognises that co-authorship is the norm for some disciplines and where this is the case, jointly authored work will be considered of equal standing. Candidates are required to provide a numerical indication in percentage terms of their contribution(s) to joint work on the CV, alongside the requirement to state the respective contributions of co-authors in regard to the initiation, conduct and direction of the work. Candidates should also provide details of the degree of intellectual contribution made to the

work (e.g. indicating their involvement in the formulation of key themes, concepts and theories). **The Promotions Committee reserves the right to ask co-authors for a confirmation of the respective contributions stated by promotion candidates.**

#### *Multiple book chapters of the same book*

The Promotions Committee expects to be able to assess a range of candidates' work. Wherever possible, the submission of multiple chapters of the same book as separate works should be avoided.

#### *Publication language*

The expectation is that normally publications submitted in support of promotion will be written in English.

In cases where a publication(s) submitted is not written in English, the Department is responsible for translating the work into English. Where this cannot reasonably be expected, the Department should contact the VCAC at their earliest opportunity to request an exemption from this rule. If an exemption is granted, the Department is responsible for providing a summary in English, summarising the output and outlining the research methodologies used. The Department should also suggest the name(s) of external experts able to read the work in the original language.

#### *Presentation of Writings*

Particular attention should be paid to ensuring that:

- Wherever available, writings should be submitted in electronic form rather than in hard copy.
- Writings are properly-ordered and clearly identified for the ease of readers.
- Wherever possible, submitted hard copies should be photocopies of originals.
- Large manuscripts should be drilled and treasury-tagged and not submitted loose-leaf.

For items where no electronic copy is available, candidates are encouraged to scan them to make them electronically available. Where this is not feasible, **seven** properly-ordered sets of each writing that are not available electronically, should be submitted to Human Resources, either in the form of original hard copies or photocopies of the original hard copy. Any reviews, whether favourable or not, which have appeared on any the candidate's books, whether submitted as part of the writings or not, should also be submitted. All writings submitted as hard copy will be returned to the candidate by the beginning of the academic session following that in which they were submitted.

## 5. EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

The Promotions Committee solicits external peer review advice from Referees as part of its decision-making process. In the interests of fairness, the Promotions Committee will not accept comments, either written or verbal from third parties; third parties being those from whom comments had not been formally solicited

**It is the responsibility of the Head of Department, in collaboration with the Research Centre / Institute Director (where applicable), to ensure that, prior to nomination, all Referees are willing to be contacted by the VCAC and to participate in the process. In particular, the Head of Department should notify potential Referees that they will be expected to comment specifically and in detail on each of the candidate's submitted writings if they are asked by the VCAC to participate in the process.**

All Referees are thanked for their advice and are informed about successful cases for whom they served.

A reference guide to the Promotion Committee's requirements regarding the number of nominations of Referees can be found at **Annex E**.

A reference guide to the documentation shared with Referees can be found at **Annex F**.

### 5.1 Role of External Referees in the Promotions Process

Referees are asked to comment specifically and in detail on each of the candidate's submitted publications as well as their planned research as set out in the research trajectory statement. They can also comment on the general research profile of candidates. The Promotions Committee gives its referees the option to provide comparisons to research staff from the same cohort in the candidate's field. Referees are not sent the *Head of Department Statement NRSC/1*.

#### *Referees for Promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow*

Heads of Department are required to provide the names of **four** external Referees; two are to be nominated by the Department, in collaboration with the Research Centre / Institute Director (where applicable), and two by the candidate, for each candidate on the *Referees for Promotion Form NRSC/3*.

#### *Referees for Promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow and Promotion to Professorial Research Fellow*

Heads of Department are required to provide the names of external Referees for each candidate on the *Referees for Promotion Form NRSC/3*. Normally, **eight** names are required in total; four are to be nominated by the Department and four by the candidate.

In all cases, the Promotions Committee takes the final decision about which referees to consult and is not bound to accept referee nominations proposed by the Department or the candidate. The Promotions Committee may substitute its own suggestion(s) for those proposed by the Department or the candidate. The Promotions Committee gives its Referees the option to provide comparisons to research staff from the same cohort in the candidate's field.

#### *Referees for Self-Sponsored Promotion*

Self-sponsored candidates are required to provide the names of external Referees on the *Referees for Promotion Form NRSC/3*. For promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow, candidates should nominate two external Referees; an additional two external Referees are to be nominated by the VCAC.

For promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow and promotion to Professorial

Research Fellow, normally, **eight** names are required in total; four are to be nominated by the candidate and four by the VCAC.

To further ensure the necessary degree of independence in the nomination of external Referees for self-sponsored cases, the VCAC will take a view on the suitability of the referees proposed by the self-sponsored candidate and may consult the candidate's Head of Department. Self-sponsored candidates will be expected to provide written justification in any case where the VCAC is of the view that the criteria of selection of external Referees (see **Section 5.2**) are not met. The VCAC should be approached for advice on individual cases.

In all cases, the Promotions Committee takes the final decision about which Referees to consult and is not bound to accept names proposed by the self-sponsored candidate or the VCAC. The Promotions Committee may substitute its own suggestion(s) for those proposed by the candidate or the VCAC.

#### *Referees for Emergency Promotion*

Heads of Department are normally required to provide the names of **two** departmentally-sponsored external referees (including two reserves) on the *Referees for Promotion Form NRSC/3*, to be consulted by the Committee. The Promotions Committee or, where this is not feasible, the VCAC takes the final decision about which Referees to consult and is not bound to accept Referee nominations proposed by Departments. Instead, or in addition, it can nominate its own set of Referees.

## **5.2 Criteria for Selection of External Referees**

Heads of Department will be expected to provide written justification in any case where it is felt the below requirements cannot be met. The VCAC should be approached for advice on individual cases.

- All Referees should be employed by a distinguished university.
- Wherever appropriate Referees should be of international standing and active in research publication in the appropriate field.
- The naming of Referees should not, normally, include people who have co-authored with the candidate in the past four years. Heads of Department should seek the advice of the VCAC for disciplines where joint authorship is the norm and where co-authors may be best placed to act as Referees.
- The naming as Referees of eminent scholars who are unfamiliar with a candidate's work or who may not be able to provide anything other than very general comments should be avoided.
- There may be different aspects of a candidate's work to be assessed and Referees should be nominated with this in mind and with an indication where appropriate of which aspect(s) a Referee is being asked to comment on.
- For candidates with inter- or multi-disciplinary research interests, Heads of Department are encouraged to nominate Referees with an appropriate profile which could include Referees from outside the Department's discipline.

Additional requirements for Referees for promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow and Professorial Research Fellow:

- Referees should be confined to those of full Professorial (or Emeritus Professorial) status or equivalent. Heads of Department should provide written justification in any case where a referee does not hold the title of Professor.
- The nomination of more than one Referee from the same Department within the same institution will not normally be permitted.
- Referees should not normally have been on the staff of the School in the four previous years, held a Centennial Professorship or visiting appointment at the School in the four previous years or hold a Centennial Professorship or visiting appointment currently.

- The naming of Referees should not include people who have acted as a PhD supervisor to the candidate.

### **5.3 Confidentiality**

Referees are advised that any reference provided in connection with the Promotion processes will be confidential to the Promotions Committee and will be used solely for the purposes of the School's Promotion processes. The references are not normally disclosed to Promotion candidates or to Heads of Departments. However, in circumstances such as a grievance or legal proceedings, references may have to be disclosed to a third party.

## 6. PROCEDURES OF THE PROMOTION PROCESS

### 6.1 Consideration of Promotion Cases

Before reaching a decision in each case the Promotions Committee will take account of the external opinions as expressed by the Referees, and of the internal opinions as expressed in the *Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1* and the opinion of the Internal Reader assigned to assess the candidate's publications as well as the Internal Monitor. The Promotions Committee is in no way bound to follow the recommendation of the Head of Department. It is a basic School principle that Departmental recommendations for Promotion are subject to assessment and evaluation by Professors from other departments. It is open to the Promotions Committee either to endorse the recommendation or to reject it.

#### *Role of Promotions Committee Readers*

All submitted writings will be read by a member of the Promotions Committee from a related department or discipline (or a member of the Appointments Committee). All readers are required to submit a short written review of the writings to the Promotions Committee. Their views serve as a basis for discussion by the Promotions Committee. The identity of the reviewer(s) and the contents of their written reports are not revealed to the candidates. The VCAC or the Promotions Committee may decide that member(s) of the Promotions Committee (or a member of the Appointments Committee) in addition to the nominated Committee member should read the writings.

#### *Grading Criteria*

Internal Readers read candidates' submitted writings and apply the grading criteria agreed by the Promotions Committee as part of their summative evaluation of cases using the grading scale A-D where,

- A - Outstanding case
- B - I am confident in my judgement that this case clearly meets the criteria for review and/or promotion
- C - Merits full discussion by Committee.
- D - Case looks inadequate – merits full discussion by Committee.

#### *Role of Promotions Committee Monitors*

All promotion cases will have one principal Internal Reader with a second member of the Committee appointed to each case in the role of 'Monitor'.

The purpose of the monitoring role is to ensure equity of treatment in the consideration of cases. The Monitor is provided with a full copy of the candidate's papers as listed in **Sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3**. The Monitor does not read the candidate's submitted pieces as a matter of routine, although copies of writings are provided on request.

The Monitor will provide a brief comment on the case. The comments of the Monitor are in addition to close reading of the cases by the appointed Internal Reader. Should the Internal Reader award a grade of C or D to the candidate, then the Internal Monitor automatically becomes the Second Internal Reader, in which case they will also read the candidates' submitted writings.

#### *Deferral of cases to a later meeting*

Where, in the view of the Internal Reader / Monitor / Committee, a case is deemed to be either category 'C' or 'D' under the Promotions Committee grading scale) or there is insufficient evidence to make a decision, a decision on the case may be deferred to the next meeting of the Promotions Committee to allow for further opinion(s) to be sought / further information to be gathered. Where this occurs, the candidate and Head of Department will be informed of the adjustment in the timescale.

## 6.2 Consideration of Self-Sponsored Promotion Proposals

Individuals wishing to propose themselves for promotion on a self-sponsored basis are free to submit the self-sponsored proposal through their Head of Department or directly to Human Resources. Template forms, along with a full copy of this Guidance, can be found on the [Human Resources website](#).

Promotion proposals are considered solely on merit by the Promotions Committee according to the criteria for promotion to the level sought.

In all cases, Human Resources will write to the candidate's Head of Department requesting a full written statement about the work of the self-sponsored candidate. The Head of Department (where applicable, in collaboration with the Research Centre / Institute Director) will be asked to state their opinion of the quality of the research and published output and to set out clearly and unambiguously the full range of opinions amongst the Departmental Professoriate. If the self-sponsored promotion proposal is submitted through the Head of Department, the Head of Department is free to submit their statement (where applicable, in collaboration with the Research Centre / Institute Director) on the work of the candidate with the promotion documentation.

Before reaching a decision, in each case the Promotions Committee will take account of the external opinions as expressed by the Referees, of the internal opinions as expressed in the promotion proposal, and the opinions of the two Internal Readers assigned to assess the candidate's publications (for self-sponsored cases there is no Internal Monitor; instead both members of the Promotions Committee assigned to the case function as Internal Readers).

## 6.3 Emergency Promotion Procedures

The Emergency Promotion Procedures only apply for promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow or promotion to Professorial Research Fellow cases. Like all promotions for research staff, emergency promotion is also subject to funding confirmation.

The Promotions Committee has agreed the following criteria for emergency procedures:

- Evidence, in the form of a written offer from a comparator peer academic institution is required. Offers from the commercial sector are not deemed relevant in this context.
- The Promotions Committee would, unless in exceptional circumstances, expect confirmation from the Head of Department that the candidate would in any event, be put forward in the forthcoming promotion round

The Appointments Committee has agreed the following two procedures to deal with emergency requests for Promotion which arise out of phase. The emergency procedures cannot be used for late applications for promotion.

### *Procedure (1) [Emergency Proposals which arise in session]*

Procedure (1) is designed to deal with emergency requests for Promotion which arise during the session outside the normal annual cycle (and including normally, the Winter and Spring vacations). Procedure (1) is identical (except in timing) to the procedures used for the main Promotions exercise, but the procedure is accelerated as far as possible so that a decision may be reached at an early opportunity – normally at the next scheduled meeting of the Promotions Committee.

The Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development) will determine on advice from the VCAC, whether the individual circumstances justify the use of Procedure (1). Heads of Department are advised therefore, to contact the VCAC in the first instance.

### *Procedure (2) [Emergency Proposals which arise out of session]*

Procedure (2) is designed to achieve as far as possible a procedure which remains comparable to the main Promotions exercise.

As with Procedure (1), the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development) will determine on advice from the VCAC whether Procedure (2) should be triggered. Heads of Department should, therefore, contact the VCAC in the first instance.

Having achieved consent for the case to proceed under Procedure 2, the Head of Department should submit the documentation for Promotion to Human Resources. Heads of Department are advised that the emergency procedures cannot be initiated until complete documentation is received by Human Resources consisting of the following elements:

- A statement from the candidate's Head of Department reporting on the candidate's progress in research and contributions to the Department and the School
- A CV presented on the standard template including a statement from the candidate on their research achievement record, a statement of planned research, a statement on past and ongoing research grants and management and leadership of research

The Promotions Committee will seek opinions from **two** external Referees nominated by the Department on the relevant template forms.

Heads of Department should refer to the relevant sections of these Guidelines for further information on the headings to be addressed in the Head of Department's Statement (**Section 3.3**), criteria for selection of Referees (**Section 5.2**) and writings (**Section 4**).

A Panel comprising members of the Promotions Committee will have authority to consider emergency requests which arise out of session. The Panel's membership will normally comprise the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development), the VCAC, and a member of the Promotions Committee.

Panel members will consider a full set of papers relating to the candidate, comprising:

- Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1
- Candidate's CV (including research trajectory & research achievement record, statement on past & ongoing research grants and management & leadership of research) NRSC/2
- Reports of two Referees nominated by the Department
- Report of the Internal Reader and Monitor (normally Promotions Committee members)

The Panel, having considered all the relevant information as described above, will reach an initial decision. The Panel will make a recommendation to the full Promotions Committee which will be asked, by circulation, to endorse it. In the event that any two members of the Promotions Committee raise an objection, the decision will be held over until the first scheduled meeting of the Promotions Committee in the following academic year (for the dates of the upcoming session please contact Human Resources).

For emergency proposals dealt with under Procedure (2), the aim will be to reach a decision within four weeks of the date the Department delivers the **completed documentation** to Human Resources. Heads of Department should note that this timetable may be affected by factors outside the Promotions Committee's control such as the availability and goodwill of external academic colleagues to act on short notice.

In exceptional circumstances, the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development), on advice from the VCAC, may agree to amend Procedure (2) to facilitate a decision on a particular case sooner than the one-month period.

## **7. DECISIONS OF THE PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE**

### **7.1 Notification of Decisions**

Decisions of the Promotions Committee remain confidential until candidates have been notified in writing of the outcome. Letters, copied to the Head of Department, will normally be issued within 10 working days following the conclusion of the meeting. Letters will normally be signed by the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development) or, alternatively, by the VCAC.

#### *Successful Promotion*

If a majority of the members of the Promotions Committee is of the view that a candidate fulfils the requirements for promotion, the staff member concerned will be promoted to the relevant higher career grade, normally from the following 1 August or from the date for which funding for the promotion is available within the academic session, if earlier. Staff will be issued with the role profile applicable for the higher career grade.

#### *Unsuccessful Promotion Applications*

Unsuccessful candidates will be sent a personal letter setting out the reasons for the Promotions Committee's decision. Unsuccessful candidates are encouraged to seek a meeting with the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development) in their capacity as Chair of the Promotions Committee or with the VCAC, to discuss their case. At this meeting, staff will be offered guidance on what they need to do in order to strengthen their case for promotion in the future. There is no right of appeal against decisions reached by the Promotions Committee. The candidate's Head of Department will also be informed of the reasons for the Committee's decision.

#### *Waiting Period and Re-Applications*

The convention is that, normally, there should be a two-year gap between submissions of promotion proposals following an unsuccessful promotion attempt. In exceptional cases, the Promotions Committee may agree that a case may come before it again in the next promotion round without waiting for two years to elapse.

There is no limit on the number of occasions on which a candidate may be put forward for promotion. The Promotions Committee will not have before it information about any previous unsuccessful promotion proposals for this candidate.

#### *Reporting to the Appointments Committee*

The names of all successful Promotion candidates are reported to the Appointments Committee.

### **7.2 Salary Determination**

#### *Promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow*

Staff promoted to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow will normally have their salaries increased to the minimum salary for Assistant Professorial Research Fellows on Step 39.5, or receive two additional increments, whichever increase is greater. The salary increase will normally take effect from the following 1 August or from the date for which funding for the promotion is available within the academic session, if earlier.

#### *Promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow*

Staff promoted to Associate Professorial Research Fellow will normally have their salaries increased to the minimum salary for Associate Professorial Research Fellows on Step 45.5, or receive three additional increments, whichever increase is greater. The salary increase will normally take effect from the following 1 August or from the date for which funding for the promotion is available within the academic session, if earlier.

*Promotion to Professorial Research Fellow*

Staff promoted to Professorial Research Fellow will normally have their salaries increased to the minimum salary for Professorial Research Fellows on Step 55.5 or receive four additional increments, whichever increase is greater. The salary increase will normally take effect from the following 1 August or from the date for which funding for the promotion is available within the academic session, if earlier.

Further information on the LSE salary scales is available on the Human Resources website.

---

## PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE: Terms of Reference and Membership

---

### 1. Purpose of Committee

The Promotions Committee is the formal School decision-making body which considers and reaches decisions on departmental recommendations for Interim Review and Major Review. The Committee is also the decision-making body for proposals to promote members of the academic staff to Associate Professor and Professor and, members of the research staff to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow, Associate Professorial Research Fellow and Professorial Research Fellow, and members of the Education Career Track staff to Associate Professor (Education) and Professor (Education). The Promotions Committee is a Sub-Committee of the Appointments Committee and is chaired by the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development).

### 2. Membership

The membership of the Promotions Committee is approved annually by the Appointments Committee and comprises *ex officio*:

Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development) (Chair)  
Vice-Chair of the Appointments Committee  
Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education)

And fifteen professorial members nominated from the five [Academic Board constituency Groups](#). There are three professorial representatives from each Academic Board Group.

Professors currently serving as Heads of Department are ineligible to be considered for Committee membership until their term as Head of Department expires.

No less than one third of the fifteen professorial members nominated from the five Academic Board constituency Groups should be women and no less than one third should be men.

The VCAC will be required to explain in the VCAC annual report to the Appointments Committee why this target could not be met if it was not met in a specific year.

The Committee is supported by Human Resources.

### 3. Nomination Procedure

Nominations to fill vacancies arising on the Promotions Committee will be sought from Heads of Department. It will normally be expected that nominations will carry the support of all Heads from within the Group(s) in which vacancies occur. The VCAC works together with Heads of Department to seek gender and disciplinary balance as well as representation of smaller Departments in their nomination of candidates.

In the interests of ensuring that the Committee retains an appropriate balance in terms of gender, subject coverage across disciplines and representation of smaller departments, the VCAC has discretion to nominate up to five professorial representatives to serve on the Committee. The VCAC's nominees may be drawn from any of the five Academic Board Groups.

### 4. Term of Office

One half of the elected members of the Promotions Committee will normally retire from the Committee at the end of each academic session and no appointed member who has served a full term of office (which is normally two years) will be re-eligible until three further years have elapsed.

Casual vacancies are filled by the appointment of a new member drawn from the Academic Board Group in which the vacancy occurs, who will serve for the unexpired period of the appointment.

## **5. Code of Conduct**

Committee members are expected to take a School-wide view of the issues before them and not to represent departmental views. Furthermore, Committee members from the same department as a candidate under consideration are not permitted to participate in discussion of the case, except to provide factual clarification if called upon by the Chair. In the case of a self-sponsored promotion proposal, Committee members from the same department as the candidate will be requested to leave the room while the case is considered.

Committee members are expected to make themselves available to attend every meeting in view of the importance of maintaining continuity in the deliberations of the Committee. Committee members are expected to respect the importance of dealing with the work of the Committee in the strictest confidence at all times. Members should not reveal the Committee's deliberations in any part outside of meetings.

## **6. Schedule of meetings**

The dates of the Committee's annual schedule of meetings are published in the School Calendar. In addition, there may, on occasion, be exceptional circumstances which necessitate convening a special meeting in vacation periods - e.g. to consider an emergency promotion proposal.

## Terms of Reference

1. Title of Committee: Promotions Committee
2. Status of Committee: Sub-Committee of the Appointments Committee
3. Responsibilities delegated to the Promotions Committee by Appointments Committee:
  - 3.1 To monitor quality and to act as the decision-making body for individual proposals put forward under the annual promotion and review round for academic staff concerning Interim Reviews, Major Reviews and Promotions as well as proposals put forward under the annual promotion round for research staff promotions to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow, Associate Professorial Research Fellow and Professorial Research Fellow, and for education staff promotions to Associate Professor (Education) and Professor (Education), and to report annually to the Appointments Committee.
  - 3.2 To consider any issues referred to the Committee by the Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee concerning the individual progress of pre-Major Review staff; where appropriate, to consider and implement measures to monitor and provide support towards meeting School expectations for a successful outcome at Interim/Major Review.
  - 3.3 To have oversight of policy and procedures pertaining to the School's arrangements for promotion and review of academic staff (including promotion and review criteria) and research staff; to review and report annually to the Appointments Committee on the operation of these arrangements and to make recommendations as appropriate on developments or changes to policy and procedures.
  - 3.4 To have oversight of equality and diversity issues in relation to the annual promotion and review round; to receive reports on the profile of promotion and review candidates by gender and ethnicity with a view to looking at potential inequalities and ensuring that School procedures do not discriminate. To make recommendations to the Appointments Committee as appropriate on equality and diversity issues in respect of promotion and review procedures.
  - 3.5 To consider and make recommendations to the Appointments Committee on policy issues relating to the recruitment and retention of academic staff.
  - 3.6 To consider and make recommendations to the Appointments Committee on any issues referred by the Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee arising from the operation of the Career Development Review (CDR) Scheme.
  - 3.7 To consider and make recommendations on any other policy matters or issues which have a direct bearing on its work that may be referred to it by the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development) the Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee, the Appointments Committee, and other School committees/fora, or arising from the outcomes of the Staff Survey or the work of the Staff Consultative Council.
4. Arrangements for Promotions Committee to report to Appointments Committee on the exercise of its delegated authority:
  - 4.1 The Promotions Committee shall report to Appointments Committee on its determinations and any significant policy or procedural issues – including recommendations on changes to policy and procedures - annually, in the Spring Term.
  - 4.2 The Committee shall report to other School committees/fora as appropriate regarding any relevant issues.

**5. Frequency of Meetings**

- 5.1 The annual schedule of Committee meetings is published in the School meetings calendar.
- 5.2 The Committee can convene exceptionally out of cycle – e.g. in relation to emergency proposals for promotion.
- 5.3 Decisions can be taken by the Committee by correspondence and email.

**6. Chair**

- 6.1 The Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development) chairs meetings of the Committee under delegated authority from the President and Vice Chancellor. In case they recuse themselves, the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education) takes over as Chair. In case, they recuse themselves as well, the VCAC takes over as Chair.

**7. Voting**

- 7.1 All official members of the Promotions Committee are entitled to vote on a case. Members do not vote on cases from their own Department. The Chair does not normally vote but has the casting vote. The VCAC does not vote unless they chair in lieu of the Chair in which case they have the casting vote.

**Appointments Committee  
June 2023**

## MEMBERSHIP OF THE PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE: 2024-2025

<b>Ex Officio</b>	Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development) (Chair) Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education)	Professor Charles Stafford  Professor Niamh Moloney Professor Emma McCoy
GROUP 1	Accounting Finance Management	Professor Péter Kondor <sup>2</sup> Professor David Webb <sup>2</sup> Professor Diane Reyniers <sup>1</sup>
GROUP 2	European Institute Government International Development International Relations	Professor Toby Dodge <sup>1</sup> Professor Ken Shadlen <sup>2</sup> Professor Lea Ypi <sup>1</sup>
GROUP 3	Economics Mathematics Methodology Philosophy, Logic and Scientific Method Statistics	Professor Alan Manning <sup>2</sup> Professor Jouni Kuha <sup>2</sup> Professor Luitgard Veraart <sup>2</sup>
GROUP 4	Anthropology Gender Studies Media and Communications Health Policy Psychological and Behavioural Science Social Policy Sociology	Professor Sandra Jovchelovitch <sup>2</sup> Professor Mathijs Pelkmans <sup>1</sup> Professor Wendy Sigle <sup>2</sup>
GROUP 5	Economic History Geography and Environment International History Law	Professor Charles Palmer <sup>2</sup> Professor Kristina Spohr <sup>1</sup> Professor Emmanuel Voyiakis <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Serving first year of a two-year term, 2024-26<sup>2</sup>Serving second year of a two-year term, 2023-25

Last updated 12 June 2024

<b>PROMOTION AND REVIEW OF ACADEMIC STAFF: TIMETABLE FOR 2024-2025</b>
--

Documentation, including writings in electronic form, should be submitted electronically to [hr.reviewandpromotion@lse.ac.uk](mailto:hr.reviewandpromotion@lse.ac.uk). **Failure to submit documents by the stated deadline may preclude consideration of the case.**

<b>Autumn Term:</b>	<b>Monday 30 September – Friday 13 December 2024</b>
Mon 30 September 2024	Heads of Department's Deadline 1 (see Annex D for details)
Mon 21 October 2024	Heads of Department's Deadline 2 (see Annex D for details)
Wed 13 November 2024	<p>Promotions Committee (Schedule of Business)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Receives names of Review and Promotion candidates and approves Referees to be consulted forthwith.</li> <li>▪ Receives Journal List and Publishing Norms documents submitted by departments.</li> <li>▪ Considers proposals for advancement / deferral of Interim Review / Major Review.</li> <li>▪ Appoints Internal Readers and Monitors to read the writings of candidates for all cases</li> </ul>
<b>Winter Term:</b>	<b>Monday 20 January – Friday 4 April 2025</b>
Wed 5 February 2025	<p>Promotions Committee (Interim Reviews)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Takes decisions on <b>Interim Reviews of Assistant Professors</b></li> <li>▪ Takes decisions on proposals for <b>Promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow</b></li> </ul>
Tue 4 March, Wed 5 March, Thu 6 March & Wed 26 March 2025	<p>Promotions Committee (Major Review and Promotion cases)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Takes decisions on proposals for <b>Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor</b>, proposals for <b>Promotion to Associate Professor (post-Major Review Lecturers/Assistant Professors only)</b> and proposals for <b>Promotion to Professor</b></li> <li>▪ Takes decisions on promotions of staff on the <b>New Research Staff Career</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Takes decisions</b> on promotions of staff on the <b>Education Career Track</b></li> </ul> <p><b>HEADS OF DEPARTMENT</b> are asked to ensure they are present in the School and available to attend this meeting, if called.</p>
<b>Spring Term:</b>	<b>Tuesday 6 May – Friday 20 June 2025</b>
Wed 14 May 2025	<p>Promotions Committee (Annual Review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To conduct an annual review of policy and procedures in light of the current session's Promotion and Review round, with proposals for changes to policy / procedure recommended to the annual meeting of the Appointments Committee.</li> </ul>
Wed 11 June 2025	<p>Appointments Committee (VCAC's Annual Report)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposals for changes to policy / procedure in respect of the annual academic promotion and review round, recommended by the Promotions Committee.</li> <li>▪ A report on the general pattern of quality and procedures for academic appointments across and within the School.</li> </ul>

<b>REFERENCE GUIDE TO DEADLINES FOR REVIEW AND PROMOTION DOCUMENTATION</b>
--

Departments must submit the documentation outlined below to Human Resources at:

[hr.reviewandpromotion@lse.ac.uk](mailto:hr.reviewandpromotion@lse.ac.uk)

Case type	HoD Deadline 1 (Monday 30 September 2024)	HoD Deadline 2 (Monday 21 October 2024)
<b>Department Documentation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Departmental Journals List and Publishing Norms Document (for note by PC)</li> <li>• Full list of candidates being put forward for the annual review and promotion process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing required</li> </ul>
<b>Promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CV, including research trajectory &amp; research achievement record &amp; statement on past and ongoing research grants and management and leadership of research NRSC/2</li> <li>• Funding confirmation</li> <li>• Referees for Promotions NRSC/3</li> <li>• Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances NRSC/4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1</li> <li>• Electronic copies of, normally, 2 writings*</li> <li>• Electronic copies of any book reviews*</li> </ul>
<b>Promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CV, including research trajectory &amp; research achievement record &amp; statement on past and ongoing research grants and management and leadership of research NRSC/2</li> <li>• Funding confirmation</li> <li>• Referees for Promotions NRSC/3</li> <li>• Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances NRSC/4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1</li> <li>• Electronic copies of, normally, 4 writings*</li> <li>• Electronic copies of any book reviews*</li> </ul>
<b>Promotion to Professorial Research Fellow</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CV, including research trajectory &amp; research achievement record &amp; statement on past and ongoing research grants and management and leadership of research NRSC/2</li> <li>• Funding confirmation</li> <li>• Referees for Promotions NRSC/3</li> <li>• Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances NRSC/4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1</li> <li>• Electronic copies of, normally, 4 writings*</li> <li>• Electronic copies of any book reviews*</li> </ul>
<b>Self-sponsored Promotion</b> (for candidates submitting their own documents, the HoD deadline applies)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CV, including research trajectory &amp; research achievement record &amp; statement on past and ongoing research grants and management and leadership of research NRSC/2</li> <li>• Funding confirmation</li> <li>• Referees for Promotions NRSC/3</li> <li>• Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances NRSC/4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1</li> <li>• Candidate's Statement NRSC/5</li> <li>• Electronic copies of, normally, 4 writings (2 writings for self-sponsored Promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow cases)*</li> <li>• Electronic copies of any book reviews*</li> </ul>

<b>Emergency Promotion</b>	<p><i>Until Human Resources receives the following, they cannot act:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Head of Department Statement NRSC/1</li><li>• CV, including research trajectory &amp; research achievement record &amp; statement on past &amp; ongoing research grants and management &amp; leadership of research NRSC/2</li><li>• Referees for Promotion NRSC/3</li><li>• Funding confirmation</li><li>• Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances NRSC/4</li></ul> <hr/> <p><i>These documents must follow as soon as possible:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Electronic copies of writings*</li><li>• Electronic copies of any book reviews*</li></ul>
----------------------------	---

\* If electronic copies are unavailable then 7 hard copies of each item are required.

## REFERENCE GUIDE TO PEER REVIEWERS (EXTERNAL & INTERNAL)

All Referee nominations on Referees form G/4 should be submitted by **HoD Deadline 1 (Monday 30 September 2024)**. All documentation to be sent electronically to [hr.reviewandpromotion@lse.ac.uk](mailto:hr.reviewandpromotion@lse.ac.uk).

The Selection Criteria for Referees (**Section 5.2**) must be followed when making recommendations, any queries must be directed as soon as possible to the VCAC in the first instance.

	Promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow	Promotion to Associate Professorial / Professorial Research Fellow	Self-sponsored promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow	Self-sponsored promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow or Professorial Research Fellow	Emergency Promotion
<b>External Referee</b>	Dept	Dept	Cand	Cand	Dept
<b>External Referee</b>	Dept	Dept	Cand	Cand	Dept
<b>External Referee</b>	Cand	Dept	VCAC	Cand	Dept
<b>External Referee</b>	Cand	Dept	VCAC	Cand	-
<b>External Referee</b>	-	Cand	-	VCAC	-
<b>External Referee</b>	-	Cand	-	VCAC	-
<b>External Referee</b>	-	Cand	-	VCAC	-
<b>External Referee</b>	-	Cand	-	VCAC	-
<b>Internal Reader</b>	VCAC	VCAC	VCAC	VCAC	VCAC
<b>Monitor/ 2<sup>nd</sup> Internal Reader</b>	VCAC	VCAC	VCAC	VCAC	VCAC

