Academic Promotions

Guidance and Process for Promotions Committees/Heads of Departments

Introduction

1. This procedure is developed in accordance with the Academic Promotions Policy which can be found at:

   https://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/people-and-od/current-staff/career-development/academic-promotions-procedures/

   The criteria for promotion to the different academic levels are those set out by the University and can be found at:
   https://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/people-and-od/current-staff/career-development/academic-promotions-procedures/criteria/

How cases are assessed

2. It is critical that those involved in assessing a promotion application review the core guidance on how candidates can evidence meeting the criteria. This can be found in Appendix 3.

Equality of Opportunity

3. The University is committed to equality of opportunity. The People Directorate will provide Promotions Committees with anonymised details of the equality and diversity data of the School's/Faculty's academic staff and:

   - Members of Promotions Committees are expected to have undertaken approved training in equality, diversity and inclusion and unconscious bias training within the last three years. Evidence that training has been undertaken may be required.
   - The membership of committees should reflect principles of equality and diversity. Where a School is unable to meet these requirements from within its own staff, it may co-opt appropriate additional members from other Schools.

   Figures relating to the numbers of applications from, and success rates of, employees with protected characteristics (where appropriate data is held) will be collected and passed to the Faculty EDI Committee and will also form part of the EDI statistics provided to schools at the start of each promotions cycle.

4. Where a candidate for promotion wishes to cite some mitigating circumstances (e.g. relating to a disability, absence due to ill health, caring responsibility, period of maternity leave, time off for gender-affirming surgery or part-time working) they should include a cover letter for the Chair of Schools Promotion Committee (SPC) (and Faculty Promotions Committee (FPC) as appropriate) providing detail of how it has contributed to the quantity of their outputs and general progress. Mitigating Circumstances should be submitted via "People Leaders Advice" <peopleleadersadvice@manchester.ac.uk>. Any such 'gaps' will not be detrimental to a case where quality is clearly evidenced but a sustained pattern of achievement must be evident. In making their assessments, committees should take into account the amount of time that has been available to candidates for the completion of their duties and make pro-rata adjustments for the expected quantity of outputs. Unless specifically instructed to do so by the candidate, the SPC and FPC Chairs will not share the letters with the other committee members, but they will give some guidance as to how the case should be considered. It is noted that where Head of Division/Departments do not have full disclosure this can affect their ability to provide an accurate/complete supporting assessment for the promotion candidate. In most cases they will be already aware of the circumstances, but where this is not the case, People Partners will liaise with the Head of School, the promotion candidate and the Head of Division/Department to establish a way forward. It is expected that any periods of illness which are cited as mitigating circumstances will have been appropriately documented at the time. People Partners will check that this is the case.

   Any cover letter provided by a candidate will not count towards the word limit in any part of the candidate's application. Mitigating circumstances shared through mechanisms other than a separate cover letter will not be taken into consideration.

   The panel should record whether mitigating circumstances have been taken into account. Though they are not expected to specify/record the specific adjustment made as this forms part of judgement of a promotion case in the round.

Consideration of Cases for Staff who are part-time

5. Where candidates for promotion are less than full-time, the quantity of evidence they provide in support of their application should be considered on a pro-rata basis based on their full-time equivalent.

   A candidate will also be considered to be part-time if part of their working time involves being seconded/recharged to another organisation. For example, a clinician may be full-time but have 50% full-time equivalent of their time allocated to clinical duties. In these scenarios, the judgement on their academic outputs should be in line with that of a 50% full-time post holder.

Impartiality

6. Committee members must ensure they can provide an impartial, fair and consistent judgement. Before discussions begin, members of the committee must declare any conflicts of interest, or any relationship with a candidate that might be perceived as creating a conflict capable of affecting their impartial judgement. The Chair will then determine the appropriate action to take on a case-by-case basis, up to and including requesting the committee member to physically withdraw during the discussion and voting. Where the Chair declares a conflict of interest requiring their withdrawal from the meeting, they will nominate an alternate Chair for the consideration of that case. Members of committees do not represent their schools/departments and there should be no advocacy of individual cases.

Confidentiality and data protection

7. Committee members should ensure that all personal data is treated with an appropriate level of confidentiality and handled in accordance with the relevant data protection legislation. It is the responsibility of the Dean (or their nominee), supported by the People Directorate, to provide outcomes and feedback to applicants and under no circumstances should a committee member discuss the activities or workings of the committee outside of the meeting. The People Directorate will retain appropriate records of the process, and applications and committee information will be circulated digitally. If a committee member chooses to make a paper copy or their own notes, these must be kept confidential and should be securely destroyed following the process.

An evidence-based process

8. Promotion is a peer-review process in which decisions are based on an objective review by committee members of all the written evidence presented to them. Therefore, the burden of proof is on the candidate to demonstrate that they meet the criteria for promotion. Committees are required to make judgements about promotion exclusively on the basis of the evidence presented to them. Where this is not provided, promotion should not be agreed.

Initiating the Application Process

9. The Faculty, working through Schools, will announce the commencement of the annual promotions cycle, provide a timetable of key dates, and tell staff how they can obtain a copy of this procedure and the criteria for promotion.

   Schools will determine a local timetable for the submission of cases and the scheduling of meetings of the School Promotions Committee.

10. Heads of School will be sent data showing the anonymised EDI profile of each academic staff category.

11. The primary responsibility for identifying potential promotion cases rests with Heads of School (in consultation with other senior members of the School). They should ensure that

those individuals they consider merit promotion are encouraged to apply and are given advice by their Head of Division/Department on how to prepare a case.

12. Individuals who want to be considered for promotion should seek the advice of their Head of Division/Department to both assess how well they meet the criteria and to obtain advice on preparing the case.

Preparing the Application: The Individual and the Head of Division/Department

13. Individuals should submit the following by the date and method communicated by their school

    - A statement that they wish to be considered for promotion which briefly explains the basis on which they consider they meet the criteria for promotion. Candidates may include up to 200 words per domain (as it is relevant to their application) e.g. up to 200 words on Research, 200 words on Service & Leadership etc.
    - An up-to-date copy of their CV presented according to the Faculty Academic CV format, only including information presented under these headings.
    - Candidates should ensure their statement and CV clearly demonstrate what has been done since the last promotion. The CV may also include a broader record of their achievements (including information prior to their last promotion) to demonstrate the wider context of their sustained performance.
    - Candidates must ensure all information in their statement and CV is factually accurate.

    Candidates should be aware that their application will be rejected by the School Promotions Committee if the CV or statement is not presented in the Faculty format or if word counts are not adhered to.

14. Statements should not repeat or summarise information contained in the CV and candidates should also not provide the same examples or evidence under more than one statement heading. The point of the statement/assessment is to set out how the candidate meets the criteria; in doing so two aspects must be clearly addressed:

    - how the candidate's accomplishments and contributions to the University exceed the criteria for their current grade;
    - what the candidate has achieved since their last promotion.

    Where the candidate has previously submitted an unsuccessful application for promotion, this must also include how they have responded to the feedback given at that stage.

    No additional information should be submitted such as appendices or testimonials from students. Such information will be disregarded.

References for Promotion

15. Schools should refer to the suggested wording for reference requests found in Appendices 1 & 2. References are only required for promotion to Reader or Professor. They are not required for promotion cases to Senior Lecturer or equivalent, to Grade 7 Lecturer or Research Fellow. References for other promotion cases should be sought as follows:

    - Promotion to Reader – the candidate should supply the name of 1 referee and the Head of School, or appointed deputy, should provide a further 2 names (i.e. **3 references in total**). These 2 referees should be academic leaders who are independent of the candidate (i.e. not suggested by the candidate). At least 2 of the 3 names should normally be international referees. It is expected that referees will be from leading research institutions. All 3 referees will be approached by the School/Institute and asked to submit a reference within the required timescales.

    - Promotion to Chair – the candidate should supply the names of 2 referees and the Head of School/Institute Director, or appointed deputy, should provide a further 3 names (i.e. **5 references in total**). These 3 referees should be academic leaders who are independent of the candidate (i.e. not suggested by the candidate). At least 3 of the 5 names should normally be international referees (although it is acknowledged that for those applying for promotion to Chair based primarily on teaching it may be more difficult to comply with this requirement and the School and Faculty Promotions Committees have the discretion to exercise their judgement in this respect). It is expected that referees will be from leading research institutions. The Head of School will approach all 5 referees, and they will be asked to submit a reference within the required timescale.

    Co-authors should not be approached to provide references unless this is unavoidable. In those circumstances the co-authorship should be highlighted in the Head of Department/Division's assessment.

    Heads of Department/Division should state briefly why the referees chosen were selected in terms of their knowledge of the candidate's field and their standing in this field (using usual kind of esteem measures e.g. REF panel member, editor of leading journal, role in learned societies etc.)

    Where the promotion case is for an academic following the Teaching and Scholarship route, it will be necessary to use additional referees from within the University who are able to comment reliably on the candidate's teaching and learning ability, and teaching scholarship. It is important in these cases that where possible, some of the referees are external to the candidate's School.

Promotion Cases where the Candidate holds posts in more than one school or where the Candidate's research aligns more with a UoA in another school

16. In promotion cases where the candidate holds posts in two (or more) schools the cases should be considered by the relevant SPCs in the normal way but then the Heads of School should discuss and agree an overall grade. The case will then be forwarded to a FPC as a joint case.

17. Where the candidate has a post in only one school, but their research more closely aligns with a Unit of Assessment in another school then the Head of School will be responsible for sourcing appropriate feedback on the research from the other school.

The School Promotions Committee (SPC)

18. Each School shall establish a School Promotions Committee, chaired by the Head of School. Schools must ensure that the Committee consists of at least five members of the school, including the School's Directors of Research; Teaching and Learning, Social Responsibility and EDI.

19. The School Promotions Committee should be constituted with a membership that reflects principles of equality and diversity. Members may be co-opted from other Schools for this purpose.

20. Schools should avoid the use of formal divisional/departmental committees in the decision-making procedures since they make the process more protracted and may raise candidates' expectations unduly. Where informal departmental groups exist, it must be clear to candidates that feedback received from these groups is purely advisory and they have no decision-making role in this process.

21. The role of the SPC is to advise the Head of School in determining whether a case for promotion has been established and, where appropriate, to advise candidates how their case might be strengthened. The SPC will consider the individuals' written cases, including references. If additional information is required this should be sought in writing. For promotion to Senior Lecturer, Reader and Chair, the SPC should identify in each case whether they consider the case:

    (a) clearly meets the criteria for promotion;
    (b) marginally meets the criteria for promotion;
    (c) marginally fails to meet the criteria for promotion; or
    (d) clearly fails to meet the criteria for promotion.

22. Cases in categories (a), (b) and (c) should be sent to the Faculty Promotions Committee (FPC), via the designated People Directorate for the Faculty, by the date indicated in local procedures, and the Head of School should inform each candidate that their case has been sent to the FPC. Heads of School should include one overall covering letter which details how many applications were received by the school, how many are now going forward for Faculty consideration and what the EDI profile is of the cases going forward.

23. Each case submitted to the Faculty Promotions Committee (FPC) should consist of the documentation received by the SPC together with the career grade it is judged to be promotable to (i.e. Senior Lecturer [Teaching and Research], Senior Lecturer [Teaching and Scholarship], Reader or Professor), the promotion category in which it falls (A, B, or C), and a brief statement from the Head of School (or Chair of the committee) covering:

    a. The committee decision and rationale for recommendation / the reasons why the SPC reached that judgement
    b. Any particular circumstances, e.g. progress in responding to feedback given following a previous unsuccessful promotion application.
    c. Provide discipline context where required (highlight relevant norms or metrics)
    d. Draw attention to exceptional strengths or concerns – this should be a contextual explanation rather than an assessment report.
    e. Whether any mitigating circumstances were considered and in what way (without sharing details of the mitigating circumstances themselves).

    Where a case is not supported by the School (category D), the individual will be notified of arrangements for making a personal case to FPC (please refer to section 27 below). Where a case falls into category C, the individual will be notified so that they have the opportunity to withdraw their application at this stage.

24. **Updates:** Candidates are not able to resubmit parts or all of their application post the submission date. Candidates may, up to 48 hours before a committee date, where there is a significant change (e.g. a book published or research grant awarded) or factual error provide a short note (no more than a few sentences) by email to inform of an update. Updates should be submitted via "People Leaders Advice" <peopleleadersadvice@manchester.ac.uk>. The Committee Chair will reference the update at the meeting.

25. **Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Monitoring:** the SPC will submit a cover sheet summarising the number of applications for promotion to each grade, and the EDI profile of the cases considered and those proceeding to FPC. A reporting template for this will purpose be provided by the People Directorate.

26. **Cases that fall in Category (d):** the Head of School shall meet the candidate to explain why the case failed to meet the criteria, provide advice on how the case might be strengthened, and provide advice, where appropriate, on the procedure for making a personal case to Faculty Promotions Committee. This should be confirmed in writing. This process should be completed by the date indicated in local procedures. If the candidate opts to make a personal case, then a statement should be provided by the Head of School see point 22, as is the case for those graded A, B or C.

27. **Cases that fall in Category (c):** the Head of School shall meet the candidate to explain why the case marginally failed to meet the criteria and provide advice on how the case might be strengthened. The individual will be given the opportunity to withdraw their application at this stage, though they have the right to have their case considered.

28. **Cases for progression/promotion to Grade 7 Lecturer, Grade 6 Lecturer (Teaching), Research Fellow and Research Associate:** The decision on these cases is made at school level and therefore there is no requirement to score the cases as described in paragraph 19. SPC should submit a summary of cases approved/not approved to FPC, for reporting purposes only. Decisions by SPC in relation to cases for promotion to Lecturer and Research Fellow will be notified formally to candidates by the People Directorate at this point.

    Where cases are not supported by SPC, the Head of School should follow the same feedback procedure as for Senior Lecturer and above applications which fall into category (d) (see below).

Faculty Promotions Committee (FPC)

29. The Vice-President and Dean shall convene meetings of the Faculty Promotions Committee (FPC) which consists of:

    (i) the Vice-President and Dean or a Vice Dean (Chair);
    (ii) the Vice Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students *or* the Vice Dean for Research;
    (iii) the Associate Dean for PG Research *or* Associate Dean for Research;
    (iv) a Vice Dean from another Faculty;
    (v) a minimum of two professors and one non-professorial member of staff drawn from the staff of the Faculty.

    In particular, the Faculty Promotions Committee will ensure that the membership is constituted appropriately in order to be familiar with disciplinary (and in some cases sub-disciplinary) research norms for the quality, range and volume of outputs (including those published beyond printed academic media where appropriate), research funding and PGR supervision that constitutes a successful track record at each level of promotion.

    Given the volume of business, Faculties may decide to split consideration of cases across multiple meetings (each where possible considering all submitted cases of the same level (so for e.g. all cases for promotion to Senior Lecturer level where possible should be considered at the same meeting).

30. The role of the FPC is to advise the Vice-President and Dean, or their nominee, in determining whether or not a case for promotion has been established. The FPC shall consider the written cases put forward for promotion, including the references. If additional information is required, it shall be sought in writing.

31. New members of FPC and SPCs will receive an induction briefing from a nominated committee member on the role of the committees and the responsibilities of their members.

32. Where there is a difference between the judgement of the FPC and the recommendation of the SPC (i.e. in the categorisation outlined in 18 above), the School will be given an opportunity to respond with additional information before a final decision is reached by FPC.

33. **Feedback to Heads of School on decisions:** Heads of School will be notified of the decisions on promotions to SL, Senior Research Fellow, Reader and Professor[1]. Unsuccessful candidates will be offered the option to meet with the Vice-President and Dean or their nominee (see 'Feedback' below).

Reporting on promotions data

34. The decision on whether an application for promotion is successful or not is that of FPC. University Executive receive reporting to enable them to monitor outcomes to ensure equity of treatment across the University. It will do this by considering summary data by School to assess whether there are any broad indicators that Schools or Faculties are applying differing standards for promotion. As such, UE will receive information about the equality and diversity profile of cases considered by SPCs and FPC. UE will also receive details of cases details of retention case promotions approved outside of the annual cycle (see 42 below).

Feedback to unsuccessful candidates after FPC and appeals

35. Candidates will be notified of the outcome of FPC following the meeting of FPC. For those candidates that have been unsuccessful, the letter to the candidate will inform them of their right of appeal against the decision not to promote (on the grounds of defect in the process) by writing to the Executive Director of People, as set out in the University Academics Promotions Policy. The letter will also offer them the option to meet with the Vice-President and Dean (or other person nominated by the Vice-President and Dean), so that s/he can explain why the case failed to meet the criteria.

    Developmental feedback should be offered where cases are not supported by School or Faculty promotion committees and is intended to support the strengthening of a future case. It does not remove the applicant's responsibility to present a complete and persuasive case against the relevant criteria, nor does it prevent the Committee from identifying concerns in a subsequent application that were not expressed in identical terms in an earlier feedback discussion. Panels make holistic judgments across domains, taking account of context, role and trajectory. It is open to the committee to consider the full range of evidence presented, and how clearly the evidence shows reach, value and impact. Feedback is not a procedural failing and would not normally result in a review of a promotion case. That said, the school/faculty should consider how they position feedback to ensure quality and usefulness.

[1] Where a Senior Lecturer is unsuccessful in their application for promotion to Chair the case will not automatically be considered for a Readership. Candidates and their Heads of School/SPCs must commit to the case either being considered for Chair or Readership.

Appeals should be made in writing using the template. Appeals should be clear on which element of the process they are appealing against.

Implementation of promotion

36. The People Directorate will make arrangements for the appointments to be reported to Senate.

37. Senior Lecturers who are successful in applying for promotion to Reader will be awarded one salary increment (in addition to any August increment already due) up to a maximum point 54.

38. Implementation of the promotion will take effect from 1st August following the FPC meeting.

Retention Cases

39. Where a promotion case arises through the threat of the loss of a key member of staff, and there is clear evidence that the individual has received or is about to receive an offer from another organisation, and is considered to be qualified for promotion, the Head of School shall bring that case to the attention of the Vice-President and Dean.

40. If the Vice-President and Dean believes a *prima facie* case exists, references will be called for as set out above, and the members of a properly constituted FPC will be consulted. If it is impossible in the timescale available to consult all the members of the FPC, the Vice-President and Dean has the discretion to decide how best to proceed.

41. All such decisions will be reported to UE via the People Directorate in accordance with paragraph 35 above.

Use of RRE Output Scores

42. The University Research Strategy Group guidance is that RRE grades should not be presented in the paperwork for probation or promotion; or introduced in discussion in probation and promotion committees. This guidance was agreed and established prior to previous REF exercises. The rationale is:
    - The RRE exercise of internal peer review is undertaken to select the strongest aggregate output submission for the Research Excellence Framework (REF) submission.
    - RRE grades for specific outputs may be revised and recalibrated over time by the Unit of Assessment coordinating team as part of the preparation of the REF submission and in light of new information about the output, such as citations or prizes.
    - When assessing an individual's research profile for probation or promotion, other indicators of output quality pertinent to the discipline or field are used as the primary source (peer review, referee comments, article citations, book reviews, etc.).

Implementation of Successful Promotion Cases

44. Successful applicants will be moved to the bottom point of the salary scale relevant to their new level. If their current salary is already at or above that amount, they will be moved to the next point up on the salary scale relevant to their new level.

<u>Appendix 1</u> SUGGESTED FORM OF WORDS FOR USE IN LETTERS SEEKING REFERENCES (ACADEMIC: TEACHING & RESEARCH)

"Dear

I am writing to request a reference for Dr X who is applying for promotion to the rank of Y in the School of Z at the University of Manchester. I attach a copy of Dr. X's current CV and the criteria for promotion to the rank of Z.

(Schools may also decide to point to or include publications to which they'd like the referee to comment on)

It would be helpful to the Promotions Committee if you could provide a clear assessment of the candidate. Please begin your reference by explaining briefly any connection you may have with the candidate and how you come to be aware of the candidate's work. It would also be useful to know briefly your experience in promotion decisions.

The Promotions Committee would ask that you please focus on providing an assessment of the candidate in relation to their research but if you are able to comment on their teaching or service & leadership that would be appreciated.

You will see from the promotion criteria that candidates are assessed against four criteria: research, innovation, knowledge exchange and external engagement, teaching, learning and student support & service and leadership (not just within the University of Manchester but to the profession more generally). The Promotions Committee would find it helpful if you would evaluate the candidate's contribution against each of these criteria, though it is recognized that you may not be able to comment on performance against all of these criteria with equal authority. What the Committee would find most helpful is substantive analysis, rather than general praise, advocacy, or a summary of what is contained in the candidate's CV. For example in terms of research, it would be helpful to know whether the candidate's work is being published by the top publishing companies or in the top journals in the discipline, what have been the one or two main contributions the candidate has made to the field and whether or not these have significantly advanced understanding. Similarly in terms of knowledge exchange, it would be helpful to know how the candidate has changed practice, or in terms of service to the profession how the candidate has improved the service offered by the profession. Balanced assessment of performance, noting any areas of weakness, is more valuable to the Promotions Committee than unalloyed praise, though there will be exceptional candidates where there is little to fault.

As well as an analysis of the candidate's performance against each of the criteria, the Promotions Committee would also find it helpful if you could assess the candidate's overall standing by saying whether you believe the candidate would be promoted to an equivalent rank in your own institution, or in any other top research institution of a standing similar to the

University of Manchester. It may be helpful to compare the candidate against other individuals who have been recently promoted to an equivalent or higher rank in equivalent institutions. I recognise that, for whatever reason, you may not wish to make such a comparison.

I am aware of the enormous demands there must be on your time, and that this request is adding to those burdens, but promotion decisions are amongst the most important decisions we take in the University, and the advice of external referees is crucially important in reaching such decisions

Finally, please note that UK legislation means that candidates can see a copy of your response if they submit a request under the terms of the General Data Protection Regulations. However, such requests are a relatively rare occurrence.

<u>Appendix 2</u> SUGGESTED FORM OF WORDS FOR USE IN LETTERS SEEKING REFERENCES (ACADEMIC: TEACHING & SCHOLARSHIP)

"Dear

I am writing to request a reference for Dr X who is applying for promotion to the rank of Y in the School of Z at the University of Manchester. I attach a copy of Dr. X's current CV and the criteria for promotion to the rank of Z.

It would be helpful to the Promotions Committee if you could provide a clear assessment of the candidate. Please begin your reference by explaining briefly any connection you may have with the candidate and how you come to be aware of the candidate's work. It would also be useful to know briefly your experience in promotion decisions.

You will see from the promotion criteria that candidates are assessed against four criteria: teaching, learning and student support, scholarship; innovation, knowledge exchange and external engagement, service and leadership (not just within the University of Manchester but to the profession more generally). The Promotions Committee would find it helpful if you would evaluate the candidate's contribution against each of these criteria, though it is recognised that you may not be able to comment on performance against all of these criteria with equal authority. What the Committee would find most helpful is substantive analysis, rather than general praise, advocacy, or a summary of what is contained in the candidate's CV. For example in terms of external engagement it would be helpful to know how the candidate has changed practice, or in terms of service to the profession how the candidate has improved the service offered by the profession. Balanced assessment of performance, noting any areas of weakness, is more valuable to the Promotions Committee than unalloyed praise, though there will be exceptional candidates where there is little to fault.

As well as an analysis of the candidate's performance against each of the criteria, the Promotions Committee would also find it helpful if you could assess the candidate's overall standing by saying whether you believe the candidate would be promoted to an equivalent rank in your own institution, or in any other top research institution of a standing similar to the University of Manchester. It may be helpful to compare the candidate against other individuals who have been recently promoted to an equivalent or higher rank in equivalent institutions. I recognise that, for whatever reason, you may not wish to make such a comparison.

I am aware of the enormous demands there must be on your time, and that this request is adding to those burdens, but promotion decisions are amongst the most important decisions we take in the University, and the advice of external referees is crucially important in reaching such decisions

Finally, please note that UK legislation means that candidates can see a copy of your response if they submit a request under the terms of the General Data Protection Regulations. However, such requests are a relatively rare occurrence.

October 2026
The University of Manchester

Appendix 3 Guidance on how candidates can evidence meeting the criteria

There are three tracks to promotion and for each there are four levels above Grades 6 and 7, for which there are separate criteria.

Academic: Teaching & Research	**Academic: Teaching & Scholarship**	**Academic: Research**
Professor	Professor	Professor
Reader	Reader	Reader
Senior Lecturer	Senior Lecturer	Senior Lecturer
Lecturer	Lecturer	Lecturer

Promotion can only be sought through a route consistent with the type of track an applicant is on.

Five areas of activity are recognised: (i) Teaching, Learning and Student Support, (ii) Scholarship, (iii) Research, (iii) Scholarship, (iv) Service and Leadership and (v) Innovation, Knowledge Exchange and External Engagement.

Which areas of activity are relevant varies between routes:

	Academic: Teaching & Research	**Academic: Teaching & Scholarship**	**Academic: Research**
Teaching, Learning and Student Support	Yes	Yes	No
Research	Yes	No	Yes
Scholarship	No	Yes	No
Service and Leadership	Yes	Yes	Yes
Innovation, Knowledge Exchange and External Engagement	Yes	Yes	Yes

One of the principles underpinning the formulation of the promotions criteria is that a successful case can be made on different combinations of depth and breadth. The School and Faculty Promotions Committees will assess the application using a breadth of evidence against the specified criteria. Candidates are not expected to evidence an equal level of performance with respect to all criteria, but to demonstrate sufficient strength on some criteria to merit promotion when the overall performance is considered in the round. An applicant can show different levels of strength with respect to the criteria within an area of activity, but if there is relative weakness with respect to one criterion, then there should be compensating strength with respect to some other criterion.

For each route, an applicant can choose to include in their case either Service and Leadership or Knowledge Exchange and External Engagement, or both areas of activity. The criteria for each of these areas of activity for each level are based on it being one of the main areas relied on in a case for promotion. If an applicant includes both areas in their case, the promotions committee will take a view on how the criteria met under both headings equate to the requirements for a candidate including only one of the two areas of activity in their case. If an applicant has some activity in an area, but not sufficient for this to be one of the main areas included in the case, this activity can be included in the case so that the Promotions Committees can take it into account if they deem it relevant to the case.

All cases for promotion will be assessed in the context of the discipline within which the applicant works.

A large body of work on teaching and scholarship roles in UK Higher Education has demonstrated that there is no "one size fits all" model of a T&S academic (see exemplars in the University's scholarship resource), and roles are often specific to context and local requirements. For this reason, T&S colleagues may also wish to consult your line manager and any local advice alongside this guidance document.

This guidance provides suggestions about ways colleagues can evidence each of the Promotions Criteria. For each criterion, apart from research, categories of "reach", "value" and "impact" are used as a starting point for considering evidence. Meanings are defined in each context.

Teaching, learning, and student support

All staff whose case involves Teaching and Student related activity must demonstrate how they meet points 1-7 of the University's Statement of Teaching Expectations. This should also account for the fact that we teach and learn in a context that encourages us to take intellectual risks and should also reflect the local context and, if relevant, personal circumstances of the individual. For individuals to be promoted they must be able to contextualise their experience for the promotions panel, demonstrating the impact and evidence relevant to their role to demonstrate success according to the following teaching expectations:

1. Teaching
2. Learning Materials
3. Assessment and Feedback
4. Academic Advising
5. Student Supervision
6. Student Support
7. Student experience

A case for promotion that involves Teaching, learning and student support activity should be assessed on a breadth of evidence, and all criteria relevant to the route and level of promotion should be taken into account when considering a case. It is not necessary that a candidate can evidence an equal level of performance with respect to all criteria, but the expectation is that relative weakness with respect to some criterion is matched by strength with respect to some other criterion.

Colleagues should consider the reach, value and impact of their teaching, learning and student support, which are defined as:

- **Reach:** The scale of influence (i.e. who has your teaching benefitted? How many students/staff are impacted? How broad is the group? A cohort? A specific group of students e.g. students from marginalised groups? Staff who will then use your work within their teaching?).
- **Value:** The benefit derived for staff and students.
- **Impact:** The difference made to policy, practice and/ or student outcomes as a result of an activity.

This criterion could be evidenced in the CV and statement by the following:

- Data on the variety and number of students/units taught/assessed/supported can be employed.
- Assessment statistics (e.g., average marks, number of failed students – in the context of past performance and the current cohort.)

- Comments from peer reviews of teaching and other peer review mechanisms external examiners, programme directors, school heads of education or directors of teaching and learning, industry advisory boards, SSLC and PASS reps, senior T&L leadership.
- Output of peer review of teaching.
- Student survey results.
- Teaching awards – internal and external, including student voted awards such as SU awards.
- AdvanceHE Fellowship and other T&L related awards or T&L related professional accreditation.
- Individual reflection on teaching philosophy articulating the reason for choices applicants have made in their teaching, assessment or student support.
- Citation of relevant literature or detail of relevant tools that have been used.
- Clear demonstration of how development activities have informed teaching e.g. how has attendance at discipline specific conferences informed up to date teaching? How has attendance at T&L conferences or workshops/NAP sessions/L&OD activities informed teaching?

Scholarship

For staff on a Teaching and Scholarship track to be promoted to any level they must engage in scholarship. Scholarship in this context is defined as: evidence based systematic practice that positively impacts student outcomes or experience and is disseminated for critical review and, where appropriate adoption by others. Scholarship can include the scholarship of teaching and learning, or discipline based educational or pedagogic research, as well as the development, application and synthesis of disciplinary knowledge to inform teaching (e.g. research-informed teaching).

A case for promotion that involves Scholarship should demonstrate the evidence-based development, dissemination, adoption and impact of the applicant's scholarship on teaching materials or methodologies, policy, student support, or similar that positively contributes to an "Outstanding learning and student experience", "Social responsibility" and/or EDI as defined in the university's strategic plan. This may be within or outside of the University of Manchester and may be co-produced with students.

Those who are unfamiliar with scholarship can consult the University's scholarship resource which provides an extended overview of what scholarship is, how it has developed, how to undertake ethical scholarship and more.

Examples of activities that constitute scholarship (although note there are different, diverse ways of meeting the criteria, and no one person might be expected to do all of these):

- Scholarship of teaching and learning which informs and/or is tested through programme and module development – and the sharing of this (which could range from sharing with close colleagues, to dissemination beyond the institution in a seminar, workshop, conference, blog, or publication*). This can include teaching and learning innovations in support of the University's social responsibility goal.
- Systematic development/design of an idea, approach, method, resource or technology which has impact on the learning and teaching culture and practices of others.
    - Very clear scholarship if the outcomes of this are then further reviewed and/or adopted by others beyond the original context.
- Obtaining funding for learning and teaching developments, including to use/develop learning technologies or teaching-related equipment (the review of the application by others is key here).
    - Very clear scholarship if the outcomes of this are then disseminated and further reviewed or adopted by others.
- Gaining external funding or recognition for pedagogic or curriculum development (e.g. AdvanceHE/JISC grants).
- Involvement in learning and teaching at a subject/programme/school/faculty/university/national/ international level, for example running workshops or specialist courses.
- Presentations on pedagogy or teaching and learning at subject/programme/school/faculty/university/national and/ or international meetings/ conferences.

- Contributions (very broad, could be anything from publications to development of new learning platforms or open educational resources) that have shaped the way in which the subject is taught across subject/programme/school/faculty/university/nationally, or have been adopted internationally (e.g. textbook that has been nationally/ internationally published).
- Contribution to teaching and learning, or teaching and learning related materials, or influencing education-related, subject policy and practice in a professional organisation or learned society or subject area.
- Interdisciplinary Collaboration – examples of teaching and innovation in teaching methods across subject and disciplinary boundaries that demonstrate a contribution to interdisciplinary/ professional education.
- External examining experience – not just disciplinary, can also include teaching specific programmes such as PGCert/National Teaching Fellow/AdvanceHE accreditation programmes.
- External curriculum review or assessment of other HEIs.
- Contributions to national or international curriculum and pedagogy debate in the subject area.
- Contribution to school/faculty/university/national/international networks to support disciplinary and/ or generic improvements in quality of learning and teaching.
- Significant output relevant to the discipline or subject area: e.g. joint or sole authorship of books, textbook in the discipline, publications in refereed journals or series; and other articles, papers and conference proceedings which have influenced the practice of teaching, or improved the student experience within the subject area.
- Significant disseminated research related to learning and teaching/ pedagogy.
- Contribution to the academic development of the discipline and research-led teaching (e.g. publications in refereed journals, teaching related activity within professional bodies or associations).
- Accreditation with or fellowship of professional bodies or societies based on scholarship contributions.
- Acting as editor of a journal or member of an editorial board (especially relating T&L).
- Lead, shape and influence teaching and learning policy at subject/programme/school/faculty/university national/ international level (e.g. contribution to QAA subject benchmarking statements).
- Prizes and awards for scholarship – e.g. essay/poster/presentation/blog prizes.

** "In press" may be considered where there is full acceptance (as opposed to submitted but not accepted).*

How to evidence scholarship in a promotion application

Evidence of scholarship can come from many sources and can be as diverse as your teaching context and practice. The University's scholarship web resource contains examples of different approaches to evidencing and representing your practice. It is important that you explain the context of your work and its alignment with the University's goals.

When evidencing scholarship colleagues should consider the reach, value and impact of their work:

- **Reach:** The scale of influence (i.e. who has your scholarship benefitted? How many students/staff are impacted? How broad is the group? A cohort? A specific group of students e.g. students from marginalised groups? Staff who will then use your work within their teaching?).
- **Value:** The benefit derived for staff and students.
- **Impact:** The difference made to policy, practice and/ or student outcomes as a result of an activity.

Some examples of how applicants might evidence this include:

- Awards for scholarship – detail of awarding body, how many are given out each time, how often do they run, how many people are eligible, how many applied, what was it for (could also be evidenced through a short quote from the committee/award if relevant)
- Commendation from external reviewers (e.g., accreditation committee)
- Presentation of scholarship inside or outside of the university, including figures (e.g. readership of a blog or article, number of attendees at a conference session etc)
- Improvement in any of the NSS or other TEF metrics as a result of your scholarship
- Policy or practice or development adopted (Remember to note by whom? How many people have been affected? In what way? Has your work had a knock-on effect?)
- Comments from external examiners/programme directors/school heads of education or directors of teaching and learning/industry advisory boards/SSLC and PASS reps/senior T&L leadership/student union/admissions lead/heads of recruitment for major employers
- Evidence of scholarship connected to the learning, experience and attainment of different groups of students, ideally with statistics to support this e.g. around awarding gap statistics/closing awarding gaps.

Examples of reach and impact for scholarship

(note that these are usual expectations but that we recognise that local level arrangements that enable reach and impact, such as the local availability of specific roles, will differ)

Lecturer	**Senior Lecturer**	**Reader**	**Professor**
Influence largely within assigned units. E.g. update taught material and assessments within the units you teach on or lead.	Influence normally across multiple activities largely within a programme of study / department.	Influence normally spans multiple activities across multiple programmes or departments. Attending and leading Dept/Faculty/University T&L meetings,	Influence spans across the faculty, university and beyond e.g., with other universities, professional bodies, or government.

Attending department/faculty T&L meetings, workshops, training and away days to keep up to date with advances in the subject matter and pedagogy. Engaging with colleagues, students, and/or industry about how to improve teaching in the discipline. Dissemination is mostly within the programme you teach on. This might be individually with unit coordinators and programme director or with relevant groups such as a board of studies. Some attendance of and participation in T&L (and/or subject specific) conferences, to include posters or presentations.	Attending and leading some aspects of department/faculty T&L meetings, workshops, training and away days to keep up to date with advances in the subject matter and pedagogy. Engaging with colleagues, students, and/or industry about how to improve teaching in the discipline. Dissemination is mostly within the school or faculty. Including presenting to groups outside of the immediate context. Some attendance of and participation in T&L (and/or subject specific) conferences, to include presentations (especially peer-reviewed). External examiner role or internal quality assurance reviewer, with evidence of contribution to learning, teaching, and assessment practice.	workshops, training and away days or events in subject specific professional body to keep up to date with advances in the subject matter and pedagogy. Engaging with colleagues, students, professional bodies, and/or industry about how to improve teaching in the discipline. Dissemination spans across the faculty and university, and occasionally beyond. Developing or leading internal networks for dissemination of best practice. Invited speaker of T&L events/conference across the university. Contributing to relevant literature (including blogs, open educational resources etc – not just traditional publications) on advances in the subject matter and pedagogy. Regular attendance of and participation in T&L (and/or subject specific) conferences, to include peer-reviewed presentations or invited contributions.	Leading Dept/Faculty/University T&L meetings, workshops, training and away days or leading training in subject specific professional body. Leading advances in the subject matter and pedagogy. Leading colleagues, students, professional bodies, and/or industry about how to improve teaching in the discipline. Contributing significantly to relevant literature (including blogs, open educational resources etc – not just traditional publications) on advances in the subject matter and pedagogy. Dissemination spans across the faculty, university and beyond. Developing or leading internal and external networks for dissemination of best practice. Invited speaker of T&L events/conference across and outside of the university.

		External examiner or external course reviewer with evidence of impact on teaching, learning, and assessment practice at another institution	Contributing significantly to relevant literature (including blogs, National Teaching Repository etc – not just traditional publications) on advances in the subject matter and pedagogy. Regular attendance, participation in and leadership of T&L (and/or subject specific) conferences. Visiting Fellowships at external institutions External course reviewer (or chairing internal course reviews) with evidence of impact on teaching, learning, and assessment practice.

Research

The University is committed to "providing a creative, ambitious and supportive environment in which researchers at every career stage can develop into and thrive as leaders in their chosen field" (Research and Discovery Core Goal, Strategic Plan).

All staff on a teaching and research (T&R contract) or research (R contract) route must demonstrate how they meet the University's Statement of Research Contributions Expectations. In essence the expectation covers the following, and candidates should refer to the document for the detail for each when preparing their case against the research promotions criterion, as well as the criterion for Knowledge Exchange and External Engagement and the criterion for Service and Leadership:

- High quality publications
- Effective publishing and associated dissemination strategies to secure academic impact
- Research funding
- Doctoral supervision and assessment
- National and international research collaborations

This section of the Statement is relevant for the Innovation, Knowledge Exchange and External Engagement promotion domain

- Knowledge exchange and impact (relevant for the Knowledge Exchange and External Engagement promotion domain)

The following sections of the Statement are relevant for the Service and Leadership promotion domain

- Collegial service to support a vibrant research environment and culture at the University
- Collegial service and engagement in the external academic community
- Research ethics and integrity
- Professional accountability

Colleagues should consider the reach, value and impact of their research with reference to the Research Excellence Framework 2021 guidelines

- **Reach**: The scale of influence
- **Value**: The benefit derived from your research
- **Impact**: The beneficial difference that your research has made

Research staff

The research route to promotion considers performance in the domain of Research plus either Innovation, Knowledge Exchange and External Engagement or Service and Leadership. When considering cases of research staff promotion (including from research assistant to research associate

to research fellow), consideration should also be given to evidence of the applicant's contribution to research grant applications, PGR supervision and teaching.

The evidence that may be presented for each research promotions criterion in the CV and supporting statement for research are presented below

Research criterion	**Examples of evidence – please refer to the promotions criteria for the detail of the expected level of achievement at each promotion level (Senior Lecturer/Reader/ Professor)**
A sustained record of high-quality publications (or other outputs eligible for REF submission)	The record of publication should highlight those publications or other outputs which are considered to be 4*/3* quality, using the REF2021 definitions: **Four star:** Quality that is world-leading in originality, significance and rigour **Three star:** Quality that is internationally excellent in originality, significance and rigour but falls short of the highest standards of excellence. Evidence of regular, high-quality publications (or other outputs) is more important than volume. The evidence might include citations; prizes or awards received for specific publications (or other outputs); published reviews (e.g. for monographs, music scores, exhibitions or other outputs). Journal impact factors may be included to indicate the prestige of the publishing outlet, and as a proxy for the rigour of the peer review process, BUT journal impact factors are NOT an indicator for the quality of the specific article. **Please note the guidance on The Research Review Exercise output grades below.** **Note that the Promotions Committee will:** • interpret these proxy indicators for research quality with judgement taking account of the discipline or field. For example, there are more prizes and awards made in some research areas than in others. Likewise, most publishers make decisions on which books to publish on commercial grounds, so that it may be easier for some areas than others to get work accepted with the some generally highly regarded publishers. • Always include consideration of the applicant's disciplinary norms in their assessment.

A successful record of Research Funding	As detailed in the University's Statement of Research Contributions Expectations all forms of external research funding are considered - including research councils, charitable organisations, industry, government, research consultancy, fellowships, major travel awards, PGR studentship funding. The applicant's role in the development and success of the grant application as well as the amount of funding attributable to the University of Manchester may also be taken into account. The applicant should be clear on whether the funding has been sought through internal UoM processes or external peer review/competitive award e.g. Impact Acceleration Accounts, funding direct from industry
Doctoral supervision and assessment	In addition to securing PGR funding, excellent postgraduate research supervision can be evidenced by a short evidence-based narrative Evidence of performance can include a short narrative, supported by evidence such as: • Number of PGRs supervised to successful completion • PGR completion rates (**allowing for student interruptions and withdrawals** for mitigating circumstances) • Accreditation via the UKCGE research supervision recognition programme. • Engagement with the Supervisor CPD Programme • Demonstrable use of the PGR Supervisors Toolkit • Subsequent career success of supervised PGRs (jobs, prizes, awards) • Service on internal year-end progress reviews ***** • Internal and external examiner service for PGR awards ***** ***** This service is not simply about the volume of PGR evaluations, it is also evidence of professional confidence in maintaining standards by reaching the difficult decision that the doctoral candidate should not progress or not be awarded a thesis.
Positive Recognition and reputation in relevant national and/or	Evidence of reputation in the relevant national or international research communities includes, but is not limited to: • Research prizes, honours and awards • Committee membership of national and international funding bodies • Membership of scientific committees

international research communities	• Editorship of international research journals or book series • Membership of editorial boards of international journals or book series • Election to prestigious academic bodies (eg, Fellowships of the Royal Society, the Academy of Medical Sciences or the British Academy) • Prestigious visiting professorships • Invitations to named lectures and keynote addresses • Invitations to review publications, funding applications or academic appointments or promotions external to your own institution

Research Review Exercise (RRE) output grades should not be used in promotion cases

The University Research Strategy Group guidance is that RRE grades should not be presented in the paperwork for probation or promotion; or introduced in discussion in probation and promotion committees. This guidance was agreed and established prior to previous REF exercises.

The rationale is:

- The RRE exercise of internal peer review is undertaken to select the strongest aggregate output submission for the Research Excellence Framework (REF) submission.
- RRE grades for specific outputs may be revised and recalibrated over time by the Unit of Assessment coordinating team as part of the preparation of the REF submission and in light of new information about the output, such as citations or prizes.
- When assessing an individual's research profile for probation or promotion, other indicators of output quality pertinent to the discipline or field are used as the primary source (peer review, referee comments, article citations, book reviews, etc.).

Service and Leadership

For staff to be promoted to any level they must demonstrate that they make a positive difference by supporting colleagues and/or students to create, sustain or enhance a positive and inclusive working environment. This includes ensuring that work with PS and academic colleagues is timely, conducted professionally, and demonstrates effective planning and organisation. They must also take on and efficiently, effectively, and inclusively perform service and leadership tasks and projects as relevant to their seniority and their role, including within the University and external academic or professional institutions or networks. For more senior roles this also includes formal and informal support for colleagues at various levels, including establishing processes and systems of team working that facilitate efficient and effective working to ensure that the whole team delivers on high quality work on time. Staff should demonstrate how they have made a positive difference in the pursuit of achieving the University's values and goals.

For all roles within Service and Leadership, there should be some evidence that the candidate has engaged appropriately with the role, not just held it.

A willingness to support others in their career development can relate to PhD students, teaching assistants, postdoctoral researchers or other academic colleagues. As above, having had a supervisory or line-managerial role with respect to someone from these categories is not sufficient, but some evidence of actual supportive activity should be provided.

Examples of this may include, but is not limited to:

- Ensuring postdoctoral researchers or early career T&S colleagues have a mentor.
- Nominating postdoctoral researchers, postgraduate researchers, T&S colleagues who excel in teaching, and PS colleagues for prizes and awards.
- Actively encouraging and providing the time for postdoctoral researchers or early career T&S colleagues to take up development opportunities such as joining committees of professional bodies, undertaking teaching.
- Actively enabling colleagues to build external networks and sharing of external partner contacts that open up new opportunities for collaboration, innovation and impact.
- Evidence of taking on additional service and leadership responsibilities in support of the university's strategies for social responsibility, public and civic engagement, equality, diversity and inclusion and environmental sustainability.
- In addition to the annual P&DR process, providing time and opportunities to discuss career development.

- Gaining recognition for excellent postgraduate research supervisory practice through the UKCGE research supervision recognition programme.

Collegiality

This inclusion of collegiality is designed to highlight and reward activities that contribute to positive University culture e.g.:

- Supporting and mentoring new colleagues,
- Contributing to accreditation events and paperwork,
- Co-creating materials,
- Undertaking teaching and assessment,
- Running student events, careers events, admissions/conversion events
- Participating in programmes to support AdvanceHE fellowship
- Playing a role in curriculum review
- Bringing in guest speakers
- Playing a positive role in staff networks
- Undertaking Chartermark activity,
- Being directly involved in areas such as social responsibility and EDI
- Contributing to, playing a positive role in and/or leading on professional development programmes e.g. Aurora, 100 Black Women Professors, Inclusive Advocacy
- Support for student societies, the Student's Union, and other mechanisms for raising the student voice e.g. supporting students to run a conference or exhibition.

Colleagues should consider the reach, value and impact of their service and leadership which are defined as:

- **Reach:** What did you do, and what was the scale of influence (i.e. who has your collegiality and leadership benefitted? How many students/staff are impacted? How broad is the group? A cohort? A specific group of students e.g. students from marginalised groups? Staff who will then use your work within their teaching?).
- **Value:** The benefit derived for staff and students (and external audiences). What demonstrably positive benefit was derived from you holding the role beyond an efficient performance of tasks? What strategic goals did you address and what did you achieve?

- **Impact:** The difference made to policy, practice and/ or student or external stakeholder outcomes as a result of an activity. How do you impact the team? What would not have happened if you weren't there? What was the uptake, change and impact of your work. How did people change their practice because of your collegiality, service and leadership? E.g. did you:
  - Amplify student voices?
  - Improve student experience? e.g. evidenced in NSS, partner enabled learning, attainment etc
  - Change in policy or ways of working? This could be in specific areas of teaching and learning such as flexible learning or developing digital capabilities, in staff development or in conjunction with the University/Faculty EDI strategies, chartermark activity such as REC and Athena Swan.
  - Demonstrably expand the role of external partnerships to broaden activity, generate income and/or enhance the reach, value and impact of work.
  - Enhanced staff development

This criterion can be evidenced through:

- Detail of relevant roles / positions of responsibility (internal and external) and how these benefitted the team.
- Examples of the support given. At what level, for how long, to how many, what was the impact on the staff you supported. This could also include EDI, social responsibility examples, staff networks, mentoring, external partnership and innovation examples.
- Collegiality can also be demonstrated through evidence of open collaborative working.

Lecturer	Senior Lecturer	Reader	Professor
Influence / leadership / collegiality will be largely within a programme	Influence/leadership/collegiality will be largely within a department/division/school (scale dependent upon context)	Influence/leadership/collegiality will be within a department/division/school (scale dependent upon context) Involvement in projects/activities across the Faculty or University or beyond.	Influence will span across the Faculty, University and beyond e.g., with other universities, professional bodies, or government.

(For T&R or R colleagues only): Collegial service to support a vibrant research environment and culture at the University

Service and Leadership – Research	Examples of evidence – please refer to the promotions criteria for the detail of the expected level of achievement at each promotion level (Senior Lecturer/Reader/ Professor)
Supporting the development of a vibrant research culture and environment	Evidence might include: • Organising internal research seminars, workshops or equivalent interactive opportunities • Internal peer review of publications or research funding applications in preparation; contribution to mock interviews for colleagues preparing for a research funding interview • Your contribution to developing and maintaining a 'research team' working ethos, including specific examples of how you have supported the career development of PGRs, research staff and other members of the wider research team where appropriate e.g. through mentoring; ensuring that research staff use their training days allocation specified in the researcher development concordat, ensuring the team's role in grant writing is recognised. • Enhancing research support in your group/unit through contribution to e.g. effective mentoring arrangements, grant-writing support • Evidence of your awareness and use of the PI toolkit • Contribution to the promotion and implementation of the Researcher Development Concordat and the University's Statement of Expectations on the Career Development of Researchers and a culture of participation in professional development among your team/group/unit • Nominating PGRs, researchers or other colleagues for awards and prizes • Inclusion of research staff or technicians as Co-Is on research grants where funder terms and conditions permit • Ensuring time and recognition for the professional development of team members is built into research grants where funder terms and conditions permit. • Providing time for career development discussions with team members. • Encouraging colleagues to share external contacts and partner networks so others can benefit from established relationships, broaden connections and open up wider scholarship, research, innovation and partnership. • Awareness of and signposting research staff to the research staff promotions criteria. • Advancing EDI and Environmental Sustainability in how research projects, research teams and ways of working are designed and delivered. Eg for environmental sustainability this might include championing LEAF status for your Lab, effective implementation of the responsible travel policy; for EDI it might include how you have contributed to the implementation of one or more specific actions related to EDI in research which are included in the Athena and Race Equality Charter action plans.

Research leadership	Evidence might include: • Creative and constructive leadership of a research team, group, centre, institute or beacon that has improved the research performance of the team/organisational unit • Ensuring standards of research ethics and integrity and other professional standards are maintained, including contribution through service on the University Research Ethics Committee, or other compliance-related committees such as Health and Safety • Using and Promoting Open Research Practices (including publications, software and datasets) • Advancing the use of AI and other technological developments to innovate research methods and practices • Contributing to researcher professional development and related training programmes • External peer review service for major research funders or journals • Record of service and leadership of research communities internal and external to the University
High quality research collaborations with national and/or international partners; including interdisciplinary collaborations	Evidence of the scale, quality and significance might include: • Contribution to building international partnerships as part of the University's international strategy • Collaborations which are supported by external funding • The interdisciplinary composition of the collaborating team or network • Contribution to organising prestigious conferences or equivalent events

Innovation, Knowledge Exchange and External Engagement

Colleagues applying through the Academic: teaching and scholarship route can also include this area of activity in their case. As indicated by the breadth of criteria, Innovation, Knowledge Exchange and External Engagement should be seen in its broadest sense. The activity must include non-academic audiences or users, and it includes cases of impact as defined by REF but is by no means limited to this. For example, this can include public and civic engagement, business engagement, spinout creation and IP licensing, co-designed community initiatives, system-level innovations in public services, and policy impact. The activity must be linked to the applicant's role within the University, but need not be linked to their research or scholarship. Colleagues applying through the Academic: teaching and scholarship route can also include this area of activity in their case. Colleagues do not need to hold a formal innovation, knowledge exchange or engagement role to evidence activity under this criterion; entrepreneurial and innovative behaviour in teaching, research support, professional practice or community-facing work are all relevant, provided the reach, value and impact can be evidenced.

Colleagues should consider the reach, value and impact of their innovation, knowledge exchange and external engagement work which are defined as:

- **Reach:** The scale of influence (i.e. who has your knowledge exchange and external engagement benefitted? How many attended/viewed/read/downloaded/cited/shared your work? How many people did you speak to? Were you invited or did you apply or lead? Was this local, national or international impact? Did you reach marginalised groups?).
- **Value:** The benefit derived for staff, students and external audiences. The worth of the activity in your context; what goals did the activity achieve? What issues/challenges did the activity address?
- **Impact:** The difference made to policy, practice and/ or student or external stakeholder outcomes as a result of an activity. The uptake, change and impact of your work. How did people change their practice because of your work?

Criterion (note that this varies depending on level of promotion)	**Examples of Evidence**
participation in advisory committees or professional or practice-based forums relevant to discipline and/or teaching and learning.	• Participation in advisory committees or professional or practice-based forums relevant to discipline and/or teaching and learning – note that the reach value and impact of your contribution should be demonstrated i.e. how you, as a member of these bodies, have made a difference.

knowledge creation and transfer in partnership with industry, government, NGOs, learned societies or professional bodies – this can be discipline specific and/or may relate to teaching and learning.	• Funding or contracts awarded from external sources (e.g. industry and social enterprise, government and other public bodies, NGOs, other HE institutions) with positive outcomes for teaching and learning, social responsibility, civic engagement, research, or enterprise. • Working with external bodies in development and implementation of policy or practice e.g. the creation of a resource from teaching or research which is then transferred to industry, government, NGOs, learned societies or professional bodies. • External consulting (e.g. for industry, other HE institutions, Schools). • Delivering mutually beneficial collaborations with external industry, government, NGOs, learned societies or professional bodies partners that generate demonstrable societal, environmental and/or economic impact.
Internal and/or external activity in support of the University's social responsibility goals	• Engagement with schools, museums, the media (including traditional and social media), and public engagement with evidenced outcomes. • School governor or other external responsibility that can be evidenced with impact • Serving as school governor or charity trustee • Engagement with employers and stakeholders in the development of pedagogic practice (co-creation) • Implementing and evaluating practice to embed a SR goal • Making a difference or other award or recognition • SR funding grant with outcomes • Engagement with employers and stakeholders in the development of pedagogic practice
activity that enhances public understanding of, and engagement with, knowledge and scholarship, or that contributes to a well-informed public debate	• Engagement with the media (including traditional and social media), • Development of or contribution to public materials e.g. blogs, texts, information boards/leaflets, performances • Creating open access or otherwise shared material outside of the immediate context of the role. (e.g. create open lab material) • Creation of intellectual property
influence on professional practice or on policy, including participation in professional or practice-	• Engagement with professional bodies and regulators; contribution to sector reports, policy and analysis.

based forums relevant to the staff member's discipline and/or to teaching and learning	• Using academic expertise to shape local, national or international policy, standards, guidance, services or other approaches with evidence that recommendations have influenced decisions. • External consulting (e.g. for industry, other HE institutions, Schools) • Leading sustained partnerships or forums with civic, professional or community organisations that address societal challenges and deliver measurable public benefit. • Part of external panel/committee shaping the T&L landscape e.g. panel/committee for degree accreditation, TEF panel, contribution to QAA benchmark statement, contribution to school curricula, external examiner, reviewer for Advance HE Fellowships, contribution to professional or discipline body shaping pedagogy locally, nationally or internationally or similar. • Participate in organisation of T&L, research, and/or innovation and knowledge exchange conferences and groups, participate in relevant panels and committees • Scholarly activity that contributes to academic debate with your context.
creation, development and exploitation of intellectual property, including open access material relevant to the staff member's discipline and/or to teaching and learning	• Creation of cross School/Faculty/University/external material or activity e.g. T&L resources, enterprise resources, workshops or recording, blogs/websites/toolkits to share good practice, ITL fellowships • Generating intellectual property and supporting its transfer into spin-outs, industry, or social enterprise, including for example securing proof of concept funding, early-stage investment, venture building activity and/or licensing of IP. • Working with external partners (including industry, the NHS, local authorities, community organisations, donors or the third sector) to undertake research, teaching (including executive education) or innovation activity where this leads to income generation and/or demonstrable social, economic, civic or system-level benefit • Embedding enterprise, innovation or partner-enabled learning into teaching, supervision, curricula or flexible/digital delivery. • Supporting colleagues and students to engage in external work by sharing networks, mentoring, creating pathways and enabling joint contributions.

	• Engagement with regional, national and international innovation ecosystems that generates evidenced commercial, social, economic or environmental outcomes.