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1. Introduction

Each year, Queen Mary conducts a mandatory review of the progress of Professors, individually and collectively. There are four steps in this review, beginning with the individual professor’s own submission which is reviewed by their Head of School / Director of Institute, then at Faculty level and finally by the Professorial Review Group, made up of the academic members of the Senior Executive Team (SET). This document provides guidance to all parties of the review process.

The review addresses a range of issues including notable individual and collective successes, collective and individual development needs and any areas with particular challenges.

There is also a review of the School/Institute recommendations on professorial pay: Faculty Vice-Principals make recommendations which are subject to overall moderation by the Professorial Review Group.

2. Principles

Expectations of contribution

The Professorial Review process was revised in 2016 following a consultation with Queen Mary professors. This resulted in a clear statement of the expectations of excellence as set out in Appendices 1 and 2 (Areas of Contribution and Scale of Contributions). The guidelines have been updated for 2019 to ensure alignment to the University’s 2030 Strategy and Values.

The Areas of Contribution are illustrative rather than exhaustive. They are not listed with any intent to show, for example, any type of progression as one moves down the list.

They represent areas of activity and achievement; and individual contribution is expected to be in line with the University Values (with indicative Values shown against each Area of Contribution).

There are four Areas of Contribution:

- **Student Experience and Education (Inclusive, Ambitious and Collegial).** Incorporating teaching and module development, this also encompasses the various means of student support as well as leadership of student experience and educational activities in line with our Mission and Values.

- **Research and Scholarship (Ambitious, Collegial and Ethical).** Alongside the specific research undertaken and its funding, this encompasses the broader research leadership of the discipline and the creation, development and maintenance of the intellectual infrastructure of the discipline in line with our Mission and Values.

- **Public Engagement and Impact (Inclusive, Ambitious, Proud and Ethical).** A focus on collaborating with public audiences, and developing partnerships with community organisations, business, government, charities and the cultural sector, leading to
mutual or wider benefit in line with our Mission and Values. This includes leadership of societal and impact initiatives.

- **Leadership (Inclusive, Collegial and Ethical).** The wider support of, and contribution to the 2030 Strategy, and the strategies and people development at School/Institute, Faculty and University levels, in line with our Mission and Values.

The Scale of Contributions provides a framework for Heads/Directors and the Faculty to ensure the consistent assessment of the evidence. This framework aims to differentiate between the *levels of reach or impact* of contributions, as well as to their size and complexity.

**Career structures and development**
A Professorial title is becoming increasingly the academic career norm and individuals may well hold the title for 30 years of active career.

Recognising this trend, the Professorial Review process includes planning to support the ongoing development of the professoriate, collectively and individually. This forward looking focus complements the individual review of past accomplishments.

**Levels of decision-making**
The onus is on the Heads/Directors to give a clear sense of the “health” of their professoriate and to differentiate between the levels of contribution at individual level, with input and oversight from the Faculty Vice-Principals and Faculty Deans. This then informs the overall Faculty decision-making on professorial development and pay. The aim is for feedback to individuals from the review to be closely connected to the decision-making.

**Documentation**
There are close links between the Professorial Review and Queen Mary’s Performance and Development Appraisal Scheme. It is anticipated, therefore, that submissions be based upon appraisal discussions and documentation. Additionally, whilst retaining the traditional focus on the work and achievements of the past, the submissions should also follow the appraisal model in having a future-focused developmental emphasis.

The form for an individual professor’s submission, as a result, provides the option for appraisal objectives and commentary to be lifted directly and inserted, where individuals wish to do so and are satisfied the appraisal appropriately captures their achievements.

### 3. Eligibility

You are required to make a submission to the Professorial Review in 2019 if:

- you are a non-clinical Professor with a contract of employment with Queen Mary and;
- you have at least one year’s continuous service as a Professor with Queen Mary as at 1 October 2019.

If you meet the above criteria you should make a submission irrespective of your contractual working hours/arrangements. This includes those who are currently on paid sabbatical leave and those who, through flexible retirement, are both working and receiving a pension.
Those currently in their notice period of leaving Queen Mary or those who have notified Queen Mary of their impending retirement are not required to make a submission, but may wish to do so.

4. Step 1: Individual Professorial Submission

The submission should be reasonably concise and should cover achievements and contributions over the last 12 month period, as well as work in progress and future development plans. Please note CVs should not be submitted.

- The first part of the Professorial Review Form enables individuals, if they wish, to lift text directly from their appraisal record. The form provides places to record six contributions (which probably originated as objectives in the appraisal) from the past year together with comments against each one.

- Please note that it is not necessary to find six contributions or objectives if, in reality, a smaller number were agreed. Conversely, where more than six were agreed, please prioritise to a maximum of six.

- There is a side-column to indicate to which of the four Areas of Contribution (see Appendix 1) the objective intends to contribute. It may be that a single objective contributes to more than one area, and therefore it is appropriate to tick multiple boxes.

- Below each contribution/objective, please include a summary comment that indicates achievement or progress against the objective: again this may be drawn from the comments in the appraisal documentation.

- The subsequent text box asks about plans for ongoing personal development and for comments on progress against these plans.

- There is an opportunity to note any particular circumstances that put the contribution into context. For instance, the potential impact of being in a part-time role, or having reduced or increased your working hours during the year, or having a disability, or experiencing a long-term absence (such as maternity, paternity, adoption or shared parental leave), or having caring responsibilities that may have had a work impact. The circumstances may be permanent or temporary.

- If you need to collect specific evidence to support your submission, you might find the following sources useful:
  - PubLists
  - Scopus

  Information and links to these databases are at http://www.library.qmul.ac.uk/

The deadline for submissions to be emailed to the Head of School / Institute Director is 22 November 2019.
5. Step 2: Head of School / Institute Director Commentary

The Head of School / Institute Director writes a two-part School/Institute commentary on the professoriate in their School/Institute.

The first part focuses on individuals and is written on the individual professor’s submission:

- Heads/Directors may find it appropriate to delegate these individual commentaries with the School/Institute, but should provide any pay recommendations themselves.

- For the purposes of transparency, any comments should be in line with discussions with the individuals, for example at appraisal meetings. Heads/Directors’ comments also form the basis of subsequent feedback. It is inappropriate to write what has not been, or cannot be, shared with the individual.

The Head/Director also provides an assessment of contribution of the individual professor.

- Read each of the *Objectives* in the light of the Area(s) of Contribution (Appendix 1), which the professor has indicated in the adjoining sidebar. Use the Scale of Contributions (Appendix 2) to assess the description. Complete the matrix *Assessment of contribution* on the individual’s form.

- Give an assessment of the professor’s contribution to each of the four areas (student experience and education, research and scholarship, public engagement and impact, leadership and collegiality) by checking *High / Medium / Low* in each of the four areas.

- There are a series of tick boxes indicating what the evaluation has been based on. Tick the appropriate boxes according to what has persuaded you to your evaluation e.g. the size/complexity of what they’ve done, the breadth of impact etc.

- Provide summary comments and highlight particular *areas of strength* or *areas for development*. Under *areas of strength*, there is the opportunity to indicate, through ticking one of the boxes, where there is an area of outstanding strength. Keep these comments brief – a couple of sentences per textbox are usually sufficient. They may also provide the basis for feedback to the individuals in letters.

- HR will provide data on current salaries and past pay awards for those within your School/Institute, and relevant analysis (e.g. average salary, gender/BAME ratios etc.)

- Based on the above, make a pay recommendation.

The second part of the report addresses the organisational profile of the School/Institute’s professoriate. In particular, it focuses attention on the collective strengths and development needs of the School/Institute at this most senior level. Whilst a Head/Director may take soundings in the preparation of this, it is important that the views are theirs.

The headings for commentary are:

- The *pay profile* for the professoriate: are there any gender/BAME pay gaps or apparent anomalies?
Areas of organisational strength within the professoriate, for example particular departments within the School or specialties within the discipline (or inter-disciplinary) where there is strength in depth or particular achievements (e.g. spin-outs) relative to the professoriate and School/Institute/Queen Mary strategies.

Areas for organisational development/investment aligned with the trajectory of the discipline or School/Institute. Again, this would relate to departments within the School/Institute or specialties within the discipline (or inter-disciplinary capabilities) relative to the professoriate.

Leadership development: plans for the development of the professoriate in the coming year, with a focus on creating leadership capability as well as academic, and developing senior leaders at School/Institute and Faculty levels. Indicate those Schools/Institutes with a good supply of future leaders, and those where otherwise.

Individuals at risk of departure, together with proposed School/Institutes strategies.

The future health of the professorial population: rising academics currently below the level of professor; what succession plans are in place to enable the renewal of the professorial pool within a School/Institution?

The deadline for School/Institute commentaries to be emailed to Rhianne Jones, HR Reward & Benefit Administrator (rhianne.jones@qmul.ac.uk) is 13 December 2019.

6. Step 3: Faculty Review

The Faculty Vice-Principal and Faculty Deans, working with HR and Heads of School / Institute Directors, will agree the appropriate peer comparators for the professors in their Faculty, based upon levels of contribution, in order to establish the appropriate internal pay relativities.

On the basis of the above discussions, the Faculty Vice-Principal, Faculty Deans and Heads of School / Institute Directors will endorse pay recommendations (in line with an indicative budget) and subject to final moderation by the Professorial Review Group.

The Faculty Vice-Principal will prepare a brief overall Faculty summary of pay recommendations for the Professorial Review Group, based on the faculty level discussions and moderations. This will be delivered verbally by the Vice-Principal to the Professorial Review Group, focusing on the strengths, achievements, development areas and plans, risks, the current professorial profile and future rising academics.

7. Step 4: Professorial Review Group (SET)

The Group will have access to: individual submissions, School/Institute reports and Faculty (verbal) summary reports, as well as pay data, diversity data and benchmarking provided by HR.
They hold a two-part conversation, organisational and individual.

Organisational

- Reviews of School/Institute reports relative to Queen Mary strategy.
- Endorsement of Faculty summary review and development plans for professoriate: agreement on areas of strength and where to best target interventions.
- Endorsement of risk management responses within Faculties.
- Review of the spread of areas of contribution across Faculties.
- Review overall health of the future leadership supply from the professoriate.

Individual

The group will note and may seek more information/moderate pay recommendations:

- To what extent are awards for similar achievements in different areas comparably rewarded?
- What is the overall affordability of recommendations?
- Where do gender/BAME pay gaps continue to exist? Are there particularly individuals where this Group should make a final call?

8. Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timetable</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Announcement of 2019 Professorial Review</td>
<td>31 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial Review Form to be emailed to Head of School/Institute Director by:</td>
<td>22 November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoS/DoI to complete HoS/DoI Statement and Overview to be emailed to Human Resources by:</td>
<td>13 December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Vice-Principals to review submissions from their Faculty ahead of presentation to the Professorial Review Group</td>
<td>December and January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial Review Group</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions and new salaries communicated (effective 1 March 2020)</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 1: Areas of Contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusive, Ambitious and Collegial Student experience &amp; education</th>
<th>Ambitious, Collegial and Ethical Research &amp; scholarship</th>
<th>Inclusive, Ambitious, Proud and Ethical Public engagement &amp; impact</th>
<th>Inclusive, Collegial and Ethical Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading on growth of u/g or p/g numbers and income streams, both nationally and internationally.</td>
<td>Leading research teams or programmes or centres and/or leading complex inter-disciplinary/international programmes.</td>
<td>Shape the national agenda relative to public engagement and/or social enterprises.</td>
<td>Contributed to the development, mentoring and career management of colleagues and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student satisfaction feedback.</td>
<td>Supervising PhD students and enabling their co-creation of research.</td>
<td>Implementing new approaches to collaborating with public audiences and/or community organisations and/or patient groups.</td>
<td>Shaped the future of School/Institute / Faculty via a significant leadership role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical publications and/or educational software</td>
<td>Publication in influential journals, or other appropriate influential outputs.</td>
<td>Contribution to school/institute’s outreach and / or to widening participation</td>
<td>Managed programme of change or leading initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating learning innovation.</td>
<td>Shaping their discipline via e.g. numbers of citations and/or editor of international journal.</td>
<td>Consultancy to social enterprise ventures or scientific/cultural events or public media.</td>
<td>Member of University Committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External examining.</td>
<td>Presidency of major/international society and/or election to prestigious scholarly societies.</td>
<td>Knowledge transfer activities, with social/economic benefit to Queen Mary e.g. high level consultancy.</td>
<td>Strategic planning at Faculty/University level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to development of teaching policy and to learning and teaching committees.</td>
<td>Deliver named lecture series and/or keynote addresses at international conferences.</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary collaborations with academic, industrial, governmental, social enterprise, or community partners.</td>
<td>Major company role resulting from transfer of research expertise and/or role in major consortia in the European Union.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaping and influencing academic strategy.</td>
<td>Chaired major research committee or REF sub-panel and/or regional/national organisations, charitable boards, governing bodies, trusts.</td>
<td>Exploiting Intellectual Property in both commercial and non-commercial contexts.</td>
<td>Led national or international inquiries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed partnerships in education or research and/or leader in national / international agencies for education policy and curriculum development.</td>
<td>Received international research awards and/or senior visiting positions at prestigious Universities.</td>
<td>Advising or giving evidence to (national or international) government, NGO, cultural, scientific or professional bodies, e.g. parliamentary select committees, Royal Society, Law Society.</td>
<td>External assessor for professorial roles in HEIs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gained high research income relative to discipline norms.</td>
<td>Influencing debate around policy or practice, based on research evidence.</td>
<td>Advanced the global reputation of Queen Mary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: Assessing the Scale of Contributions

| **Size/complexity** | How big were the projects or programmes of work being described?  
How complex was the work e.g. budgets, multiple territories or multiple interest groups? |
|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Sustained individual contribution aligned to the University’s Mission and Values** | To what extent has individual contribution at professorial level been maintained and continually improved in line with University Values?  
To what extent is the individual contributing to the University’s Mission to create a truly inclusive environment, building on our cherished cultural diversity, where students and staff flourish, reach their full potential and are proud to be part of the University? Is the individual striving to be dedicated to the public good, generate new knowledge, challenge existing knowledge, and engage locally, nationally and internationally to create a better world? |
| **Measurable outcomes** | Is it possible to quantify the outcomes of the work being described? Examples of quantification would include:  
- Completion rates  
- Satisfaction ratings  
- Volume / amount  
- Frequency |
| **Breadth of impact** | How wide-ranging was the impact of the work? Some of the categories to consider for assessing impact would be:  
- The breadth of their impact on the work itself. What role were they playing? Examples include: Initiating / Leading / Advising / Consulting / Participating  
- Their discipline: the extent of their impact upon their discipline.  
- HE organisations: to what extent did they impact at School/Institute / Faculty / University / Sector levels?  
- Territories: to what extent have they had an impact which was national / international?  
- People: who has been impacted by their work? For example:  
  - Students (u/g or p/g)  
  - Colleagues in / outside Queen Mary  
  - Practitioners within the discipline  
  - Wider public |
| **Partner profile** | How influential or distinguished are the organisations or bodies with whom or for whom the work was done? What sort of national/international reach do they have? This is a wide-ranging group, which would include:  
- Other HEIs  
- Journals  
- Learned societies  
- Social enterprises / Charities  
- Government bodies / Parliamentary bodies  
- Industrial or commercial organisations  
- Research committees  
- Conferences  
- National/international media |
| **Recognition** | How has the professor been recognised?  
- Assessor / Reviewer  
- Visiting positions (for named lecture)  
- Awards / Election to distinguished body (e.g. FRS, FBA) |