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1. Introduction

Each year, Queen Mary University of London (QMUL) conducts a 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 academic members of QMSE.

The review addresses a range of issues from notable individual and collective successes to collective and individual development needs to 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 QMUL-wide moderation from the Professorial Review Group.

This document provides guidance to all parties of the review.

2. Principles

Expectations of contribution

This Professorial Review process was revised during 2016. The revision included consultation with QMUL professors. A significant theme in the consultation feedback was that participants would welcome a clear statement of what the expectations of excellence are. Appendices 1 and 2 provide guidelines on the Areas of Contribution and Assessing the Scale of Contributions.

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: they are not intended to be standards. Across the wide span of types of academic endeavour at professorial level, a set of standards would be unlikely to be universally meaningful.

There are four Areas of Contribution:

- **Student Experience and Education.** Incorporating teaching and module development, this also encompasses the various means of student support as well as leadership of student experience and educational activities.

- **Research and Scholarship.** 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.

- **Public Engagement and Impact.** 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. This includes leadership of societal and impact initiatives.
Leadership and Collegiality. The wider support of, and contribution to, the strategies and people at School/Institute, Faculty and University levels.

Assessing the Scale of Contributions provides a framework of questions for Heads/Directors and the Faculty to pose to assist in the consistent assessment of the evidence. This framework looks 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 some 30 years of active career.

Recognising this trend, consultation feedback asked that the Professorial Review ensure that planning is encouraged to support the ongoing development of the professoriate collectively and individually. This has driven a shift in the design of the Review, with a new forward looking focus complementing the tradition review of past accomplishments.

Levels of decision-making

A concern was expressed during consultation that decision-making should take place closer to the individual. As a result, greater onus is now placed on the Heads/Directors working with the Faculty Vice- Principals and Faculty Deans. In this way, feedback to individuals from the review should be more closely connected to the decision-making.

Documentation

Feedback pointed to the close links between the Review and appraisals and proposed that submissions be based upon appraisal 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 invited to make a submission to the Professorial Review in 2018 if:

- you are a non-clinical Professor with a contract of employment with QMUL and;
- you have at least one year’s continuous service as a Professor with QMUL by 30 September 2018

If you were promoted to Professor on 1 October 2017, you will have one year’s continuous service as a Professor by 30 September 2018 and should therefore make a submission.

If you meet the above criteria you should make a submission regardless of whether you work part-time, are currently on paid sabbatical leave or are receiving part of your pension.
4. Step 1: Individual Professorial Submission

The submission should be reasonably concise and should cover achievements and contributions from the last year 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, being in a part-time role, or reduced or increased hours, or a disability, a long-term absence, maternity, paternity, adoption or shared parental leave or caring responsibilities that 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

  Fuller information and links to both these databases are available on http://www.library.qmul.ac.uk/

Submissions must be emailed to the Head of School / Institute Director by 16 November 2018.
5. Step 2: School/Institute 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 themselves provide any pay recommendations.

- One of the aims of the revisions has been to improve transparency. Therefore, any comments should be in line with discussions with the individuals, for example at appraisal. Heads/Directors’ comments also form the basis of subsequent feedback. It is inappropriate to write what cannot be said to the individual.

Following the practice of previous years, the Head/Director provides an assessment of contribution of the individual professor, although now in a different format.

- 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 interrogate 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. was it the size/complexity of what they’ve done, the breadth of impact etc.? You may tick more than one box.

- Provide summary comments and highlight particular areas of strength or areas for development. Under areas of strength, there is the opportunity to underline, through ticking (normally) one of the boxes, where there is an area of outstanding strength.

  Keep these comments brief – a couple of sentences per textbox would be usually sufficient. They may also provide the basis for feedback to the individuals in letters.

- You will receive input from HR on current salaries, past awards, gender ratios and discipline-specific Russell Group pay benchmarks.

- Based on the above, make a pay recommendation.

The second part of the report addresses the broader organisational profile of the School/Institute’s professoriate. In particular, it focuses attention on the collective strengths and concerns of the School/Institute at this most senior level. Whilst the Head/Director may well 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 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/QMUL strategies. Tick one or more areas and comment.

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. Comments would normally align with PAR comments insofar as these related to the professoriate. Tick one or more areas and comment.

**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 Schools/Institutes where there is a good supply of leaders and where there is concern.

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

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?

**School / Institute commentaries must be submitted to HR by email to Rhianne Jones, Reward & Benefit Administrator (rhianne.jones@qmul.ac.uk) by 14 December 2018.**

### 6. Step 3: Faculty Review

The Faculty Vice-Principal and Faculty Deans, working with HR and consulting appropriately with and seeking feedback from relevant 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 and Faculty Deans will endorse pay recommendations (in line with an indicative budget agreed by QMSE) and subject to final QMSE moderation.

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

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 QMUL 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 pay gaps continue to exist? Are there particularly individuals where this Group should make a final call?

8. Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018 Timetable</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Announcement of 2018 Professorial Review</td>
<td>19 October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial Review Form to be emailed to <strong>Head of School/Institute Director</strong> by:</td>
<td>16 November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoS/DoI to complete HoS/DoI Statement and Overview to be emailed to Human Resources by:</td>
<td>14 December 2018</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>February/March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions and new salaries communicated</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1
Areas of Contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student experience and education</th>
<th>Research and scholarship</th>
<th>Public engagement and impact</th>
<th>Leadership and collegiality</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 interdisciplinary/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 high-impact journals, or other appropriate high-impact 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 QMUL 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 major national/international, governmental, non-governmental, 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 QMUL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2
**Assessing the Scale of Contributions**

| Size/complexity | How big were the projects or programmes of work being described?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How complex was the work e.g. budgets, multiple territories or multiple interest groups?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td>To what extent was contribution at this level sustained?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Measurable      | Is it possible to quantify the outcomes of the work being described?  Examples of quantification would include:  
| outcomes        | 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 QMUL  
|                 | 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) |