



Mathematical, Physical & Life Sciences Divisional Office
9 Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PD

REVIEW AND REAPPOINTMENT PROCEDURES FOR ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

Associate professors are normally appointed for five years in the first instance. Formal reviews are carried out around the middle of the five year period (known as mid-period review) and early in the fifth year of appointment (known as initial period or IPO review). On satisfactory completion of these reviews, the associate professor is granted tenure (which is formally referred to in Oxford as reappointment to the retiring age). Evidence of sufficient progress in research and of sufficient contributions to teaching and citizenship is required at each stage.

The processes set out here, whereby tenure is granted to associate professors, are separate to the University's procedures for the award of the title of Full Professor (that is, the Recognition of Distinction exercise) and for the award of Professorial Merit Pay.

A summary of the review processes and a table showing typical review timing can be found towards the back of this document.

1. Reviews: timing, purpose and preparation

1.1 *Timing of reviews*

The mid-period review is intended to help, support and guide the associate professor by providing an opportunity to assess progress in research and teaching and contributions to citizenship; discuss publication strategy and workload; and address any difficulties which could affect their ability to meet the requirements for reappointment. The mid-period review must be completed by the end of the third year of the associate professor's initial period of appointment. This ensures that the associate professor has time to act upon the resulting feedback ahead of the start of their IPO review, and allows for any issues or barriers to progress to be identified and tackled expeditiously.

The initial period review is intended to assess the performance of the associate professor in light of the MPLS division's criteria for reappointment to the retiring age. The initial period review must be completed by the end of the first term of the fifth year of the associate professor's initial period of appointment *It is very important that this review is carried out promptly, to allow time for necessary extra steps if any performance issues persist or are newly identified.*

Occasionally there are delays, for example if an assessor's report is not received as expeditiously as expected. Because there tend to be good reasons for unexpected delays, associate professors will be encouraged to contact the Head of Department or Divisional Office if they have concerns about delays or questions about the process.

1.2 *Start of the process*

Ahead of the start of the academic year, the divisional office will send each department a list of staff due to be reviewed during the forthcoming year. The list will be sent both to the relevant administrator and to the Head of Department.

Before or at the start of each term, the divisional office will write to associate professors due to provide their report for either a mid-period or an initial period review during the following term. The letter will give details of the forthcoming review process and of the self-report that they need to prepare. The request for the self-report sets out the timetable for the review and will be copied to the

Head of Department and the relevant administrator.

On receipt of the annual list of staff, the Head of Department should make arrangements for the requisite evidence to be provided (see below) and for the relevant panels to be constituted and scheduled. Associate professors' teaching is often unevenly spaced through the academic year. This can sometimes present a challenge in scheduling reviews. In supplying a complete list ahead of the start of each academic year, it is intended that departments will be able to consult lecture timetables and consider the timing of other relevant factors to ensure that reviews of teaching and other documentation can be collected in good time.

1.3 The review panel

Departments have discretion in the composition of review panels but these should include:

- Head of Department, who should normally chair the panel, and who is responsible for ensuring that evidence is collected and obtained;
- several other senior members of the department;
- a member of another department in a cognate subject, or a subject specialist belonging to another institution.
- The Head of Department will normally chair the panel but may delegate their role throughout the review process to an appropriate senior colleague.

Heads of Department are encouraged to consider issues of diversity in setting out the panel membership.

Review panels may include a representative of the college, but *must not* include the advisor of the associate professor being reviewed. Should the department wish, a single panel may consider several associate professors, e.g. those being reviewed in one term.

2. Documentation

The documentation required for reviews is as follows. Further detail about the content of each report is set out below.

Prompted by the Divisional office

Self-report: content as set out below

Prompted by the Head of Department

Teaching Report: by senior member(s) of departmental staff

College Report provided by the college, normally Senior Tutor or Head of House

Citizenship Report *at mid-period* review, by the associate professor's advisor
at IPO by Head of Department or an appropriate senior colleague

Research Reports: *at mid-period* review, by head of research group
at IPO reports from minimum of three referees external to Oxford
at least one referee from overseas
must be acknowledged experts in the field and must be chosen by the panel

Produced by the review panel

Review Report:

2.1 Self report

The division requires self-reports for mid-period and initial period reviews, and supplies the following information to the associate professor about its structure.

A Research

'Research' is to be understood as original investigation undertaken to gain knowledge and understanding, including work of direct relevance to the needs of commerce and industry, as well as to the public and voluntary sectors. It includes the use of existing knowledge in experimental development to produce new or substantially improved materials, devices, products, and processes, including design and construction.

The self-report should set out the following:

- Review of research to date (*set out the composition of your research group if applicable, and note any engagement in/establishment of research collaborations*)
- Details of research grants awarded and/or applications under consideration (*including dates, amounts and whether you are PI or a Co-PI*)
- Statement of future research plans and directions
- Markers of recognition (*e.g. invitations to deliver lectures, appointment to journal editorial boards, election to learned societies or research bodies etc*)
- List of publications and other outputs (*for publications, include full title, all principal authors, date of submission, volume, number, year, and initial and final page numbers as applicable*)
 - i) Reports of original research, peer reviewed to an international standard
 - ii) Conference proceedings or meeting abstracts, peer reviewed to an international standard
 - iii) Other reports of original research
 - iv) Review articles
 - v) Conference abstracts not internationally reviewed
 - vi) Monographs and Textbooks
 - vii) Volumes or collections of articles for which you were the editor
 - viii) Other outputs, including e.g. spin-outs, software and patents

B Teaching

'Teaching' includes any undergraduate and graduate lecturing and teaching, demonstrating, field tuition, tutorials, supervision, course design, and more generally the mentorship of the next generation of researchers.

The self-report should set out the following:

- Demonstrations and lectures given (*indicating per term the titles of courses given, the number of lectures in each course, and the average number of hours of demonstrating/practical work each week*)
- Details of graduate teaching



- Details of graduate student supervision and other project supervision (*indicate the volume of projects supervised, give numbers of graduate students supervised and number completed, specify if you are a co-supervisor*)
- Average amount of college teaching (*and whether the amount and distribution of teaching time is in keeping with the contractual norm for the relevant type of Fellowship*)
- If you have, or have had, an agreed arrangement that reduces the volume of your teaching (*such as a buyout from a grant, variation of duties agreement, part time appointment etc*) give dates and details of the proportion of the departmental and college teaching carried out.
- Involvement in course design/redesign, or in innovation in teaching methods
- Any nominations or awards for teaching

C Citizenship

'Good citizenship' is in the context of the department and college, and of the subject discipline more broadly. It may include activities such as admissions, examining, service on committees, holding university and/or college offices and their associated administrative work; and also editorship of journals; convening or organizing conferences; access, alumni or public engagement activity; as well as activity connected to links with industry or business.

The self-report should set out information about the following types of contribution:

- Examining and admissions
- Committee work and associated administration
- Other contributions to the life and culture of the department and/or the college
- Contributions to the subject discipline
- Other contributions
- If you have, or have had, an agreed arrangement that reduces the volume of your administrative contributions (*such as a buyout from a grant, variation of duties agreement, part time appointment etc*) give dates and details of the proportion of departmental and college administrative duties carried out.

D Professional development activities

- Any courses attended (*include training in skills specific to your research, courses attended or qualifications gained in teaching or supervision, sessions organised by the Oxford Learning Institute or IT services*)
- Other development activities during the period

Disclosure of Personal Circumstances

Applicants should feel free to disclose circumstances that may, over a considerable period of time, have had a substantial effect on their record of research, teaching and/or citizenship. This is intended to cover not only circumstances protected under employment and equality legislation such as maternity leave, but also unusually high loads of teaching and/or administration. Any personal disclosure should be provided as a separate document, not included as part of the self-report. Disclosures will be seen by the review panel and divisional officers but not by any other report-writers or independent assessors, and will be treated as strictly confidential.

2.2 Teaching

The Mathematical, Physical and Life Sciences Division specifies its requirements for teaching and administration to associate professors as follows.

Holders of academic posts in the Mathematical, Physical and Life Sciences Division are required, over the period of their appointment at Oxford, to contribute to the division's achievement and maintenance of a teaching profile of the highest order in terms of internal and external quality assessments.

The Divisional Board shall carry out a review at mid-point and towards the end of the initial period of appointment to assess an individual's ability to meet this requirement. This will involve an assessment of the extent and quality of the teaching and administrative activities carried out by the individual during their initial period of appointment at Oxford, and will in all cases involve a detailed eye-witness report of teaching attended by an assessor appointed by the department, and liaison with the college(s) of association to ascertain the quality of college teaching. Appropriate use will also be made of student feedback in assessing teaching excellence.

The individual must demonstrate effectiveness and willingness in carrying out their teaching duties (including, where appropriate, lecturing, graduate supervision, demonstrating, fieldwork, and class teaching) and in carrying out administrative work in a timely and effective manner.

A teaching assessment is required for mid-period and for initial period reviews. On receipt of the list of associate professors due to be reviewed in the forthcoming academic year, the Head of Department should consider the teaching schedule and for each review make arrangements for a senior member of the departmental academic staff to attend one or more lectures at an appropriate time.

Should it not be possible to arrange a review of a lecture (eg in cases where no lectures are scheduled to be carried out by the associate professor during the period between the initial request for the self-report and the panel's meeting) *with the agreement in advance of the divisional office, a review of an alternative instance of teaching, such as field tuition, demonstrating, or class teaching may be submitted. A review of at least one lecture must however have been submitted by the IPO review stage.* After the observation, a written report on the teaching competence of the associate professor should be submitted to the review as set out below.

The report on teaching competence must set out explicitly the extent to which the associate professor has achieved the requisite levels of contribution and proficiency and must include:

- Remarks on the qualities and effectiveness of the teaching observed
- The quantity and range of teaching undertaken overall, including course development activities
- Any indications from student feedback or from colleagues administering teaching activity
- Whether there has been any reduction from the normal load, for example as a result of a buyout, or of departmental policies on teaching load for e.g. new appointees or maternity returners

The report should be drawn together by the relevant departmental personnel and the observer who has attended a lecture (or other instance of teaching).

2.3 College report

With all joint appointments, the college needs to be consulted. The department should send a copy of the self-report to the Senior Tutor of the college concerned explaining how the review will be conducted and on what timescale, and asking for comments on the performance of the associate professor's college responsibilities.

2.4 Citizenship and general performance

- At mid-period, the associate professor's advisor should provide a report;
- At the initial period review, the Head of Department or an appropriate senior colleague (e.g. head of sub-department) should provide the report

This report should assess the associate professor's performance in general, and must specifically include comment on their contributions as a citizen of the department and where appropriate of their subject discipline more generally.

Since the mid-period review is formative in nature, and designed to support and guide the associate professor and help them to achieve the standard which will ensure reappointment at the initial period review, the advisor's report should set out any on-going difficulties which the associate professor has experienced. Such issues might include agreeing to accept too heavy a burden of administrative tasks at too early a stage in their career, difficulties with time management leading to a drop in publication rate, or problems in delivering lectures. The advisor should consider and report on whether there is any training (including training or development activity specific to the research area, courses run by IT Services or the Oxford Learning Institute) that the associate professor might benefit from, and alert the review panel.

2.5 Research

The Mathematical, Physical and Life Sciences Division specifies its requirements for research to associate professors as follows.

Holders of academic posts in the Mathematical, Physical, and Life Sciences Division are required, over the period of their appointment at Oxford, to contribute to the Division's achievement and maintenance of a research profile of the highest order in terms of REF outcomes and international recognition.

The Divisional Board shall carry out a review at mid-point and towards the end of the initial period of appointment to assess an individual's ability to meet this requirement. This will involve an assessment of the extent and quality of the research activities carried out by the individual during their initial period of appointment at Oxford.

A high level of research achievement, as defined above in terms of REF outcomes and international recognition, must be demonstrated by the individual, as evidenced in research outputs, in the form of substantial articles published or accepted for publication in leading journals (or equivalent).

Firm evidence of at least very considerable progress towards the publication of the results of a major research project is required. In addition to actual publications, the quality of work in progress may need to be assessed.

This definition of research achievement will be interpreted flexibly insofar as it might be appropriate in some cases to consider other evidence of research achievement. It will also be interpreted flexibly as a function of the particular stage in the individual's career.



A research assessment is required for mid-period and for initial period reviews:

- At mid-period, the assessment is provided by the head of research group or similar within the department;
- At initial period review, the assessment takes the form of written references from a minimum of three external referees (at least one from overseas), who must be acknowledged experts in the field and must be chosen by the review panel.

In each case, the Head of Department (or their nominated panel chair as appropriate) should provide the assessor(s) with the associate professor's self-report and ask that the assessment considers **explicitly** the associate professor's national and international standing in research.

Please note that requests for references must include the following statement:

'All references received will be treated as confidential and held in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and related UK data protection legislation. However, applicants have the right to request a copy of the reference under the GDPR. In this event you will be asked for your views on disclosure before the University responds to such a request.'

We provide a Privacy Notice for our Staff with details of our approach to processing their data at: <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/councilsec/compliance/gdpr/privacynotices/staff/>. Please keep their data securely and destroy it when it is no longer needed.'

For all reviews, research assessors must be asked to comment explicitly on the extent to which the associate professor has achieved (or at mid-period, is likely to achieve) research activity at the appropriate level for the award of tenure (in terms of international excellence, number of publications and professional development including markers of recognition and esteem). It is accepted that, by the time of the mid-period review, some projects will not have produced new results that are appropriate for publication. However, the review panel should consider the prospects for future publication and refer to this explicitly in its report.

Review panels may request further information from the individual beyond that contained in their self-report (e.g. evidence of unpublished work).

3. Meetings and the report to Divisional Board

The composition of the panel is discussed under 1.3 above. The review panel should meet at an appropriate point to consider the documentation collated for the review and form a considered opinion on the performance of the associate professor.

It is also good practice for the panel or the Head of Department (or their nominated panel chair) to meet with the associate professor as part of the review process.

3.1: Meeting with the Associate Professor

The Head of Department (or their nominee) should arrange a discussion with the Associate Professor, to convey any points arising from the review. The meeting should cover research progress and teaching and administrative proficiency, publication strategy and workload, and any difficulties that may have been encountered. This discussion should be seen as an opportunity for the Head of Department to encourage the Associate Professor under review.

If the Associate Professor is progressing as expected and/or if the points arising are simple positive suggestions for the next stage of their development, it may be appropriate to meet with the Associate Professor either immediately before, or immediately after conclusion of the review process. A written note of the discussion with the Associate Professor can be a helpful addition to the review papers,

however.

If any issues come to light in the course of a mid-period review, the Head of Department (or their nominated panel chair) must meet with the Associate Professor *before the review process concludes*. Where problems have been identified, the Department must put in place appropriate support for the individual, e.g. regular mentoring, specific training, help in formulating grant proposals etc. In addition, the Department will need to put in place measures to monitor progress, and the panel chair will need to agree the plan of action with the Associate Professor, and set out both the issue and what has been agreed in the panel report.

See below for further information on tackling difficulties in the Initial Period review.

3.2: The Panel Report

The departmental review panel must submit to the Divisional Secretary for the consideration of the Divisional Board a *written* report which must be genuinely *qualitative* and *evaluative*, which describes explicitly the *process* of the review, the *criteria* used, and the *conclusions* reached.

The review report should explicitly consider the evidence in the following areas:

- **Research:** consider against the criteria in 2.5 above and state explicitly the extent to which the associate professor has achieved, and is expected to maintain, research activity at this level, in terms of national and international excellence, group size, level of funding, recognition and esteem, and number of publications and the quality of their venues.
- **Teaching** consider all teaching activities (including college teaching) against the criteria in 2.2 above and comment on the associate professor's teaching competence, range and volume of contributions, and willingness to undertake these duties
- **Citizenship** consider all administrative activities (including departmental and college administration and other contributions to the life and work of the department, college, and subject discipline) against the criteria in 2.2 above and comment on the associate professor's administrative competence, range and volume of contributions, and willingness to undertake these duties.

The report of the review panel must therefore include a clear statement of the panels' view of the associate professor's performance and the extent to which they have fulfilled the full range of contractual duties (teaching, research, and administration/citizenship).

At the initial period (five year) review, a clear recommendation on whether the associate professor should be granted tenure (reappointed) should be included.

Reviews should be completed and reports should be submitted as follows:

- Mid-period, by the end of the third year of appointment;
- Initial period (five year), by the end of the first term of the fifth year of appointment.

This timetable will allow for timely confirmation of progress or reappointment and will also allow time for remedial action where this is required. . If any performance issues are identified in the course of the review, the personnel procedures require the issue of written warnings, with time allowed for the individual to demonstrate improved performance and for the panel and Division then to assess whether the criteria have now been met. These processes should all take place *before* the end of the Initial Period of Office. Given these constraints, it is especially important that the mid-period review provides an honest picture of achievements against all three criteria so that interventions can be put in place where there are weaknesses and so that there is time for the Associate Professor to make progress in any weaker areas.

Reports of review panels should be submitted to the Divisional Office accompanied by all the evidence considered.

4 After the review

On receipt by the Divisional Office, the review panel's report will be reviewed by the Head of Division and placed on the associate professor's file. Where problems in process have been identified, a note will be held on the associate professor's file of the nature and timetable for remedial action and follow-up.

After the review panel's report has been reviewed by the Head of Division and approved by or on behalf of the Divisional Board, the Divisional Office will notify the Head of the Department of the outcome of the review.

Where the conclusion of the mid-period review is satisfactory, on receipt of confirmation from the Division, the Head of the Department should then notify the associate professor that the process has been fully completed. The notification to the department will prompt them to do this.

Where the conclusion of the initial period review is satisfactory, the appointment will be confirmed to retiring age (i.e. tenure will be granted) and a new contract issued to the associate professor.

5. Difficulties with the reappointment process

Where problems have been encountered which could have an effect on the ability to meet the requirements for reappointment to the retiring age, the panel chair must meet with the Associate Professor in good time ahead of the conclusion of the review to discuss the issues (as set out below), and must set out in writing a note of the issue and their advice on action to address them, and should send a copy to the Divisional Secretary as soon as is possible.

The Department must put in place appropriate support mechanisms for the individual e.g. regular mentoring, specific training, and must explain clearly to the associate professor (at the meeting and in a subsequent letter, which will serve as a formal warning) the actions required, the timetable for carrying them out, and the consequences of the required standard not being reached in relation to ability to meet the standards for reappointment.

The panel chair should seek advice from the Divisional Secretary in these complex cases.

After an assessment has been made to determine whether the agreed remedial actions have been carried out to the required standard, in any case where the departmental review panel is minded, at the conclusion of its review, to conclude that the criteria for reappointment to the retiring age have *not* been met, ***it is essential that***

- i) the panel chair should ***immediately*** advise the Divisional Secretary;
- ii) ***before*** the departmental review panel makes a recommendation to the Board and submits a written report to the Board, the associate professor should be made aware of the full background of the departmental review panel's opinion and be given copies of all the reports made available to the departmental panel (advice should be sought from the University's data protection office before copies of any references or reports are released to the individual)
- iii) the associate professor should be given the opportunity to present their case, both orally and in writing to the departmental review panel, and be accompanied, if they so wish, by a union representative or colleague.

If, after full account has been taken of these representations, the departmental review panel recommends that the associate professor should not be reappointed, or be reappointed for a further fixed period, the case will be considered by the Divisional Board (the appointing body). The associate



professor will have the opportunity to present their case, both orally and in writing to the Board.

If the Board concludes that the associate professor should not be reappointed (which would entail dismissal), the associate professor will have the opportunity to show cause to the Personnel Committee, through written and/or oral representations, why the Divisional Board's decision should not be confirmed.)

If the Divisional Board concludes that the associate professor should be reappointed for a first further fixed term, it may reappoint on its own authority; specification of what the associate professor must achieve and appropriate support will be provided. If the Divisional Board decides, exceptionally, to reappoint for a second further term, this would be subject to the Personnel Committee approving an exception to the regulations (Regulations 131 of Council Reg. 3, 2004).

At each level, the associate professor is entitled to address the relevant committee (i.e. departmental review panel, Divisional Board and, if an appeal is lodged, the Personnel Committee) submit written and/or oral evidence; and be accompanied by a union representative or colleague of their own choice and will normally be able to see all relevant testimonials and reports.

Potential problems should normally have been picked up at the Mid-period review stage, and the extent to which the member of staff was alerted to any shortcomings and the advice, and on-going support and training (as appropriate) provided since then, will have to be set out in detail.

G:\Academic Staff folders\Acad Staff (in post)\Reviews\Review and Reappointment Procedures2018.docx

Last updated January 2019

**MATHEMATICAL, PHYSICAL & LIFE SCIENCES DIVISION
REVIEW AND REAPPOINTMENT OF ACADEMIC STAFF**

ANNEXE A

The associate professor's self report

The division requires self-reports for mid-period and initial period reviews which encompass the following.

1) Research

'Research' is to be understood as original investigation undertaken to gain knowledge and understanding, including work of direct relevance to the needs of commerce and industry, as well as to the public and voluntary sectors. It includes the use of existing knowledge in experimental development to produce new or substantially improved materials, devices, products, and processes, including design and construction.

The self-report should set out the following:

- b) Review of research to date (*set out the composition of your research group if applicable, and note any engagement in/establishment of research collaborations*)
- c) Details of research grants awarded and/or applications under consideration (*including dates, amounts and whether you are PI or a Co-PI*)
- d) Statement of future research plans and directions
- e) Markers of recognition (*e.g. election to learned societies or research bodies, invitations to deliver lectures, appointment to journal editorial boards etc*)
- f) List of publications and other outputs (*for publications, include full title, all principal authors, date of submission, volume, number, year, and initial and final page numbers*)
 - i) Reports of original research, peer reviewed to an international standard
 - ii) Conference proceedings or meeting abstracts, peer reviewed to an international standard
 - iii) Other reports of original research
 - iv) Review articles
 - v) Conference abstracts not internationally reviewed
 - vi) Monographs and Textbooks
 - vii) Volumes or collections of articles for which the associate professor was editor
 - viii) Other outputs, including e.g. spin-outs, software and patents

2) Teaching

'Teaching' includes any undergraduate and graduate lecturing and teaching, demonstrating, field tuition, tutorials, supervision, course design, and more generally the mentorship of the next generation of researchers.

The self-report should set out the following:

- a) Demonstrations and lectures given (*indicating per term the titles of courses given, the number of lectures in each course, and the average number of hours of demonstrating/practical work each week*)



- b) Details of graduate teaching
- c) Details of graduate student supervision and other project supervision (*indicate the volume of projects supervised, give numbers of graduate students supervised and number completed, specify if you are a co-supervisor*)
- d) Average amount of college teaching (*and whether the amount and distribution of teaching time is in keeping with the contractual norm for the relevant type of Fellowship*)
- e) If you have, or have had, an agreed arrangement that reduces the volume of your teaching (*such as a buyout from a grant, variation of duties agreement, part time appointment etc*) give dates and details of the proportion of the departmental and college teaching carried out.
- f) Involvement in course design/redesign, or in innovation in teaching methods
- g) Any nominations or awards for teaching

3) Citizenship

'Good citizenship' is in the context of the department and college, and of the subject discipline more broadly. It may include activities such as admissions, examining, service on committees, holding university and/or college offices and their associated administrative work; and also editorship of journals; convening or organizing conferences; access, alumni or public engagement activity; as well as activity connected to links with industry or business.

The self-report should set out information about the following types of contribution:

- a) Examining and admissions
- b) Committee work and associated administration
- c) Other contributions to the life and culture of the department and/or the college
- d) Contributions to the subject discipline
- e) Other contributions
- f) If you have, or have had, an agreed arrangement that reduces the volume of your administrative contributions (*such as a buyout from a grant, variation of duties agreement, part time appointment etc*) give dates and details of the proportion of departmental and college administrative duties carried out.

4) Professional development activities

- a) Any courses attended (*include training in skills specific to your research, courses attended or qualifications gained in teaching or supervision, sessions organised by the Oxford Learning Institute or IT services*)
- b) Other development activities during the period

Disclosure of Personal Circumstances

Applicants should feel free to disclose circumstances that may, over a considerable period of time, have had a substantial effect on their record of research, teaching and/or citizenship. This is intended to cover not only circumstances protected under employment and equality legislation such as maternity leave, but also unusually high loads of teaching and/or administration. Any personal disclosure should be provided as a separate document, not included as part of the self-report. Disclosures will be seen by the review committee and divisional officers but not by any other report-writers or independent assessors, and will be treated as strictly confidential.

ANNEXE B Summary of review procedure

1. Shortly before the start of each academic year, the Divisional Office will send each Head of Department a list of associate professors due to be reviewed during the coming year.
2. The Divisional Office will write to each associate professor due for review with a request to produce a report on activities since appointment.
3. In preparation for each review, the Head of Department must:
 - (a) Set up a review panel consisting of the Head of Department (or an appropriate senior nominee), senior members of the department and an external member (*but not to include* the associate professor's advisor)
 - (b) Arrange for a senior member of academic staff to attend at least one lecture given by the associate professor and arrange for submission of a written assessment of the associate professor's teaching overall
 - (c) Arrange for an assessment of the associate professor's research to be produced
 - (i) for mid-period reviews, by the head of research group or other similar unit within the department
 - (ii) for initial period reviews, by each of a minimum of three external referees (at least one from overseas), who must be acknowledged experts in the field and must be chosen by the review committee
 - (d) Arrange for a written report on the associate professor's citizenship and overall performance, including general departmental contribution, to be provided
 - (i) for mid-period reviews, by the associate professor's advisor
 - (ii) for initial period reviews, by the Head of Department or by an appropriate senior colleague
 - (e) Obtain from each associate professor's college a report on their college responsibilities
 - (f) Schedule a meeting of a review panel, to consider the review documentation
 - (g) meet with the associate professor to discuss their progress (for straightforward reviews this meeting may take place after the review concludes)
4. Following the meeting of the review committee, the panel chair must:
 - (a) Prepare a written, qualitative, evaluative report on the associate professor's performance in teaching, research and citizenship, referring explicitly to the division's criteria in each of these three areas, and
 - (i) for mid-period reviews, include a clear view on the associate professor's progress and, where necessary, clarify what they must achieve in order to reach a satisfactory standard by the time of the initial period review
 - (ii) for initial period reviews, include a specific recommendation about whether the associate professor has reached an appropriate standard for tenure (reappointment to the retiring age). **Note:** the panel chair should alert the Divisional Secretary *immediately and prior to preparing the report* if it appears that the review committee may not be able to recommend reappointment
 - (b) Send the report and all supporting documentation to the Divisional office within at very most two terms of receiving the associate professor's self-report, or within at the very most four terms where additional time has been necessary for the individual to meet agreed performance targets.