THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME AUSTRALIA

Procedure:

Academic Promotion

Effective: 28 May 2026

Audience: Employees

Policy Category: Management
Policy Sub-category: Human Resources

Key words:	academic promotion, performance standard
Procedure Owner:	Deputy Vice Chancellor Academic
Responsible Officer:	Director, Organisational Development and Health Safety and Wellbeing
Review Date:	May 2029

Fremantle Broome Sydney

Contents

1 PURPOSE 3

2 RELATED POLICIES AND REGULATIONS 3

3 PREPARING FOR ACADEMIC PROMOTION 3

4 EQUITY CONSIDERATIONS 4

5 SUBMITTING AN APPLICATION 4

6 QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND INTERVIEWS 7

7 ADVICE OF DECISION 8

8 APPEALS 8

9 RELATED DOCUMENTS 9

10 DEFINITIONS 9

1 PURPOSE

1.1 This Procedure supports the implementation of the *Policy: Academic Promotion* by:

1.1.1 providing guidance on preparing for academic promotion and outlining equity considerations;

1.1.2 outlining the application process and requirements; and

1.1.3 outlining the qualifications, performance standards and interview process.

2 RELATED POLICIES AND REGULATIONS

This Procedure should be read in conjunction with the following policies:

2.1 *The University of Notre Dame Australia Enterprise Agreement 2022-2026,* as amended from time to time.

2.2 *Policy: Academic Promotion*

2.3 *The University of Notre Dame Australia (UNDA) Academic Excellence Framework*

3 PREPARING FOR ACADEMIC PROMOTION

3.1 Applicants must ensure they meet the eligibility requirements for promotion as outlined in the *Policy: Academic Promotion.*

3.2 Applicants are encouraged to seek guidance and discuss their application with:

3.2.1 their National Head of School;

3.2.2 an academic peer who has achieved promotion; and

3.2.3 the Executive Officer, Academic Promotions Committee for any policy and procedure related queries.

3.3 Applicants should discuss their readiness to apply with their National Head of School well in advance of applying, including any intentions for applying under exceptional merit or reapplying after a previous unsuccessful application.

3.4 Applicants are expected to focus on providing a clear account of significant achievements and contributions made at *The University of Notre Dame Australia* (University) over the shortest of either the previous five (5) years, or since the date of their last promotion or appointment at the University. The Academic Promotion Committee (Committee) will look for evidence of career progression and movement, both current and continuing.

3.5 Applicants' claims against the promotion criteria should align with the standards detailed in the *Academic Excellence Framework* (which encompass the Academic Position Classification Standards within Schedule F of the *Enterprise Agreement*) for the relevant Academic Role and classification level for which they are applying.

3.6 Applicants need to demonstrate that they are working at the expected level by ensuring their claims are supported with evidence aligned to the *Indicative Evidence Guide for Demonstrating Academic Excellence* (contained within the *Academic Excellence Framework*). It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide a well-documented case in support of their promotion within the written application. It is not sufficient simply to list claims of achievement.

4 EQUITY CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 Achievements and contributions are assessed relative to working arrangements and opportunity. The achievements of applicants for promotion are considered relative to:

4.1.1 required working arrangements e.g. part-time work or flexible working arrangements;

4.1.2 the opportunities that have been available to the applicant relative to the discipline and appointments held;

4.1.3 career histories, including late entry to academia or interrupted career trajectories; and

4.1.4 relevant personal circumstances e.g. carer responsibilities, disability or ongoing medical condition, relevant cultural expectations or circumstances.

4.2 The University recognises such circumstances do not alter the applicant's capacity to produce high quality work, but may have other impact, e.g. on the quantum of output. Assessing achievements relative to opportunity gives more weight to the overall quality and impact of achievements. Achievement relative to opportunity is not about expecting a lesser standard of performance.

4.3 Applicants may include a personal statement (maximum 250 words) on any relevant circumstances and their career impact that they would like the Committee to consider in assessing their application.

4.4 Applicants are not required to provide specific details about sensitive issues. The statement should focus on the personal circumstances and career impact.

5 SUBMITTING AN APPLICATION

5.1 Promotion application and attachments

5.1.1 Applicants must submit the following documents by the Closing Date and in accordance with the University's published application procedures:

i. Academic Promotion Application Form;

ii. Case for Promotion, including Appendices of Evidence; and

iii. National Head of School Report.

5.1.2 Applications will normally be open for eight (8) weeks.

5.1.3 Late applications and additional material will not be accepted without the prior approval of the Academic Promotions Committee.

5.1.4 A request for an extension must be submitted to the Executive Officer, Academic Promotions one (1) week prior to the Closing Date outlining the rationale for the request with relevant supporting documentation.

5.1.5 Each of the documents set out in section 5.1.1 must be in the form provided by the University.

5.1.6 Applications must be concise and typed on A4 paper in Calibri Font 12, 1.5 line spacing. Pages must be paginated consecutively in the bottom right-hand corner.

5.1.7 An electronic copy of the documents set out in section 5.1.1 are to be submitted to People and Culture at academicpromotions@nd.edu.au in accordance with the published application procedures. No paper copies will be accepted.

5.1.8 The maximum number of pages for the Case for Promotion is eight (8) pages.

5.1.9 The maximum number of pages for the Appendices of Evidence is up to four (4) pages (which must not include any hyperlinks), and excludes the applicant's:

i. Publications list;

ii. Peer Review of Teaching report (where relevant); and

iii. Three (3) recent Student Experience Survey results - excluding student comments (where relevant).

5.1.10 Any pages over the prescribed page limit or additional attachments not prescribed will be removed from the application and will not be provided to the Academic Promotions Committee.

5.1.11 Applications may not progress at any stage of the promotions process and be deemed ineligible if it does not conform to the application instructions provided in the *Academic Promotion Application Form*.

5.2 Referees

5.2.1 Applicants are required to provide the names and email addresses of three (3) referees, at least one (1) which must be external to the University, to be consulted about the applicant's suitability for promotion.

5.2.2 Internal referees, including Adjuncts of the University, should where possible provide a broader scope of the applicant's contribution beyond their School/Institute/Office. An individual is considered an internal referee if they are a current employee of the University or resigned within six (6) months of the application.

5.2.3 External referees are expected to have national and/or international standing in the applicant's field and have normally not been an employee of the University during the two (2) years preceding the application.

5.2.4 Referees are expected to be of high academic and/or professional standing and normally be at a higher level of appointment than the level of promotion sought by the applicant.

5.2.5 It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that their nominated referees:

i. do not include their National Head of School or members of the Academic Promotions Committee;

ii. are free from any Conflict of Interest;

iii. are willing and available to provide a reference shortly after the Closing Date; and

iv. are familiar with their recent work.

5.2.6 Applicants should seek advice from their National Head of School about referee selection.

5.2.7 The Committee reserves the right to review referees for conflicts of interest, diversity and to ensure the holistic appraisal of the applicant's achievements. If required, the Committee may appoint or request additional or alternative referees. The applicant and their National Head of School will be notified if additional or alternative referees are required.

5.2.8 The Executive Officer will provide referees with a copy of the applicant's full application, when requesting a written reference.

5.2.9 Referee reports are confidential and will not be forwarded to the applicant at any stage of the process, including after the outcome of the application is known.

5.2.10 Referee reports are considered advisory and form one component of the overall evidence base. The Committee will evaluate referee comments in conjunction with internal reports, workload allocation, achievement relative to opportunity, and the full body of evidence presented.

5.3 External Assessors (Level E only)

5.3.1 The Committee will consult, in confidence, with two (2) external assessors from a list of three (3) nominated by the applicant to provide an independent critique of an applicant's application for promotion to Level E.

5.3.2 External assessors will be experts within the applicant's discipline(s) at Professor (Level E) of national or international standing and free of any conflict of interest. Assessors must be independent and should not include the applicant's PhD supervisors, co-authors, co-editors, other collaborators or referees.

5.3.3 The Committee will consider the list of nominated external assessors and select two (2) to be requested to provide an assessor's report. Where an assessor declines, the Chair and the relevant Executive Dean will decide on an alternative assessor. While the Committee will use the list provided for guidance, it may take advice from the relevant Deputy/Pro Vice Chancellor (or nominee) on the Academic Promotions Committee when selecting assessors.

5.3.4 The Executive Officer will provide external assessors with a copy of the applicant's full application when inviting them to provide an assessor's report.

5.3.5 The names and reports of external assessors are confidential and will not be forwarded to the applicant at any stage of the process, including after the outcome of the application is known.

5.4 National Head of School Report

5.4.1 The National Head of School (or relevant Director, Research Institute/Office) must provide a written report as part of the applicant's promotion submission, highlighting key achievements against the criteria and benchmark performance standards, and provide any other additional information.

5.4.2 It is the responsibility of the applicant to:

i. advise their National Head of School of their intention to apply in the current round;

ii. provide the National Head of School with a copy of their application; and

iii. provide the National Head of School with sufficient time to prepare the National Head of School Report.

5.4.3 The National Head of School may consult or obtain the views of other senior academic members, staff members or students in developing the report.

5.4.4 The applicant must sign to confirm they have read the National Head of School's Report before submitting their application.

5.4.5 If the applicant does not agree with or wishes to clarify comments made by the National Head of School, the applicant may provide a brief response to the National Head of School Report and submit it with their application.

6 QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND INTERVIEWS

6.1 Qualifications

6.1.1 Subject to the norms of the discipline, applicants are expected to possess the following qualifications for promotion to:

Qualifications for promotion to:		
Level B	**Level C**	**Level D and Level E**
• A Masters degree with substantial progress towards a doctorate; or • Evidence of a research component as part of a higher degree; or • Evidence which demonstrates equivalence with appropriate qualifications.	• A doctorate; or • Evidence of a research component as part of a higher degree; or • Evidence which demonstrates equivalence to a doctorate.	A doctorate or presentation of a body of evidence to demonstrate equivalence to a doctorate.

6.1.2 The Committee will consider the appropriateness of the qualifications held by applicants, and/or substantial progress towards qualifications.

6.1.3 Applicants who do not have the expected qualification for promotion must make their case for equivalency in recognition of relevant experience and achievement; or other exceptional circumstances. In their case for equivalency, applicants must indicate whether they are progressing towards completing the relevant qualification.

6.1.4 Relevant professional experience involving a high level of expertise will be considered in place of such qualifications in appropriate circumstances, where supported by evidence.

6.1.5 Equivalency is assessed by the qualitative judgment of the Committee considering the particular discipline and judging whether experience, skills and standing are equivalent to the required qualification. The Committee may look for substantial progress towards the expected qualification.

6.2 Performance Standards

6.2.1 The Committee will assess each of the promotion criteria based on the following:

Satisfactory	Demonstrated achievement and contribution at the current level.
High Performance	Demonstrated significant achievement and contribution at the current level, and evidence of capacity to perform at the higher level and clear evidence of a performance trajectory that would warrant promotion to the higher level.
Unsatisfactory	Has not demonstrated satisfactory achievement and contribution at the current level.

6.2.2 The definitions of Satisfactory, High Performance and Unsatisfactory Performance Standards for each area of academic endeavour are to be read in conjunction with the *Academic Excellence Framework* to contextualises the description relative to the classification level.

6.2.3 Applicants must state how their academic activity in each of the promotion criteria has impacted student learning and/or the University according to the level of achievement they are claiming and provide evidence of this impact. Evidence must be referenced within the application and provided as appendices in their Case for Promotion.

6.3 Interviews

6.3.1 Applicants applying for promotion to Levels E judged as having a prima facie case for promotion may be invited to attend an interview. Where an interview is undertaken, it forms part of the holistic assessment of the case for promotion.

6.3.2 Applicants required to attend an interview will be notified by the Committee to arrange a suitable time and date for the interview.

6.3.3 During the interview, the applicant may be invited to make a 10-minute presentation to the Academic Promotions Committee on a topic normally provided 5 days in advance of the interview.

6.3.4 The interview supplements the written application and is an opportunity for interaction between the Committee members and the applicant. The interview process provides an opportunity for applicants to present their case for promotion, to further explore areas such as leadership and the future contribution of applicants and enables the Committee members to seek clarification on any aspects of the application and for applicants to respond to relevant questions.

7 ADVICE OF DECISION

7.1 The Executive Officer, on behalf of the Chair, will notify applicants and their National Head of School in writing whether their application for promotion has been successful or not.

7.2 The advice to unsuccessful applicants will indicate the promotion criteria where their application was assessed not to have met the required performance standard.

7.3 Unsuccessful applicants will be provided with the opportunity to meet with the Chair, Academic Promotions Committee and/or their Executive Dean after the close of the Appeals Period, to receive relevant information and guidance for a future application. The applicant's National Head of School will normally accompany the applicant to enable them to understand any identified gaps and to work with the academic employee.

7.4 Promotion will be effective from 1 January of the following year.

8 APPEALS

8.1 An unsuccessful applicant may only appeal a decision of the Academic Promotion Committee on the grounds of a Procedural Breach.

8.2 The Academic Promotion Committee's assessment of the academic merit of an application is final and not subject to appeal.

8.3 To appeal a decision of the Academic Promotion Committee, an applicant must:

8.3.1 detail the allegation(s) that demonstrate the Committee did not follow the requirements and/or process specified in the *Policy: Academic Promotion* and/or this Procedure, which resulted in a material effect on the decision; and

8.3.2 submit the appeal in writing to the Executive Officer no later than fourteen (14) days after the date of the written advice notifying the applicant of their unsuccessful application for academic promotion.

8.4 The appeal submission must not exceed two (2) pages.

8.5 An Academic Promotions Appeals Committee (Appeals Committee) will be formed to consider valid appeals. The Appeals Committee will comprise:

8.5.1 the Chair, Academic Council or a nominee of the Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic (Chair)

8.5.2 a nominee of the Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic (normally at academic staff Level E); and

8.5.3 a nominee of the Chief People Officer.

8.6 The Executive Officer who supports the Academic Promotions Committee will also provide secretariat support to the Appeals Committee.

8.7 The Appeals Committee will consider matters collectively and decisions will be determined by majority.

8.8 In considering an appeal, the Appeals Committee will:

8.8.1 determine whether the appeal is within scope (Procedural Breach)

8.8.2 review all relevant documentation, such as:

i. the original application for promotion;

ii. the meeting records of the Academic Promotions Committee;

iii. other records of the Academic Promotions Committee proceedings relevant to the decision;

iv. the written advice from Chair, Academic Promotions notifying the applicant of the Committee's decision and reasons; and

v. the appeal submission.

8.8.3 consider whether a Procedural Breach occurred and whether it materially and adversely affected the decision.

8.9 In determining the outcome of an appeal, the Appeals Committee will either dismiss or uphold the appeal. The decision of the Appeals Committee is final and not subject to further appeal.

8.10 Where the appeal is upheld, the application will be referred back to the Academic Promotions Committee with a recommendation to address the Procedural Breach and reconsider those parts of the decision (if any).

8.11 Where the appeal is dismissed, the application will not be reconsidered.

8.12 The applicant will be notified, within fourteen (14) days, of the decision of the Appeals Committee.

9 RELATED DOCUMENTS

9.1 *Academic Promotions Application Form*

9.2 *Case for Promotion template*

9.3 *National Head of School Report*

9.4 *Employee Code of Conduct and Ethical Behaviour*

10 DEFINITIONS

10.1 For the purpose of this Procedure, the definitions outlined in the *Policy: Academic Promotions* apply.

10.2 In addition, the following definitions apply to this Procedure:

10.2.1 ***Closing Date*** means the published deadline for the submission of applications for Academic Promotion.

10.2.2 ***Conflict of interest*** means situations where a person's private arrangements, benefits, interests (whether pecuniary or otherwise), personal circumstances or personal or family relationships could, or could be perceived to, impinge on a person's ability to act impartially.

10.2.3 ***Procedural Breach*** *means the Policy: Academic Promotion* or *Procedure: Academic Promotion* were not adhered to resulting in a substantive material disadvantage to the applicant with regards to the Academic Promotion Committee's decision.

Version	Date of approval	Approved by	Amendment
1	19 July 2022	Deputy Vice Chancellor, Learning & Teaching	New procedure - replaces *Guidelines: Academic Promotion* and revises content to align to Academic Excellence Framework, Performance Standards definitions, updated Referee and External Assessor process and provides enhanced information and procedures on Equity Considerations, Qualifications and Interview processes.
2	4 May 2023	Deputy Vice Chancellor, Learning & Teaching	Minor amendments to: - Application extensions guidelines -Application & interview guidelines -Advice of decision - Change in terminology from TPE/CCE to 'Student Experience Survey'
3	25 March 2024	Deputy Vice Chancellor, Learning & Teaching	Minor changes to links and titles. Definition of internal referee changed to include University Adjuncts.
4	7 April 2025	Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic	Clarified internal referees, conflict of interest and defined unsatisfactory Performance Standard.
5	28 May 2026	Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic	Major amendment to clarify the purpose of referee reports in the assessment process and to formalise the process, scope and operation of the Appeals Committee. Administrative amendments.