

Responsible Officer	Chair of the Academic Staff Promotions Committee
Approved by	Vice-Chancellor
Approved and commenced	May 2016
Review by	January 2018
Relevant Legislation, Ordinance, Rule and/or Governance Level Principle	<i>University of Tasmania Act 1992</i> Governance Level Principle 11 – Employment
Responsible Organisational Unit	Office of the Chair of the Academic Staff Promotions Committee

Contents

1	Objective	2
2	Scope	2
3	Key Principles	2
4	General Policy Provisions	3
5	Key Considerations in Making a Case for Promotion	4
6	Promotion to Level B	5
7	Promotion to Level C	5
8	Promotion to Level D	6
9	Promotion to Level E	6
10	Applications and Head Reports	6
11	Academic Staff Promotions Committee	8
12.	Interviews	10
13.	Recommendations of the Academic Staff Promotions Committee	10
14.	Review of Recommendations of the Academic Staff Promotions Committee	11
15.	Definitions and Acronyms	11
16.	Supporting Documentation	12
17.	Versioning	12

1 Objective

This policy governs promotions of academic staff at the University of Tasmania.

2 Scope

This is a University-wide policy. It applies to all academic staff employed by the University of Tasmania, other than those with casual appointments, irrespective of the source of funding or the mix of academic work undertaken. This policy encompasses academic promotions at any point of the academic scale from Level A to Level E and guides the operations of the Academic Staff Promotions Committee (ASPC).

3 Key Principles

- 3.1 Promotion is the movement from one academic level to the first point of the next level, as a reward for performance.
- 3.2 Promotion at the University of Tasmania is evidence-based. Applications for promotion are assessed solely on merit. Resource allocation issues are not relevant to the promotions process.
- 3.3 This policy is consistent with the University's workload principles, and performance and career development processes.

In alignment with the University's statements of performance expectations for academic staff, as outlined in *Opening UTAS to Talent: The UTAS Academic*, this policy identifies four categories of academic activity:

- Research and contract research
- Learning and teaching
- Community engagement and professional service
- Internal service to the University.

- 3.4 This policy is intended to allow for flexibility, in order that the ASPC may recognise and treat equitably:

- Widely varying combinations of academic activity
- The differing types of academic activity and differing forms of output that are characteristic of different disciplines.

This policy also recognises that the balance of academic activities for any one staff member is likely to change over time.

- 3.5 This policy aligns with the University's Statement of Values, principles of equal opportunity, confidentiality, transparency and procedural fairness; these key principles guide the implementation of the policy and all procedures associated with academic promotions.
- 3.6 Records and Information that support these activities will be created, managed and retained in accordance with University Records Management Policy, Procedures and Guidelines.

4 General Policy Provisions

4.1. Applications for promotion are considered annually by the ASPC. Advice on preparing and presenting evidence of performance in each of the four categories of academic activity can be found in the *Academic Staff Promotions Guidance for Applicants and Heads*.

4.2 To be eligible to apply for promotion, a staff member must:

- submit an Expression of Intention to apply for promotion by the set date; and
- have been employed by the University of Tasmania for at least one year by the closing date for expressions of intent.

In special circumstances, the Chair of the ASPC may grant an exemption to this provision, and will report any such exemption to the next meeting of the ASPC.

4.3 A staff member will be ineligible to apply for promotion the immediate following year of an unsuccessful application. That is, if an applicant is unsuccessful in 2017 they will not be eligible to apply until 2019. In special circumstances, the Chair of the ASPC may grant an exemption to this provision, following submission of a detailed case as to why eligibility should be granted.

4.4 In evaluating an application for promotion, the ASPC will consider whether to recommend promotion of the applicant to the next level.

4.5 As an alternative to promotion to the next level, the ASPC may recommend accelerated progression within the current level where performance has been meritorious but insufficient to justify promotion to the next level.

4.6 Academic promotion and accelerated progression are awarded by the Vice- Chancellor on the recommendation of the ASPC. Accelerated progression within a level or promotion from one level to the next will date from 1 January in the year following consideration of the application by the ASPC.

4.7 When considering promotion applications from staff holding fractional appointments, the ASPC expects the criteria for promotion to be satisfied at the same quality as for staff holding full-time appointments, but at a quantity or volume consistent with the fraction of their employment.

4.8 Promotion to Level D and Level E is for the exceptional few and is for levels of achievement above the normal career grade, which is Level C.

4.9 The ASPC is concerned only with an applicant's professional activities that are related to their employment at the University and/or draw directly on their professional skills. Activities of an essentially private nature will not be taken into account in assessing an application for promotion.

4.10 The applicant's WARP report is the only acceptable evidence (unless otherwise approved by the Chair of ASPC) for the following areas of research activity: publications (including creative works since 2003), research income, HDR supervision, HDR completions and consultancies and research contracts.¹ Further details are available in *Academic Staff Promotions Guidance for Applicants and Heads*. The applicant's HEA Assessors Report is

¹ Note that non-University of Tasmania HDR supervisions and completions should be documented separately. Non- University of Tasmania publications and grant income can be reported through WARP

the only acceptable evidence for learning and teaching activity, other than eVALUate results. Applicants who have applied to the HEA to be an Associate Fellow, Fellow, Senior Fellow or Principal Fellow need to submit their Assessors Report as evidence of achievement.

- 4.11 While a particular form of activity may not fit conveniently into any one of the four categories of activity, applicants should attempt to provide the most appropriate categorisation. The ASPC will not give credit for the same activity under more than one category.
- 4.12 Applicants should submit summary eVALUate reports as evidence of excellence in student learning and teaching practice. The ASPC will also accept Student Evaluation of Teaching and Learning (SETL) summary reports as historical evidence of excellence in student learning and teaching practice. Academic staff contributing to Vocational Education and Training (VET) programs may also submit summary reports of Learner and Employer Questionnaires as developed by the National Centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER).

5 Key Considerations in Making a Case for Promotion

5.1 The ASPC considers performance in four categories of academic activity:

- Research and contract research
- Learning and teaching
- Community engagement and professional service
- Internal service to the University.

5.2 When making the case for promotion, the majority of the case must be made around a combination of achievements in the categories of research and learning and teaching.

Academic staff with a strong work emphasis on community engagement and professional service or internal service to the University should demonstrate the ways in which the outcomes of these activities contribute to research and/or learning and teaching.

5.3 When assessing applications, the ASPC considers academic achievements as manifested through evidence of excellence, scholarship, significance and impact of outcomes. Evidence of intellectual and organisational leadership is a requirement, for staff applying for Academic Level D and E.

5.4 Exceptional contributions in one or more categories of activity, may compensate for lesser contributions in others, provided that the overall contribution meets the test of merit appropriate to the level to which promotion is being sought. Where this occurs, it must be acknowledged by the Head of School or equivalent as it may reflect a shift in workload allocation output and impact

5.5 Performance will be assessed over an applicant's entire career, but the ASPC will place particular weight on achievements since the applicant's appointment to the University of Tasmania, since the most recent promotion, or over the last five years, whichever is the shortest.

5.6 Applications for promotion are assessed on merit. While the overall volume of such contributions (relative to opportunity) is a relevant consideration, the ASPC is more concerned with academic excellence, indicated by the demonstrated quality of the contributions and their significance as indicated by evidence of their impact. Advice on how to measure, assess and express the impact of various categories of activity can be found in *Academic Staff Promotions Guidance for Applicants and Heads*.

- 5.7 When evaluating performance, the ASPC recognises that academic staff work in diverse disciplines with differing protocols and conventions, that staff allocate their time and talents in different ways, and that the University's well-being and reputation depend on a wide and varied range of contributions.
- 5.8 The ASPC recognises that staff work in diverse disciplines with different protocols and conventions, and therefore attempts to assess applications against those discipline-specific expectations, but the ASPC is *not* constituted as a committee of disciplinary experts. Accordingly, the applicant, the Head, the Dean or Pro Vice-Chancellor (where relevant) and independent assessors (where required) are required to provide information on disciplinary norms and expectations and to provide evidence and/or commentary that will enable the ASPC to assess the application against them.
- 5.9 Evidence of significant leadership contributions in academic thought leadership and broader academic leadership (both within and outside the University) are required in applications for promotion to Level D and Level E. Leadership achievements may also provide evidence to support an application for promotion to Level B or Level C.
- 5.10 It is important that at Level C, D and E, academics are able to identify the unifying thread in their academic career.
- 5.11 The ASPC will consider the performance expectations outlined in *Opening UTAS to Talent: the UTAS Academic* as a key reference point in assessing an application for promotion. The ASPC will consider the quality and impact of outcomes, and not merely the achievement of quantitative thresholds. The Committee is interested in the total case for promotion, not simply the attainment of the performance metrics; achieving the performance expectations alone is unlikely to be deemed sufficient to justify promotion. The ASPC will also consider evidence of the applicant's performance trajectory over time.
- 5.12 The ASPC will give consideration to the performance expectations for the level to which the applicant is applying. The applicant will be required to give the ASPC confidence that they have the capacity to sustain this level of performance.

6 Promotion to Level B

- 6.1 Level A academic staff members are eligible to apply for promotion to Level B.
- 6.2 In order to achieve promotion to Level B, applicants are required *to demonstrate a capacity to make a significant overall contribution evidenced by a valuable contribution in their current position.*

7 Promotion to Level C

- 7.1 Level B academic staff members are eligible to apply for promotion to Level C. In order to achieve promotion to Level C, applicants are required *to demonstrate academic excellence, evidenced by a significant overall contribution in their substantial work activities.* Very significant performance in one category of activity, may compensate for lesser achievement in another category of activity provided this is agreed and acknowledged by the Head of School or equivalent as it may reflect a shift in workload allocation output and impact

Applicants will be expected to demonstrate an active record of scholarly achievement in their discipline.

Applicants must also demonstrate a capacity to make a significant contribution to internal

service to the University by contributing to activities of the College/Division in which they are employed.

8 Promotion to Level D

8.1 Level C academic staff members are eligible to apply for promotion to Level D.

8.2 In order to achieve promotion to Level D, applicants are required *to demonstrate excellent academic merit, evidenced by a very significant overall contribution in the categories of academic activity in which they are involved.*

The *very significant overall contribution* required for promotion to Level D will normally be accompanied and demonstrated by an outstanding reputation at a national or international level.

Applicants must also provide evidence of leadership and its impact in academic thought leadership and broader academic leadership (both within and outside the University).

Outstanding performance in one category of activity, may compensate for lesser achievement in another category of activity provided this is agreed and acknowledged by the Head of School or equivalent as it may reflect a shift in workload allocation output and impact.

9 Promotion to Level E

9.1 Level D academic staff members are eligible to apply for promotion to Level E.

9.2 In order to achieve promotion to Level E, applicants are required to *demonstrate outstanding academic merit, evidenced by an outstanding overall contribution to: research; learning and teaching; community engagement and professional service; and internal service to the University.*

The *outstanding overall contribution* required for promotion to Level E will normally be accompanied and demonstrated by an outstanding reputation at an international level.

Applicants must also provide evidence of extensive leadership contributions and its impact in academic thought leadership and broader academic leadership (both within and outside the University).

It is recognised that few individuals will have outstanding achievements in all four areas of activity. Extraordinary achievements in one category of activity, may compensate for lesser achievement in another provided this is agreed and acknowledged by the Head of School/or equivalent as it may reflect a shift in workload allocation output and impact.

10 Applications and Head Reports

10.1 Format

Intending applicants must submit an Expression of Intent to Apply for Promotion to the ASPC prior to the closing date published when the Chair of the ASPC announces the opening of the current academic promotion round.

Applicants must submit written applications with the information specified and in the format indicated in the *Academic Staff Promotions Procedure* by the deadline specified.

Applicants are entitled to update their applications with information on new activities and achievements up until an annual date to be determined by the ASPC and publicised by Human Resources as part of the promotions timetable.

10.2 Head of School or Equivalent's Report

The relevant Head of School or equivalent will provide a written report on the applicant's performance, including progression over time, and a statement of the activities and achievements relative to disciplinary norms.

Heads are encouraged to consult with relevant senior colleagues when writing their report.

Advice for Heads is contained in *Academic Staff Promotions Guidance for Applicants and Heads*.

The Head's report is to be submitted as part of the application for promotion.

The Head must also provide confirmation of the accuracy of the application materials, including specific endorsement of the summary of eValuate reports (or equivalent) and the applicant's stated workload allocation. The Head must also provide narrative confirming workload allocations and provide specific detail where:

- a claim for promotion is based on a non-standard academic workload allocation;
- there is a significant variance between the agreed workload allocation and the claims made by the applicant; and/or
- there has been any informal variance to an applicant's workload.

The applicant may apply to have another senior staff member carry out the duties of Head or Executive Dean/ Pro Vice-Chancellor/Head of Division where relevant as specified in this policy. Requests to use a substitute must be approved by the Chair of the ASPC prior to the submission of applications, and will be considered in light of advice from the relevant Executive Dean/ Pro Vice-Chancellor/Head of Division and Head of School or equivalent. Any such substitute must have the capacity to provide all the information specified in this policy and will undertake all responsibilities of the Head, Executive Dean/ Pro Vice-Chancellor/Head of Division as prescribed in this policy.

The applicant's Head may apply to the Chair of the ASPC to stand down from the duties of Head. Such requests will be considered in light of advice from the relevant Executive Dean/ Pro Vice-Chancellor/Head of Division and the capacity to identify a suitable alternative person to carry out the duties of Head.

If the Head is the applicant for promotion, the Head's responsibilities will be undertaken by the Executive Dean/ Pro Vice-Chancellor/Head of Division.

10.3 Executive Dean/ Pro Vice-Chancellor/Head of Division's Report

All applications to Level B or C must be signed by the relevant Executive Dean/ Pro Vice-Chancellor/Head of Division to signify that they have sighted the application and have had the opportunity to provide advice.

For applications to Level D or E, the relevant Executive Dean/ Pro Vice-Chancellor/Head of Division must provide a written report on the applicant's performance, including progression over time, a statement of the activities and achievements relative to disciplinary norms and an assessment of the contributions to University and College/Division strategic priorities. The Executive Dean/ Pro Vice-Chancellor/Head of Division's report is to be submitted as part of the application for promotion.

Executive Deans/ Pro Vice-Chancellors/Heads of Division are encouraged to consult with relevant senior colleagues when preparing their report. Advice for Executive Deans/ Pro Vice-Chancellors/Heads of Division is contained in *Academic Staff Promotions Guidance for Applicants and Heads*.

10.4 Independent Assessors

Independent Assessors are expected to be impartial and objective advisors to the ASPC. They are expected to provide a balanced view of the applicant's achievements and worthiness for promotion at the University of Tasmania, and not to act merely as advocates for the applicant. Independent Assessors will be asked to provide contextual advice to assist in judging the applicant's performance against disciplinary norms.

Independent Assessors are not required for applicants for promotion to Level B and Level C.

Applicants for promotion to Level D and to Level E are required to submit the names of two Independent Assessors that are not employed at the University and that the applicant can declare there is no conflict of interest. Applicants are expected to check with their Head to make sure any recommendations for Independent Assessors do not involve conflicts of interest.

For all Level D and E applicants, additional Independent Assessors will be identified on the advice of the Head or other appropriate advisor.

The applicant should seek written comments from Independent Assessors or make contact with Independent Assessors regarding the promotion process, excepting to request their availability to provide an assessment.

The ASPC will take reasonable steps to contact external Independent Assessors. Alternative Independent Assessors may be sought where the identified person is not available.

It is incumbent upon the applicant and the Head to provide appropriate, conflict free and available Independent Assessors.

The ASPC has the right to identify the need for and solicit further written advice from any persons with relevant expertise who may be internal or external to the University in relation to an application for promotion.

Members of the ASPC cannot act as Independent Assessors for applicants.

11 Academic Staff Promotions Committee

The primary role of the ASPC is to consider applications for promotion and to make recommendations to the Vice-Chancellor.

All applications will be considered by the ASPC, which will be responsible for:

- Seeking reports from independent assessors
- Considering all relevant evidence
- Recommending to the Vice-Chancellor those applicants deemed worthy of promotion or accelerated progression
- Formulating feedback to unsuccessful applicants.

The ASPC may consider any written information from any source to assist it in making a decision.

The ASPC comprises academic staff members with Level E appointments and has the following membership:

Provost	<i>Ex officio</i> – [Chair]
Chair, Academic Senate	<i>Ex officio</i> [Deputy Chair]
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching)	<i>Ex officio</i>
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)	<i>Ex officio</i> For consideration of applications for promotion to Level D and Level E only
One person from the Australian Maritime College, Menzies Institute for Medical Research or the Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies as University institutes	
One person from each of the Colleges of the University	
One external member from another university	For consideration of applications for promotion to Level E only
Vice-Chancellor	May choose to sit as a full member of the ASPC for consideration of applications for promotion to Level E

Note that except in exceptional circumstances the membership of the ASPC will remain stable.

The composition of the ASPC will always be such that it includes expertise in both research and learning and teaching.

With the exception of the *ex officio* positions, the term of office of members of the ASPC shall remain for a period of at least 5 years, and a review then be undertaken.

Representation will be based on agreed organisational units as defined by the Ordinance 14 – Academic Structure.

Six members of the ASPC, including at least one of the Provost, Chair of Academic Senate, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) and Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching), constitute a quorum.

In accordance with Council's resolution on gender balance on committees, the ASPC will not meet as a single gender committee.

The proceedings of the ASPC will be strictly confidential. All materials and deliberations relating to academic promotion applications will be treated in the strictest confidence by all participants in the promotions process. ASPC members must not discuss applications, recommendations and deliberations outside of Committee meetings.

When a member of the ASPC is the supervisor/performance manager of an applicant they will not take part in the deliberations concerning the applicant.

A member of the ASPC cannot be an alternate representative for an applicant.

The ASPC will make its recommendations based on the application, Head's report, Executive Dean/ Pro Vice-Chancellor/Head of Division's report (where relevant), Independent Assessor's reports if deemed sufficiently independent of the applicant, any written information and, where relevant, the interview.

The ASPC must act fairly and without bias. Members of the ASPC must be vigilant in identifying possible conflicts of interest. Where there is a possible conflict of interest, the relevant member of the ASPC must declare this to the Chair. The Chair will determine the appropriate action. Where there is a significant conflict of interest, the relevant member(s) of ASPC will absent themselves from discussion and determination of the particular application.

The ASPC will provide Unconscious Bias training for the Committee each year of sitting. The Committee must have a majority of members trained in unconscious bias awareness in order to proceed with the current round's assessment.

The ASPC must follow the *Academic Staff Promotions Policy* and the *Academic Staff Promotions Procedure* strictly.

Where the ASPC is not certain of the merit of an application, it must provide the applicant with an opportunity to respond to its concerns, normally during an interview.

12. Interviews

The ASPC will not interview applicants for promotion to Level B or C.

The ASPC will interview all applicants for promotion to Level D and Level E.

To be considered for promotion, applicants must be available to attend interviews and the Heads of Schools or equivalent and Executive Deans/ Pro Vice-Chancellors/Heads of Division must attend in person, interviews will not be carried out in absentia. If an applicant is unable to attend an interview in person, they must attend using video conferencing or skype or similar technology.

When the ASPC interviews an applicant, the relevant Executive Dean/Pro Vice-Chancellor/ Head of Division and Head of School or equivalent will be invited to attend the meeting of the ASPC while an applicant from that School speaks with the Committee and when the application is being discussed. The Executive Dean/Pro Vice-Chancellor/ Head of Division and Head are entitled to participate in preliminary discussions but are not permitted to be present during the final discussion.

For the sake of clarity, if the Head and Executive Dean/ Pro Vice-Chancellor/Head of Division is the same person, it is only that person that attends the interview.

13. Recommendations of the Academic Staff Promotions Committee

The ASPC will forward its recommendations to the Vice-Chancellor for approval. Formal notice of the Vice-Chancellor's decision will be conveyed to all applicants.

Unsuccessful applicants will have the opportunity for individual feedback from the Chair (or delegated member of the ASPC) at the conclusion of the round. To assist the staff member, their Head will also be present so as to ensure a consistent understanding as to the reasons why and to enable a consolidated approach for any future applications.

14. Review of Recommendations of the Academic Staff Promotions Committee

Unsuccessful applicants may request that the ASPC's recommendation is reconsidered on the basis of procedural error; that is failure to comply with the *Academic Staff Promotions Policy* or the *Academic Staff Promotions Procedure*.

Requests cannot be based on an applicant's disagreement with the ASPC's views about the merit of their application.

- 14.1 Written requests for review must be submitted to the Vice-Chancellor through Human Resources within 14 days of the applicant being formally advised that their application has been unsuccessful. The request must specify clearly the details of the alleged procedural error and provide any available evidence to support the allegation.
- 14.2 Before seeking such a review, the unsuccessful applicant must consult with the Chair of the ASPC.
- 14.3 Applications under review will be heard by the Academic Staff Promotions Review Committee (ASPRC). The ASPRC is constituted as follows:
 - A chairperson appointed by the Vice-Chancellor;
 - A nominee of the Vice-Chancellor; and
 - An employee elected by the academic staff of the University.
- 14.4 The Panel will first assess if a procedural error has occurred before requesting any further advice from the Chair of the ASPC or applicant.
- 14.5 If the Panel assesses in the first instance that the claim is based on decision and not process, the Panel can make a recommendation to the Vice-Chancellor without the requirement to seek a report from the Chair and undertake any further review. In this instance, the applicant will be advised of the Panel's determination described in 14.7 below.
- 14.6 Where the ASPRC assesses in the first instance that there is a procedural error at question, then as part of its review process the ASPRC will seek a written report from the Chair of the ASPC on matters relevant to the application under review and relating to the alleged procedural error. The ASPRC will also invite the applicant to respond in writing to the ASPRC's summary assessment of the appeal.
- 14.7 Following its review, the ASPRC will provide a written report to the Vice-Chancellor outlining its findings and recommendation(s), with copies of that report being provided simultaneously to the applicant and to the Chair of the ASPC. In reviewing a recommendation of the ASPC, it will be open to the ASPRC to recommend that the Vice-Chancellor accept or overturn the recommendation or, alternatively, remit the application for promotion to the ASPC to address any procedural errors.
- 14.8 The decision of the Vice-Chancellor arising from a review is final.

15. Definitions and Acronyms

Accelerated Progression	Progression at a faster than normal rate within the current level where performance has been meritorious but insufficient to justify promotion to the next level
ASPC	Academic Staff Promotions Committee
ASPRC	Academic Staff Promotions Review Committee
Category of Activity	One of: research; learning and teaching; community engagement and professional service; or internal service to the University
eValueate	University of Tasmania online student feedback system
Head	The applicant's Head of School or equivalent Head of Faculty, Centre or Institute
NCVER	National Centre for Vocational Education Research
HDR	Higher Degree by Research
SETL	Student Evaluation of Teaching and Learning
VET	Vocational Education and Training
WARP	Web Access Research Portal

16. Supporting Documentation

- *Open to Talent: Strategic Plan 2012-Onwards*
- *Academic Staff Promotions Procedure*
- *Academic Staff Promotions Guidance for Applicants and Heads*
- *Heads of School Policy*
- *Academic Staff Workloads – Guidelines*
- *Conflict of Interest Policy*
- *Individual Faculty and Institute Workload Guidelines: refer <https://secure.utas.edu.au/academic-workload-models>*
- *Opening UTAS to Talent: The UTAS Academic*
- *The Role of the Professor at UTAS*
- *University of Tasmania Staff Agreement 2013-2016*
- *University Records Management Policy, Procedures and Guidelines*

17. Versioning

Former Version(s)	<p>Version 1 – <i>Academic Promotions Policy</i> (approved by Council 11/04/2008 resolution no. 08/2/29)</p> <p>Version 2 – <i>Academic Promotions Policy</i> (approved by Council 03/04/2009 resolution no. 09/2/29)</p> <p>Version 3 – <i>Academic Promotions Policy</i> (approved by Council 16/04/2010 resolution no. 10/2/35)</p> <p>Version 4 – <i>Academic Promotions Policy</i> (minor amendments approved by Director, Governance and Legal, May 2011)</p> <p>Version 5 – <i>Academic Promotions Policy</i> (minor amendments approved by Vice-Chancellor, April 2012)</p> <p>Version 6 – <i>Academic Promotions Policy</i> (minor amendments approved by Provost, May 2012)</p> <p>Version 7 – <i>Academic Staff Promotions Policy</i> (approved by Vice-Chancellor, March 2013)</p> <p>Version 8 – <i>Academic Staff Promotions Policy</i> (approved by Vice-Chancellor, May 2014)</p> <p>Version 9 – <i>Academic Staff Promotions Policy</i> (minor amendments approved by Vice-Chancellor, April 2015)</p> <p>Version 10 – <i>Academic Staff Promotions Policy</i> (minor amendments approved by Vice-Chancellor, July 2017)</p>
Current Version	Version 11 – <i>Academic Staff Promotions Policy</i> (minor amendments approved by Vice-Chancellor, XXX 2018)