Academic Promotions Report 2020/21

1 Introduction

This report summarises the work of the Academic Promotions Committee, and the People and Organisational Effectiveness team that supports it, over the last 12 months. Year-on-year trends have also been included where available.

Further, this report describes other changes to promotions processes, criteria and practice.

2 Academic Promotions

2.1 Trends in promotions applications

The sharp increase in promotion application seen between 2015/16 and 2018/19 now seems to have levelled off, with numbers approximately stable for the last three years. Appendix 1 looks at how the number of applications relate to the ‘eligible pool’ of academics in recent years.

2.2 Executive summary of academic promotions data

The full data on academic promotions is presented in Appendix 1. Observations are summarised here for brevity.

Promotion cases progress from application to prima-facie stage, to final outcome, and so bar charts are presented comparing these stages.

2.2.1 Case type

Cases can lead on one of Teaching, Research, or Academic Leadership and Engagement, or they can be Balanced across two or three of these domains; contribution is required in all three domains (other than where staff are on teaching or research-focussed contracts and are not required to carry out research or teaching respectively).

• In 2020/21, similar to 2019/20, there was quite an even split between Balanced and Research-led cases.
• The success rate is even this year between the two largest case types.

See Appendix 1, section A1.1.

2.2.2 Analysis by Equality, Diversity and Inclusion factors

EDI statistics are presented in Appendix 1, section A1.2. These compare numbers of cases by protected characteristic at each stage of the promotion process. New data sets are included this year for age, intersectionality (by ethnicity and gender) and part time/full time post holder analysis.

No investigation has been undertaken into the underlying reasons for any of these observations as part of the production of this report; this data has been shared with the teams working on Athena SWAN and Gender Pay Gap.

2.2.2.1 Gender data

In 2020/21, as with 2019/20, there is a clear trend that once they enter the promotions process, female candidates are more successful than male candidates at progressing to the prima-facie stage and more successful ultimately.

In 2020/21, a higher proportion of promotion applicants were women than of the eligible pool. The proportion of successful candidates that are female is also greater than the proportion of the eligible pool that is female. However, when looking at SL promotions in isolation, a lower proportion of applications were from women compared to the eligible pool.

2.2.2.2 Ethnicity data

In 2020/21, BAME staff applied for promotion in approximately the same proportion as in the eligible pool, progressed and were ultimately successful in line with this. The number of BAME staff applying for promotion to Chair was a higher proportion that the eligible pool but this dropped for Reader and Senior Lecturer, or equivalent, applications. This observation will continue to be monitored; the number of BAME applications received is an increase from 2019/20 and the level of successful outcomes has risen sharply since 2019/20.

2.2.2.3 Disability data

Numbers of staff with a known disability are small in the eligible pool, and this is reflected in the promotions process.

In 2020/21 overall applications from disabled staff were in line with the proportion of disabled staff within the eligible pool. Successful outcomes were lower than the eligible pool proportion at Senior Lecturer, or equivalent, level and Reader but exceeded the eligible pool proportion at Chair level.

2.2.2.4 Age

This is a newly introduced category for EDI analysis in 2020/21. The data demonstrates that the majority of academic promotion cases are received from the 30-50 year old category with a slightly higher success rate demonstrated for this age category also.
2.2.2.5 Intersectionality (Ethnicity and Gender)

This is a newly introduced category for EDI analysis in 2020/21. The data shows BAME female applications are approximately in line with the eligible pool (6% applications, versus 5% of pool). Similarly, to other protected characteristics, there is over-representation in Chair promotions and under-representation in SL promotions.

2.2.2.6 Part time/full time analysis

This is a newly introduced category for analysis in 2020/21. Applications from part time staff are lower than the eligible pool (6% versus 13%) however a degree of caution needs to be taken regarding the validity of the eligible pool data as no distinction is made between staff who work part-time in totality (either since appointment or following a flexible working request, for example) and staff who work part-time for Lancaster because they also work for another employer (another HEI or a business) or because they are flexibly retired. 100% of applications from part-time staff were successful in 2020/21.
3 Professorial Review

3.1 Trends in Professorial Review applications

2020/21 was the second year when both types of applications (in-band and between band movement) were permitted within the same round. The numbers have now started to stabilise to what is expected to be a more typical level now, after a bumper year in 2019/20 (a two-year in-band cohort and a one-year between-band cohort).

3.2 Executive summary of professorial review data

The full data on professorial review is presented in Appendix 2. Observations are summarised here for brevity.

3.2.1 Analysis by Equality, Diversity and Inclusion factors (between band promotions)

3.2.1.1 Gender data

Women comprise a much larger proportion of between-band promotion applications (56%), compared to the eligible pool (30%). Their progression through the process, through to successful promotion, is in line with the proportion of applications.

The three-year trend data shows that while overall numbers of applications is down, the number of successful female promotion cases is trending upwards.

3.2.1.2 Ethnicity data

There were not applications (of the 16 cases received) from BAME applicants in 2020/21. This compares to 2 and 1 applications in the previous two years respectively.

3.2.1.3 Disability data

There were two applications from candidates with a declared disability in 2020/21 (12% of applications), which is a higher proportion than the eligible pool (7%). The successful proportion (one candidate, 8%) is also greater than the proportion in the eligible pool (although it should be noted that numbers are very small).

3.2.1.4 Age data

Applications and successful cases skew towards candidates aged over 50, compared to those under 50.
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3.2.2 Analysis by Equality, Diversity and Inclusion factors (in-band reviews)

3.2.2.1 Gender data

The proportion of women in the eligible pool (28.6%) compared to applied (26.9%) and successful cases (27.6%) is very consistent through the process.

3.2.2.2 Ethnicity data

Numbers of BAME staff are small in the eligible pool (7%); the numbers are marginally higher amongst applicants (12%) and successful cases (10%).

3.2.2.3 Disability data

The proportion of disabled staff in the eligible pool (7%) compared to applied (8%) and successful cases (10%) is very consistent through the process (numbers are very small).

3.2.2.4 Age data

Applications and successful in-band reviews skew towards under 50s, in direct contrast to between-band promotions.

This is the first year the data has been collated so it is unclear whether this is a sustained trend.

4 Retention cases

During 2020/21, a small number of retention cases were considered in line with the University’s Recruitment and Retention Policy, and reported through to Academic Promotions Committee.

The number of cases approved was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FASS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FST</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUMS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A promotion is not requested in every case; where the retention case resulted in a promotion in 2020/21, this is indicated in brackets.
5 Changes for 2021/22

5.1 Academic Promotions Criteria Change

A new pillar dedicated to Engagement has been introduced to the academic promotions criteria. It has replaced the pillar for academic leadership and engagement. Leadership has been embedded across the three pillars of research, teaching and engagement and contributions to effective leadership in each of the three are recognised in the updated criteria.

Information, training and support on the roll out of the new criteria will be provided within the Making Professor, HoD induction and Faculty/Department sessions planned for the next academic year.

5.2 Online Promotions System

The Reward team are currently working with an existing University supplier (Stonefish, providers of the recruitment system) to introduce an online promotions application system ready for the 2021/22 promotions cycle. The development of the system is now complete and the system is live for 2021/22 promotion applications.

The system is in use for Academic Promotion applications to SL/equivalent, Reader and Chair, but not for Grade 8 or Professorial applications; these may be introduced for 2022/23 along with other process efficiencies identified throughout the course of the next year.

5.3 Improvements to the Guidance Document

Improvements to the guidance documents have been made for the launch of the 2021/22 promotions cycle. These have been updated with feedback received from the Academic Promotions Sub-Committees, candidates and Head of Departments, and cover topics such as new Engagement criteria, references, and the new application system.

5.4 Faculty role in applications flow

An additional stage has been created between the completion of the case by the candidate and HoD, and the consideration by the Committee, where the Dean will consider the spread of cases that have come forward, has the opportunity to enquire as to any apparent omissions, and to check that individual cases are prepared to the standard required by the Committee.

6 Other developments

6.1 Covid statement

The statement recognising the impact of Covid on promotion applicants was used in 2020/21 and will continue to be used in 2021/22 and as long as required. This is there to reassure applicants that their case will not be disadvantaged by factors outside of their control that have affected their academic work since the start of the pandemic.
6.2 Additional Support

In order that staff feel supported through the proposed changes this year various workshops and collaborative events have been held.

Making Professor – the Whole Journey was an event aimed at academics at all stages of their careers, combining keynote speakers with practical workshops on how to compile a promotion case. It received positive feedback from attendees.

In addition, a follow up event (Engagement promotions criteria: myth-busting session) was organised specifically focussing on the new Engagement criteria.

To aid the launch of the online applicant system for academic promotions this year, various stakeholder demonstration and consultation sessions have been held in the lead up to the launch. These sessions have provided valuable feedback which has helped inform and shape the final look and feel of the system.

In addition, a workshop has been held recently, Developing Lancaster’s Pathways, which focussed on academics currently on Teaching & Scholarship contracts and how they can develop their academic career pathways.

Andrea Ferguson, HR Advisor – Reward

Ben Dobson, Reward and Resourcing Manager

20 October 2021
Appendix 1: Academic Promotions data

A1.1 Analysis by case type

The numbers of cases from the four main case types, or promotion routes, are given below.
A1.1.1 Notes

- The three-year trend is towards research-led applications, and away from Balanced cases; both of these types far exceed teaching-led or ALE-led still, which have changed little. A greater proportion of the balanced cases this year were successful, compared to the R-led ones, which is the opposite to last year.

- R-led dominated in 2020/21 for Chairs, but for SLs more were balanced.

- However, in 2020/21 all ALE-Led and all T-Led applications were successful. For the other case types, the majority of declined cases came at the prima facie stage.
A1.1.2 Applications and promotions by Faculty

![Graph showing promotion applications by Faculty by year.]

A1.1.3 Notes

- The three-year trend is for growth in numbers from FST and FASS, and a decline from LUMS.
A1.2 Analysis by Equality, Diversity and Inclusion factors

A1.2.1 2020-21 Gender Data

The above shows that women are a higher proportion of applications than the eligible pool, and then through the process are proportionately more likely to be successful than men.

The overall trend noted above for all promotions is particularly noticeable for Chair promotions.

---

1 Eligible pool for SL/equiv is all academic staff in Grade 8, for Reader it is Grade 9 academic staff who are not already a Reader, for Chair it is all Grade 9 academic staff.
For SL promotions this year, women were under-represented in applications compared to the eligible pool (38% versus 43%) but then progressed through process at a very similar proportion to their male counterparts.

A1.2.2 2020-21 Ethnicity Data

Overall, rate of applications and progress through the process is very similar between BAME and non-BAME staff.
Application rates for SL promotion are lower for BAME staff (16% of applications versus 22% of the eligible pool), and this fell further to 14% of promotions awarded. This is the opposite pattern to Chair promotions.
2020-21 Disability Data

### All Promotions - Disability

- **Successful**: 5 (Disabled), 69 (Not Disabled), 1 (Not Known)
- **Prima Facie**: 5 (Disabled), 73 (Not Disabled), 1 (Not Known)
- **Applied**: 7 (Disabled), 90 (Not Disabled), 2 (Not Known)
- **Eligible**: 58 (Disabled), 810 (Not Disabled), 26 (Not Known)

### Promotions to Chair - Disability

- **Successful**: 3 (Disabled), 16 (Not Disabled), 0 (Not Known)
- **Prima Facie**: 3 (Disabled), 18 (Not Disabled), 0 (Not Known)
- **Applied**: 4 (Disabled), 28 (Not Disabled), 0 (Not Known)
- **Eligible**: 21 (Disabled), 276 (Not Disabled), 12 (Not Known)

### Promotions to Reader - Disability

- **Successful**: 5 (Disabled), 1 (Not Disabled), 0 (Not Known)
- **Prima Facie**: 5 (Disabled), 1 (Not Disabled), 0 (Not Known)
- **Applied**: 1 (Disabled), 9 (Not Disabled), 1 (Not Known)
- **Eligible**: 20 (Disabled), 244 (Not Disabled), 9 (Not Known)
A1.2.3.1 Notes on disability stats

- Disability figures follow a similar pattern to the ethnicity figures this year: the overall pattern is approximately in line with the eligible pool, but Chair promotions move to the right (towards greater success for disabled staff) and SL promotion move to the left.
- Numbers are very small however.

A1.2.4 2020-21 Age Data

This is a new analysis for 2020/21 as proposed by EDI and Athena Swan colleagues.

Younger staff make up a greater proportion of applications than of the eligible pool, but then progression through the process is approximately proportionate.
Promotions to Reader - Age

Promotions to Senior Lecturer - Age
A1.2.5 2020-21 Intersectionality Data (Ethnicity & Gender)

This is a new analysis for 2020/21, in line with the Athena Swan action to monitor promotions for female BAME staff.

In the graphs below, BAME and non-BAME are depicted blue and orange, with the darker shading representing women and the paler men.

BAME female applications are approximately in line with the eligible pool (6% applications, versus 5% of pool).
Similarly, to other protected characteristics, there is over-representation in Chair promotions and under-representation in SL promotions.

**A1.2.6 Promotions by part-time or full-time**

This is a new analysis for 2020/21.

Note no distinction is made between staff who work part-time in totality (either since appointment or following a flexible working request, for example) and staff who work part-time for Lancaster because they also work for another employer (another HEI or a business) or because they are flexibly retired.

- Applications are lower than the eligible pool (6% versus 13%) however a degree of caution should be taken regarding the validity eligible pool for the reasons above.
- 100% of applications from part-time staff were successful.
Female applications and promotions have been largely stable for the last three years.

The low number of BAME promotions in 2019-20 appears to have been an outlier.²

Numbers of declared disabilities remain very low, but applications and promotions are fairly stable.

² Unknowns have been discounted on the ethnicity and disability graphs for clarity.
Appendix 2: Analysis of 2020/21 Professorial Review

A2.1 Application trends by year

2019/20 was the first year when both types of applications (in-band and between band movement) were permitted within the same round, this led to more applications in 2019/20. As predicted, the pattern of applications appears to be settling in 2020/21 and this number is expected to level off going forward.

A2.1.1 Analysis of 2020/21 Professorial Review

For 2020/21, there are applications for both in-band progression (increase of salary without changing bands) and for promotion between bands, data on both is presented.
A2.2  Analysis by Equality, Diversity and Inclusion factors

A2.2.1 2020/21 Gender Data

Whilst the graph above shows two unsuccessful male and two unsuccessful female candidates at prima facie stage, these cases were referred to the in-band review and were awarded at least one increment within Band 1. These outcomes are reflected within the in-band progression data later within the report.

- Women are over-represented in applications, compared to the eligible pool (apart from Band 3 promotions).
- The Band 3 promotion data is challenging to interpret as there was only one male applicant this year.
• Progression from prima facie to successful stage is proportionate (across Band 2 Promotions and all Professorial Promotions).

• Women comprise more of the overall successful candidates than they do of the eligible pool (apart from at Band 3 Promotion).

A2.2.2 Three-year gender data

![Applications and promotions by gender by year](image)

• Applications are down for men and women this year compared to the last two years, but a higher proportion are successful.

• There is an upward trend (albeit with small numbers) of successful female cases.
- All Professorial promotion cases this year were from non-BAME applicants.

- Application numbers from BAME professors are very low and are decreasing (albeit only with three data points).
A2.2.5 2020/21 Disability Data

- The numbers are small; there were only two applications from candidates with a declared disability.

A2.2.6 Three-year disability data

- The numbers are very small and so hard to draw conclusions.
A2.2.7  2020/21 Age Data

This is a new analysis for 2020/21.

- Professorial promotions do appear to skew towards older applicants from this data.
A2.3 2020/21 Professorial In-Band Review EDI graphs

A2.3.1 2020/21 Professorial In-Band Gender Data

- The figures shown above show a higher number of successful cases at in-band review than applications. This is due to four candidates applying for Promotion to Band 2 but the committee awarding increments within Band 1 instead.

- The proportion of men and women is fairly consistent through the process.

A2.3.2 2020/21 Professorial In-Band Ethnicity Data

- The numbers are small, but the proportion of BAME staff applying is greater than in the eligible pool.
A2.3.3 2020/21 Professorial In-Band Disability Data

- Numbers are small but the proportion of applications is approximately in line with the eligible pool, and of successful cases.

A2.3.4 2020/21 Professorial In-Band Age Data

- At In-Band Review, a higher proportion of age 30-50 candidates applied and were successful in being awarded at least one increment than the eligibility pool representation. In contrast to band promotion, in-band movement seems to skew towards younger applicants.