

## **Guidance about the Year 3 UAF Probationary Review Process:**

### **Your Objectives:**

- The UAF probationary expectations were adjusted last year (2016) to align with our new academic promotions criteria. Therefore, UAF colleagues are not expected to demonstrate evidence beyond that of other academic colleagues seeking promotion to Associate Professor at the end of the 5 year probationary period (or earlier, where appropriate).
- It is anticipated that the broad wording provided in the probationary objectives template will have been customised in discussion with you to reflect the nature of your discipline and specific skills/experience.
- If you are still working to the generic wording of the probationary template or are unclear about your objectives it is important to seek clarification on these matters well in advance of the third year review. When selecting the 'optional' criteria, it is worth focusing on 3 or 4 where there has been a significant contribution

### **Your Probationary Report:**

- This is the narrative that you will supply to provide a commentary on how you are progressing in relation to the Year 3 probationary expectations. A template proforma will be provided for you to complete. You will also be asked to provide an up to date CV which can list conferences, publications, grant income etc. There is a template Academic CV available [here](#) but you are not required to use this if you already have one.
- The report that you submit should state the specific objectives agreed by you and your manager, quoting the relevant probation/promotion criteria number from the original template for the purposes of cross referencing. You may feel that you can evidence some Year 5 objectives and you may wish to present this evidence in your report so that the objective can be 'signed off'.
- Written submissions should be concise – the narrative in the probation submission should not exceed 6 sides of A4.
- You do not need to provide evidence such as email correspondence of invitations to speak at conferences, editorial board membership. However, a short statement indicating the context, scale and impact of activities is helpful eg size of the conference, national or international etc.
- You can cross reference to the CV that you supply in order to keep the main document succinct. However, as above, where it would be helpful to elaborate on the significance or scale of a particular achievement cited in your CV, please do so.
- The written submission should be selective - the probationary reviewers do not need to know about everything you have done over the past 3 years and the inclusion of relatively low level activity may dilute the impact of your submission.

- Where a piece of work has been particularly challenging, complex or high impact, it can be cited as evidence for more than one of the criteria eg leadership and research outputs. It is important to articulate the way in which the project/activity meets the specific criteria.
- When considering evidence to include in relation to student education, it is worth looking at the UKPSF (UK Professional Skills Framework) requirements for HEA Fellowship. If you are starting to compile evidence for that, it may well be relevant to include in the probationary submission too.
- You may also find the guidance provided on the HR pages regarding some of the types of evidence that can be used to support applications for academic promotions helpful in thinking about examples that you can include in your probationary review:  
[http://hr.leeds.ac.uk/info/8/promotions/299/promotions\\_process](http://hr.leeds.ac.uk/info/8/promotions/299/promotions_process)
- Instead of providing lots of individual pieces of information, consider ways of presenting outcomes in summary eg graphs, tables, quotes from feedback etc.
- Where you feel there are gaps in the evidence you can supply in relation to probationary criteria eg PGR progression, income generation, ensure that you provide any relevant narrative in terms of the context for this and indicate, where possible, what steps you have in place to remedy the issue.
- Talk through your written submission with your mentor and/or a colleague to identify any points that need clarifying, strengthening etc.
- The probationary submission will be explored further at the meeting so there will be an opportunity to expand on/discuss the work that you have been doing. The probationary reviewers will be looking for as much evidence as they can to strengthen your case and give you useful feedback. The process is designed to be developmental and give you a 'sense check' of where you are, not to catch you out!

### **The Probationary Review Meeting:**

- It is suggested that the probationary review meeting takes place between yourself, your Head of School and a Faculty Pro-Dean (ideally from outside your School to provide a cross faculty perspective).
- If it would be beneficial to have additional people in the meeting eg a probationary adviser where different from the Head of School, this can be agreed on a case by case basis.
- The purpose of the review meeting is to have an informed conversation about your progress, probationary report etc without it becoming an overly formal panel interview. It is therefore important that those best placed to review and advise on your submission before making a recommendation to the Dean are involved in the discussion.
- You will be sent details of who will be taking part in your probationary review meeting well in advance of the conversation. If there is anyone else that you feel should be involved, or you have any concerns, it is important to contact your HR Manager as soon as possible.

- It is not recommended that the mentor is part of this process. The role of the mentor is to provide you with informal advice, guidance and feedback rather than make a formal assessment of your performance. The mentor can be a useful resource in preparing your written submission or prompting you to consider areas for further development but would not usually be expected to participate in the probationary review.

**Process and Timescales:**

- You will be contacted by a member of staff from your Faculty HR Office at least 3 months before the end of your third year. The HR team member will confirm who will be conducting your probationary review and provide you with the probationary review form to complete.
- You will be required to submit the probationary review documentation at least 2 weeks before the review meeting.
- The probationary review meeting will take place prior to the end of your third year (where possible) and you will receive a written outcome of your third year probation within 4 weeks of the review meeting.
- It is anticipated that there are 4 potential outcomes from your review:
  1. You are deemed to have exceeded the Year 3 probationary expectations and are on track for early progression to Associate Professor. An action plan and timescales may be set for reviewing readiness to progress before the end of the 5 year probation.
  2. You are deemed to have met the Year 3 probationary expectations and are on course for successful completion of the probationary period at Year 5.
  3. You are largely on track with your probationary objectives with some minor omissions which it is anticipated can be signed off within the next 6 months pending confirmation of achievement.
  4. You have made insufficient progress across a number of probationary criteria and are not on track to meet the 5 year probationary expectations. In these instances a follow up meeting would be arranged to consider any actions and support that can be put in place to enable the required improvements to be made. The resulting action plan would be kept under regular review.