

Promotion to Professor 1

The Promotion Profile and Promotion Procedure have been revised, based on an evaluation and in consultation with the deans. This document was adopted by the Executive Board in November 2023.

Professor 1 Promotion Profile2

Promotion Procedure4

Annexes:

1. TRIPLE model8
2. UU Leadership Profile10
3. Examples of forms of evidence to include in the narrative11
4. Mandate from the Executive Board to the University Promotions Committee12

Professor 1 Promotion Profile

Effective date: 1 August 2021, revised in November 2023.

A Professor 1 (HL1) is a role model and figurehead for Utrecht University and is recognised and acknowledged as such by others, as evidenced by positions, appointments and roles. An HL1 has been a professor for a long time and **meets all the criteria for Professor 1 and 2** according to the University Job Classification (UFO) system and the Development and Careers Framework for all UU staff (FLOW).

Promotion to HL1 is **not an automatic career step** for every professor, even if the professor receives excellent performance reviews and/or is accepted to a managerial role.¹

The assessment by the Executive Board will be based on long-term² above-average performance³ (a proven track record) and a demonstrated vision in the areas of Team Spirit, Leadership, Education, Research, Impact and Professional Performance (including patient care), in line with the **Utrecht TRIPLE model**.⁴ It is possible to have different focus areas within the profile – see the information on page 3 under 'Narrative'. Cooperation with others (team spirit) is the starting point and guiding principle for all areas.

To be considered for promotion to HL1, a candidate must stand out from other HL2 professors due to above-average performance in at least three areas, including, at a minimum, Leadership and Education, or Leadership and Research. The candidate must also be performing at a level appropriate to their position in the other areas. In all cases, candidates must hold a Senior Teaching Qualification (STQ) and a Senior University Research Qualification (SRQ). Candidates from the Faculty of Medicine must be able to demonstrate that they hold an 'STQ-equivalent' qualification.

Team Spirit

The university expects all staff members to show team spirit. It is the job of managers to effectively draw on the talents of their team or teams and to encourage cooperation and diversity in career paths. Team spirit is therefore a prerequisite for each and every HL1. An HL1 serves as an important role model, as an enthusiastic leader who facilitates demonstrably excellent team performance in education and research and enables impact by making optimum use of staff talents and encouraging diversification within teams. An HL1 makes a selfless contribution to the university as a whole, including beyond their own field of expertise, thereby helping to shape the UU community.

Leadership

An HL1 shows exemplary academic leadership:⁵ they are a role model for Utrecht University and are recognised and acknowledged as such by others within and/or beyond the faculty or university, as evidenced by positions, appointments and roles. To a greater extent than an HL2, an HL1 must have a clear and shared vision of their own field of study that aligns with the UU strategy. An HL1 must have delivered demonstrable performance, including in a team setting, within and beyond their own field of study, and must have made a contribution to the collective interests of Utrecht University.

As a *manager*, an HL1 has an open mind and a development-oriented attitude. An HL1 is also able to lead a group in a development-oriented way, and in that regard receives positive feedback from staff on the competences enshrined in the UU leadership profile. An HL1 ensures an open, safe

¹ As an indication, around 15 to 20% of all professors will move up to HL1 level.

² 'Long-term' means for several years at a minimum.

³ 'Above-average' means exceeding the usual level in the relevant field.

⁴ The TRIPLE model forms part of Utrecht University's vision of Recognition and Reward. See Annex 1.

⁵ The UU leadership profile comprises three levels: personal, organisational and strategic leadership. A prominent aspect thereof is the importance of reflection, open communication, a development-oriented attitude, appreciation of team achievements and the desire to contribute to the bigger picture. See Annex 2.

atmosphere within the groups in which they work. An HL1 has demonstrated their ability to manage other leaders and ensure team diversity, healthy succession and mobility.

An HL1 has responsibility for and is trusted to perform *managerial roles*, both for Utrecht University as a whole and outside the university. This could include leading national or international committees or programmes in one or more fields, thereby also raising the profile of Utrecht University. An HL1 is able to show how this will bring about change. An HL1 is demonstrably trustworthy and authoritative in the performance of their managerial duties within the international university community and takes a leading role in impact creation in the broadest sense.

Education

An HL1 is a nationally and internationally recognised authority, team player and role model with a proven track record (long-term performance and impact, including in a team setting) in education. To a greater extent than an HL2, an HL1 is able to inspire others and bring about change on a large scale. An HL1 leads by example during prominent national and international gatherings and in Bachelor's and Master's degree programmes. An HL1 has an impact not only on student learning but also on the competence of a large group of fellow teaching staff, not limited to Utrecht University. This is evident from roles, positions and results. The Senior Teaching Qualification (STQ) is a requirement for both HL2 and HL1. Professors who do not hold this qualification are not eligible for promotion to HL1. Candidates from the Faculty of Medicine must be able to demonstrate that they hold an 'STQ-equivalent' qualification.

Research

An HL1 is a nationally and internationally recognised authority, team player and role model with a proven track record (long-term performance and impact, including in a team setting) in research. To a greater extent than an HL2, an HL1 is able to inspire others and create impact on a large scale. This includes training, guiding and inspiring the next generation of academics. An HL1 must have dedicated themselves to research innovation over a long period of time and on a large scale. This specifically includes innovation in a team setting. This is evident from roles, positions and results. An HL1 acts as a figurehead for Utrecht University in prestigious international research programmes and at leading conferences, and their academic publications (open access whenever possible) are used and held in esteem by leading colleagues. The Senior University Research Qualification (SRQ) is a requirement for both HL2 and HL1. Professors who do not hold this qualification are not eligible for promotion to HL1.

Impact

According to the TRIPLE model, impact is about the way we work. It is an essential part of Utrecht University's open strategy and underlines our goal of improving the world together. An HL1 has an above-average proven track record: long-term outstanding performance and impact, including in a team setting. The high relevance and visibility of their teaching and research for science, society, government and business make an HL1 a role model for Utrecht University, both within academia and beyond. An HL1 uses their position to actively promote Open Science. An HL1 maintains an extensive network of key players within academia and beyond. This puts the HL1 in a pivotal position to foster the exchange of experience and ideas between science and society – a position they frequently utilise, including for the collective benefit of Utrecht University.

Professional Performance

The Professional Performance area encompasses duties and roles that fall outside research and teaching, but which nevertheless have a strong connection to the academic discipline, e.g. patient care or similar roles in professions within other fields. An HL1 holds prominent positions, including serving as a member or chair of national and international advisory boards and committees. Where applicable, an HL1 plays a leading role in professions adjacent to their own field of study. The university has made a strategic decision to have leading academics play these interconnecting roles. An HL1 thus strengthens interactions between education, research and impact, creating unique scientific and societal value.

Promotion Procedure

The procedure has three main steps: (1) in collaboration with the candidate, the dean prepares a promotion dossier and submits it to the Executive Board; (2) the Executive Board seeks advice from the University Promotions Committee, which assesses the substance of the dossier in accordance with the TRIPLE model; (3) the Executive Board makes a decision and communicates it to the candidate. Each of these steps is explained below.

1. Preparation of a promotion dossier

- If an HL2 thinks they might be eligible for promotion to HL1, they should discuss this with their manager, e.g. in an Assessment & Development (A&D) meeting. If the manager is not a dean, the manager should contact the dean to discuss the matter.
- The dean or the faculty board may also nominate someone for promotion to HL1 on their own initiative, e.g. following a strategic development meeting.
- The dean will make an initial assessment of the promotion application. They may consider using the 360-degree feedback reflection tool to do so.⁶
- The use of a collegial consultation is at the discretion of the dean. Such a consultation could involve the faculty board, a member of the Executive Board or colleagues within the faculty.⁷
- At a minimum, the dean is expected to do the following:
 - Check that the candidate holds an STQ and SRQ. Candidates from the Faculty of Medicine must be able to demonstrate that they hold an 'STQ-equivalent' qualification.
 - Check that the candidate is of good character, based on the available information.
 - Remain at arm's length from members of the University Promotions Committee and not involve them in preparing recommendations.
- The dean will then ask the candidate to write a narrative and will check that this narrative is factually correct.⁸

Narrative

- The candidate should write a single, cohesive narrative of **no more than 2,000 words** in which they reflect on their merits in the six areas of the TRIPLE model.⁹
- The narrative should include **various forms of evidence**, including self-reflection, a factual description, peer evaluation and potentially the STAR method. Annex 3 contains more information about the possible forms of evidence.
- There is no set format for the narrative. The candidate may structure it as they see fit, provided it does not exceed the maximum word count.
- The narrative will not be shown to referees; it is intended solely for the Promotions Committee and the Executive Board.
- The following should not be included in the narrative: self-assessments, self-assigned scores, and salary and promotion agreements.
- The narrative should show how the candidate stands out due to their **above-average performance in at least three components**, including, at a minimum, *Leadership* and *Education*, or *Leadership* and *Research*. The candidate must be performing at a level appropriate to their position in the other components. A candidate with a clinical focus should describe their work in this area under *Professional Performance*.
- The candidate does not need to satisfy every aspect of the profile descriptions. It is also possible to cite **other relevant indicators** not included in the Professor 1 profile description.
- The candidate should select their **top ten core publications** that they consider most important and briefly explain the selection, and in particular their personal contribution to each publication, in relation to the remit of their academic position.

⁶ See [360-degree reflection for managers – Intranet \(uu.nl\)](#)

⁷ When preparing a recommendation, the dean may not seek advice from members of the University Promotions Committee, since they must be able to form an independent judgement in their role as members of this committee.

⁸ For example: if the narrative mentions excellent teaching evaluations, the Executive Board expects the dean to request and sight these evaluations before submitting the application.

⁹ The TRIPLE model forms part of Utrecht University's vision of Recognition and Reward. An explanation can be found in Annex 1.

- The narrative may have **up to three annexes**: a brief **CV** in English (no more than four pages), the **list of the top ten core publications** and an annex of the candidate's choice (not compulsory).
- The intention is for '**alternative metrics**' to be used, rather than an h-index score and/or impact factors. The box below provides an explanation.

Explanation of 'alternative metrics'

In general, figures can be used to support the narrative in relation to the impact of research, provided these figures relate to individual output items (so no impact factors, institutional rankings or h-index scores).

'Alternative metrics' can include a range of indicators of the use and impact of various forms of outputs and activities. There is no set list of alternative metrics. The question is what forms of impact you, as an academic, think are the most relevant, and how you substantiate them. A great example is this [visual guide](#) from Stephen Curry (Imperial College, UK), in which he shows the impact that various articles have had in addition to citations (and compares it with citations and h-index scores).

There are a number of tools and platforms that can provide supporting information on where and by whom research output is being used or cited. In addition to citation information, this includes the information provided by altmetrics tools (such as Altmetric, Plum and Crossref Event Data). Other information sources include the news media, policy documents, and discussions on social media. The challenge when using this type of data is to look beyond the aggregate figure and see it as information: where is my research being used or talked about? By whom, and in what context? And therefore, what impact is my research having?

You can find more information about the above tools on [the University Library website](#). In the long term, there are plans to run a trial with one of the providers of altmetrics data, and Altmetric data will also be shown in PURE. At present, altmetrics data can also be found in databases such as Scopus and the freely available [Dimensions](#).

The University Library can provide support with finding and using such data, both one-to-one and in workshops. Contact: library@uu.nl.

Promotion application

- Once the dean has approved the narrative, they will write a **letter** containing a promotion application to the Executive Board (no more than two A4 pages).
- Like the candidate's narrative, the letter should be framed in terms of the **TRIPLE** model. This means that, for each TRIPLE criterion, the dean should provide one or more **examples** showing how the candidate stands out from other HL2s.
- In the promotion application, the dean should suggest two **external referees**, who should be as independent as possible, and who the committee can speak to if they wish. The external referees should not be associated with UU, and at least one of them should work abroad. Co-authors of core publications from the past ten years cannot be used as referees.
- Only the Promotions Committee will speak with the referees.
- The dean should submit the promotion dossier (letter with narrative and annexes) to the Executive Board by emailing it to the Secretary of the Promotions Committee.

2. Assessment of the promotion application

The Executive Board will seek an opinion from the University Promotions Committee, which will assess the substance of the dossier in accordance with the TRIPLE model. Working with a university promotions committee helps generate a common understanding of what a Professor 1 is, what they do, and what their contribution is to the university as a whole. All applications are assessed in the same way. The mandate from the Executive Board to the committee is set out in Annex 4.

Composition of the University Promotions Committee

- Deans periodically nominate two members each to the Executive Board for the university committee. The first nominations were made in September 2021; nominations are now submitted every four years, or whenever a mid-term vacancy arises.
- Deans periodically make suggestions for an independent chair. The first chair was appointed in September 2021; a new chair is nominated every four years, or when a mid-term vacancy arises.
- Deans can nominate a new member, an existing member or a deputy chair as the new chair.
- The Executive Board appoints members and chairs for four-year terms.
- The University Promotions Committee consists of a group of 14 HL1s (2 per faculty) who are, in principle, able to carry out this work, along with a permanent independent chair. 'In principle' means that, in general, they have the capacity to perform the work required. For each recommendation, consideration is given to which members are best equipped to assess it.
- In addition to the permanent independent chair, the Executive Board appoints two deputy chairs. The deputy chairs are part of the group of 14 professors.
- An evaluation is conducted every two years. Each dean discusses with the two members they appointed whether their contribution to the committee remains appropriate and desirable. The committee chair and the Rector evaluate the committee's processes and consider whether the make-up of the committee is still appropriate. After four years, each dean discusses with their appointed members whether they would like to serve for another term or step down. The Chair and the members may serve on the committee for a maximum of two consecutive terms.
- The committee is supported by two secretaries.

Processes

- The Executive Board asks the Chair of the University Promotions Committee to set up a **subcommittee**.
- The subcommittee is supported by one of the committee's two secretaries.
- The Chair of the Promotions Committee determines the **composition** of the subcommittee for each promotion application. In practice, the committee chair and the secretary discuss the composition of the subcommittee, then the secretary informs the committee members.
- The secretaries perform an admissibility check before the dossier is accepted for processing (only complete dossiers will be processed).
- The subcommittee consists of the **independent chair and 3 members**, selected from the group of 14: 1 member of the faculty from which the request stems, 1 expert from a closely related field (or strategic theme) and 1 member from a field that is not closely related.
- In principle, the Chair presides over subcommittee meetings. If the time commitment, a potential conflict of interest or other reasons so require, the Chair may delegate the task of chairing these meetings to one of the deputies.
- The subcommittee will always contact **at least one external, independent referee**.
- Referees will receive only the candidate's CV, the TRIPLE framework and a standard cover letter soliciting their opinion.
- If necessary, the secretaries may also **request additional information** from the dean on the committee's behalf, such as 360-degree feedback, assessments, etc.
- The Promotions Committee will compare the candidate's narrative and the dean's letter with the HL1 promotion profile set out above. In doing so, they will also take into account the common standard in the relevant field.
- The committee will issue a **written opinion** to the Executive Board, of no more than two A4 pages.
- The opinion will be drafted during a committee meeting and finalised by the secretary.
- Following approval by the committee chair, the secretary will send the opinion by email on the Chair's behalf to the Rector and the Chair of the Executive Board.

3. Decision-making and communication

- The Executive Board will make a decision based on the opinion issued by the University Promotions Committee.
- If the decision is positive, the secretary concerned will write a promotion letter to the candidate on behalf of the Executive Board and CC the dean and the faculty head of HR.
- The substantive part of the opinion of the Promotions Committee will be appended to the promotion letter.
- If the decision is negative, the Executive Board will contact the dean to discuss development opportunities for the candidate. The candidate will not receive a letter.
- The reasons for the negative decision (from the Promotions Committee) will be recorded and shared with the dean.
- The dean will inform the candidate of the Executive Board's decision and the development opportunities that have been discussed.

Schematic overview: who does what and when?

1. Preparation of promotion application by dean and candidate		
Candidate invited to write a narrative based on TRIPLE	Dean and candidate	p.m.
Drafts promotion application	Dean	p.m.
Selects referees from the Netherlands/abroad who could be contacted if required	Dean	p.m.
Sends application (letter with potential referees, narrative with annexes) to secretary/secretaries	Dean	p.m.
2. Assessment of promotion application by committee		
Admissibility check	Secretary	Immediately ¹⁰
Speaks with the Chair	Secretary	2-3 working days after application
Determines the composition of the subcommittee and writes to the referees	Chair, in consultation with the secretary	2 weeks after application
Convenes the subcommittee	Secretary	p.m.
Formulates an opinion during a meeting	Subcommittee	7 weeks after application
Writes out the opinion in the correct format, including reasons (max. 2 x A4 pages)	Secretary	8 weeks after application
Emails the opinion to the Executive Board Chair and Rector	Secretary on behalf of the Chair	9 weeks after application
Decision made on the basis of the opinion	Executive Board Chair and Rector	1 week after receipt
3. Decision and communication by Executive Board		
If the decision is positive: promotion letter sent to candidate with prior email to dean; dean informs candidate.	Secretary, Executive Board Chair	Within 3 months after application
If the decision is negative: dean contacted with explanation and proposed development steps for candidate; dean informs candidate.	Executive Board Chair or Rector	Within 3 months after application
In the event of doubt: Dean and Executive Board members contacted	Executive Board Chair or Rector	Within 3 months after application

¹⁰ Applications submitted in the months of July and August will be processed in September.

Appendix 1: TRIPLE-model

version 2023

UU applies the principles of the Recognition and Rewards (R&R) system. The Utrecht TRIPLE model is a **tool for applying the basic principles of recognition and rewards in practice**. It will help you consider the various aspects of our work from a broad perspective and relate them to each other.

The TRIPLE model applies to all UU staff, at both individual and team level. Teams can use it to discuss everyone's contributions to the objectives. It can also be useful in individual development interviews or when drawing up texts of job adverts. Above all, TRIPLE is an invitation to every employee and every team to look at the different activities from a broad perspective and discuss them.

The TRIPLE lotus is made up of three types of elements: the base (Team and Leadership), the core (Impact) and the flower petals (the domains in which we carry out our activities). Team spirit and (personal) leadership are the foundation supporting every employee and team: they are prerequisites for effective performance, collaboration and personal development.

Team spirit refers to the connection between the individual and common goals. It is about collegiality, collaboration, trust, sharing ideas, mutual engagement and contributing to the organisation.

Leiderschap gaat over persoonlijk leiderschap van iedereen. Leiderschap gaat niet alleen over leidinggeven. Het gaat ook om competenties die we van elke medewerker verwachten: vertrouwen en verantwoordelijkheid geven en nemen, zelfreflectie en ruimte geven aan diversiteit. Dit noemen we persoonlijk leiderschap en is voor alle medewerkers én leidinggevenden van toepassing. For everyone with managerial tasks, this is also about being a good leader. Find out more about [leadership at UU](#).

The focus is on **impact**: *Why do we do the things we do? What sort of values, drives and expectations does that involve? How do our efforts affect our colleagues, the discipline, the organisation or society?* Impact cannot always be determined in advance, and it is not always possible to make target agreements. That is why we prefer to refer to the outcomes of our work rather than specific quantifiable outputs.

The domains in which we work are the 'flower petals' of the lotus. If you zoom out all the way and look at UU as a whole, this is where you will see the domains of **education, research and professional performance/organisation**. When you give shape to the TRIPLE model as a team or as an individual employee, the three domains can also be made more specific. The goal is always to map the full spectrum of the work, to enable a dialogue about this.

The extent to which employees are active in the various domains depends on their position, the context and any agreements made about this. Employees can focus on different aspects and may shift their focus over time.

For the positions of assistant professor, associate professor and full professor, the domains of **education and research** apply in any case, although this may be subject to variation within teams and shifts in scope over time. These domains may likewise be relevant for other positions and teams, such as for an education coordinator who provides an essential contribution to teaching or a laboratory assistant who ensures that research can be conducted robustly and safely.

If the work cannot directly be linked to education or research, it falls under the domain of **professional performance/organisation**. As this is a very broad domain, it can be useful to **apply a further breakdown** of this domain for the purposes of TRIPLE. For example, **advising** can be a domain for a policy adviser or study adviser, and **organisation** can be a domain for a

management and office assistant. You should choose the domains that are relevant to your team or your position.

Colleagues who provide teaching and do research are often also involved in the domain of professional performance/organisation. In the medical domain, **patient care** naturally plays an important role. In veterinary medicine, the third domain has been translated to **veterinary care**. In other contexts, this may involve, *for example*, (academic) **communication** or another service for the benefit of academia, society or the local UU community.

Appendix 2: UU Leadership profile

At Utrecht University, we value leadership very highly. We believe that effective leadership is a vital factor in creating a safe and inspiring working environment as it boosts employee motivation, helps us achieve our goals, facilitates cross-border collaboration and enables UU to help make the world a better place.

Leadership plays a role in all kinds of issues, both big and small. It's about how various levels within UU communicate with one another. It's about how you give feedback to your colleagues. It's about constructively identifying things that could be done better, taking other people's viewpoints and feelings into account and giving direction.

There are many dimensions to leadership, each of which features its own key competences. Every dimension has its own individual perspective, although they are all applicable to your everyday duties as a supervisor. What makes you a good leader and what do you need in order to be one? At UU, we define three dimensions of leadership:

You



- Self-reflection
- Cultivating mutual trust, giving and taking responsibility
- Recognising and nurturing diversity of employees
- Clear communication

You and your team



- Interdisciplinary collaboration
- Reinforcing the culture of improvement
- Encouraging development
- Result-orientation

You and the organisation



- Setting objectives for own unit and linking them to UU objectives
- Objectives
- Achieving objectives in the UU Strategic Plan
- Taking responsibility for the bigger picture

For more information, see: <https://intranet.uu.nl/en/leadership>

Annex 3: Examples of forms of evidence to include in the narrative

To be considered for promotion to HP1, the candidate must write a single, cohesive narrative of no more than 2,000 words in which they reflect on and substantiate their merits in the six areas of the TRIPLE model (see Annex 1). In their narrative, the candidate may use various forms of evidence, including:

- self-reflection;
- factual description;
- the STAR method; and
- peer evaluation.

Examples of these forms of evidence are presented below. The examples are intended to serve as a guide in writing the narrative.

Self-reflection

Reflecting on personal development and future ambitions, describing your leadership role, activities and impact in education, research and professional performance; the role of the team; describing your leadership vision and style; reflecting on past performance and output as the leader of a team; reflecting on effectiveness; benchmarking against the standards of the field of expertise; describing ideas, strategies and goals of research, educational and community activities; describing your contribution to the goals of Utrecht University. Describing the ability to change your own behaviour and approach.

Factual description

Teaching material, involvement in resources for educational innovation (e.g. Educate-IT); Senior Teaching Qualification (STQ); active mentorship, future career and development of supervised students (e.g. PhD candidates) and staff; academic collaborations and publications, impact and collaborations outside of your own research area; grants and awards obtained, including those won by members of your team; active leadership/active role on boards and committees and in international networks/consortia within and outside of the academic world; editorships; qualifications in academic leadership; agreements with/involvement of stakeholders; building up of productive, interactive networks; results/products; certificates from training courses.

Examples using the STAR method

Substantiate the TRIPLE criteria using examples that follow the STAR method. STAR stands for Situation, Task, Action and Result. Describe a situation you faced (usually a problematic situation), describe your responsibility/task in relation to that situation, then describe the action you took, what your specific contribution was, and finally, the result that ensued. Explicitly state what different or extra thing you did, beyond what might be expected of an HL2 professor.

Evaluations, including peer evaluations

Student evaluations; peer evaluations of lectures by other lecturers; 360-degree feedback; written references, including in the context of work supervision, general supervision or peer coaching; references from people who benefited from the activities, including impact activities; information from research evaluations.

Annex 4: Mandate from the Executive Board to the University Promotions Committee

1. Mandate

The mandate from the Executive Board to the HL1 Promotions Committee:

The HL1 University Promotions Committee shall assess promotion applications submitted by deans to the Executive Board. The committee shall provide an opinion on the promotion to the Executive Board based exclusively on substantive grounds derived from the TRIPLE assessment framework. The opinion shall contain substantiation for each criterion, and a conclusion, which shall be a "positive", "negative" or "undecided" outcome. The assessment and the issuing of an opinion will be performed in the strictest confidence.

2. Roles

The promotion policy makes a distinction between the roles and responsibilities (policymaking, management, advising, decision-making) of the various parties involved. The HL1 University Promotions Committee provides substantive advice to the Executive Board with regard to recommendations from deans, based on the policy framework that has previously been adopted by the Executive Board in collaboration and with the approval of the deans. The Executive Board makes decisions on promotion recommendations; the advice from the HL1 Promotions Committee supports them in making these decisions. The advice given by the HL1 Promotions Committee is not binding on the Executive Board.

The mandate given to the Promotions Committee does not involve management or policy-related matters, nor requests to make decisions. The committee's mandate also does not cover questions of diversity. Responsibility for the policy implementation of the new assessment system based on the TRIPLE model lies with the Executive Board, deans and support services.

3. Relationship between the HL1 University Promotions Committee and the deans

- *Independent judgements and avoiding 'dual roles'*

The HL1 University Promotions Committee has been given a mandate by the Executive Board and operates at arm's length from the deans. The policy framework states the following: "The dean will make an initial assessment of the promotion application. The application will then be assessed by the University Promotions Committee, which will issue an opinion to the Executive Board." The members advise the Executive Board, not the dean. It is not desirable for committee members to be put in a position where they are asked to judge their own advice. Members of the Promotions Committee must be able to form independent judgements with regard to recommendations, which means that they must not interfere or be involved in the preparation of the promotion application by the dean.

- *Security and confidentiality: enabling critical judgements*

For each promotion application, a subcommittee is formed, comprising two members from the same field who have the expertise to evaluate the CV, and one member who is somewhat further removed from the candidate's field of expertise. All members are expected to exercise independent, critical and careful judgement based on substantive reasons, and to weigh the extent to which the professor concerned meets the TRIPLE criteria. The position of the candidate or how far removed the committee member is from the faculty should not play a role. Applications must be assessed in complete confidentiality. The composition of the subcommittee must not be shared outside of the committee, except with the client, the Executive Board.

- *Qualitative basis for assessment: the recommendation*

The dean is responsible for the quality of the recommendation. The current framework states that a recommendation for promotion must include a narrative written by the candidate and a statement of support from the dean. To enable an effective assessment of the *team spirit* and

leadership criteria, the committee would appreciate receiving the necessary qualitative information, such as 360-degree feedback, where available. It is also important for the narrative to be checked for factual accuracy by the faculty (in other words, if the candidate mentions excellent teaching evaluations, these should be requested and sighted by the faculty before submission). A third issue requiring attention is the quality of the substantiation for each criterion (examples and evidence). Finally, the Executive Board asks that deans only submit recommendations for professors who they know to be of impeccable character (including with regard to social safety and integrity), and where they have checked, e.g. through HR, that this is the case, based on the available information.

- *Policy implementation/lobbying (no), building up knowledge and expertise (yes)*

Various members of the Promotions Committee rightly noted that there were differences in the assessment criteria for each faculty, as well as in the processes leading to recommendations being made. That was one of the reasons why the university, together with the deans, examined and revised the university procedure and made the policy more uniform, while still allowing scope for differences. The faculties are now in a transition phase and the University Promotions Committee is meeting for the first time. The TRIPLE model is the new university assessment system, replacing MERIT and other systems still in use in some faculties.

The HL1 Promotions Committee is not responsible for generating support within the institution. Responsibility for the policy implementation of the new assessment system lies with the Executive Board, deans and support services, all of which are 100% committed to this task. The deans collaborated in the policy review, and they already use TRIPLE for various recommendations and grant applications. Knowledge and expertise are built up gradually. This applies to the deans and the members of the HL1 Promotions Committee, as well as to all other staff members of the university. Members of the assessment committee indicated that the TRIPLE framework for HL1 promotion leaves a lot of room for interpretation; it has its advantages, but also provides little guidance on how it should be applied.

The outcomes of interim evaluations may contain input, on the basis of which the Executive Board could consider whether the policy requires further adjustment, but this is not the responsibility of the committee. The experience of the committee might also be valuable to faculties in relation to the structure and quality of a recommendation dossier in general.

To build up knowledge and expertise in the committee and faculties, it is recommended that they make use of the guidelines that already exist, such as previous research conducted by BETA, and the GEO handbook, which includes a list of forms of evidence that could be considered for each criterion (MERIT criteria in this case). These could help faculties and committee members get started.

4. Care and confidentiality

Promotions and promotion applications, positions on the salary scale and academic ranks are extremely sensitive subjects for staff members (and deans). Accordingly, the Executive Board handles applications from deans with the utmost discretion. The policy framework states: "The Executive Board will make a decision, explain it to the dean and, if the decision is positive, draft a promotion letter for the candidate. This letter will be finalised by the secretary (...) and sent to the candidate. If the decision is negative, or in the event of doubt, the candidate will not receive a letter. The Executive Board will contact the dean to discuss development opportunities for the candidate. The reasons for the negative decision or rejection will be recorded." The dean will inform the candidate of the decision of the Executive Board and the development opportunities that have been discussed. Following the 2022 evaluation, in the event of a negative decision it is proposed, in the interests of transparency, that the Executive Board will share with the dean the full written rationale for the decision based on the TRIPLE criteria, as drawn up by the Promotions Committee for the Executive Board, so that the dean can then share it with the candidate.

Working arrangements relating to confidentiality:

- The composition of the HL1 University Promotions Committee is public: the name of the Chair is stated on the website and members' names are available on request.
- Subcommittees are anonymous to protect the individual members, i.e. the composition of the subcommittee is not shared with third parties, other than the Executive Board.
- Members of the Promotions Committee are expected to perform their work for the committee in confidence. This means that they will not discuss this work with colleagues, committee members who are not in the subcommittee, deans, or the candidate concerned. The subcommittee may discuss its work only with the secretaries and the Executive Board, who are also responsible for liaising with the deans.
- The deans are the only ones who may have direct contact with the recommended candidates.
- The dean's recommendation is confidential, and can only be accessed by the Executive Board, the Committee Chair, the subcommittee members and the secretaries. In the event of a negative decision, the full reasons will be shared with the dean, who may then share them with the candidate.
- The opinion sent by the subcommittee to the Executive Board is confidential and will not be shared beyond the HL1 University Promotions Committee.
- The Executive Board's decision is confidential and will be communicated to the dean and candidate as described above in the policy framework.
- The Executive Board's decision will also be shared with the Promotions Committee so they can learn from it.
- The University Promotions Committee will maintain confidentiality with regard to the Executive Board's decision to promote or not to promote the candidate.