
Senior Academic Review and Development Process

Explanatory Notes

Human Resources

Published: Dec-2009
Revised: May 2019

1	Introduction	1
2	SARD Overview	1
3	Following the ADR Discussion	2
3.1	Does Not Meet Expectations	2
3.2	Meets Expectations	2
3.3	Exceeds Expectations	3
3.4	Significantly Exceeds Expectations as a result of outstanding performance	3
4	Meeting of Head of Department/School and Executive Dean	3
5	Following Submission by Executive Deans	3
6	Senior Academic Review and Development Panel	3

Senior Academic Review and Development Process

Explanatory Notes

1 Introduction

All University employees participate in the Accountability and Development Review (ADR) process which provides for a single annual discussion between a staff member and a reviewing officer. This one-to-one discussion is structured around three parts:

1. a consideration of past performance and development during the previous review period (covering 1st August to 31st July), reviewing progress against objectives set
2. a look forward to the forthcoming review period with the setting of objectives aligned with the operational and strategic priorities of the Departmental/School, Faculty and University
3. a discussion regarding any development needs which may ensue in light of those objectives.

For senior academic staff, the ADR process will also inform the Senior Academic Review and Development (SARD) process. This process applies to:

- Professors
- Vice Deans
- Heads of Department/School

2 SARD Overview

SARD involves the following steps which are additional to the ADR process:

- Under the ADR process senior academic staff will have a one-to-one meeting with their Heads of Department/School. Executive Deans will undertake the one-to-one meetings with Heads of Department/School and Vice-Deans. Following these meetings, Heads of Department/School will give initial consideration to a rating to reflect the past year's performance for each individual using the following scale:
 1. does not meet expectations
 2. meets expectations
 3. exceeds expectations or
 4. significantly exceeds expectations as a result of outstanding performance
- Professorial performance will be considered with reference to the [Professorial Zoning Descriptors](#) for the relevant zone. This would mean, for example, that a similar contribution from a Zone 2 and a Zone 3 Professor could be deemed as 'exceeds' or 'significantly exceeds' expectations for the Zone 2 Professor but could be a 'meets expectations' for a Professor in Zone 3.
- Following the one-to-one meetings, discussions will take place with Heads of Department/School and Executive Deans to consider the Heads of Department/School's initial thoughts on ratings. The Head of Department/School will submit the ADR Review Record Forms to the Executive Dean in advance of their meeting. The Head of Department/School will also forward the proposed ratings to the Executive Dean in advance of their meeting. The Executive Dean will have a key role in ensuring consistency of ratings and of objective setting across the Faculty.
- To facilitate consistency of ratings and of objective setting across the University, the Director of HR, the Executive Deans and the Vice Principal will meet prior to the SARD Panel to review ratings and to identify and correct any prospective anomalies.
- The SARD Panel will then meet and will normally consider two categories of cases:-

- Where there is a recommendation from the Executive Dean that a performance related salary increase should be applied. In some cases, a one-off bonus payment could be considered to recognise an individual's single exceptional contribution, for example in the context of a one-off task or project that is finite in nature. In other cases of an individual's sustained exceptional contribution, a recurrent salary adjustment may be made.
- Where a 'Does not meet expectations' rating has been given and the SARD Panel agree that the rating of "does not meet expectations" should apply, a further consideration will be made by the SARD Panel in relation to the nature of follow up action which will be required for each individual, with three levels of follow up intervention being available:
 - A. support and encouragement meeting (involving the Executive Dean and Head of Department)
 - B. developmental meeting (involving the Executive Dean and the Principal)
 - C. performance improvement meeting (involving the Executive Dean, Principal and Human Resources).
- Individuals appointed to a Strathclyde Professorship, either through internal promotion or external recruitment, during the review year being considered by SARD (i.e. 1st August – 31st July) will have an ADR discussion with their Head of Department/ equivalent as standard and, if they have been in post for 6 months or more at the time of their ADR discussion, will be allocated a performance rating. However, unless exceptional circumstances prevail, a salary increase or bonus will not be appropriate.

The SARD Panel will consider cases for Professorial Zone movement in line with the [Procedure for Progression between Professorial Zones](#).

3 Following the ADR Discussion

Following the ADR meetings, at the subsequent meeting of the Head of Department/School and Executive Dean, one of four levels of performance will be identified, based on the framework below. Performance will be assessed with reference to the expectations for the relevant Professorial zone outlined in the [Professorial Zoning Descriptors](#).

3.1 Does Not Meet Expectations

If the evidence provided at the ADR discussion demonstrates a shortfall in the required performance in the areas of research, teaching, knowledge exchange and citizenship with reference to the [Professorial Zoning Descriptors](#) for the relevant zone, then the SARD Panel will agree a course of action as follows:

- A. support and encouragement meeting with the individual concerned and the Head of Department/School and the Executive Dean
- B. developmental meeting with the individual concerned, the Executive Dean and the Principal
- C. performance improvement meeting with the individual concerned, the Executive Dean, the Principal and a representative from Human Resources

In advance of the SARD Panel, the Executive Dean will inform any member of Professorial staff for whom a "does not meet expectations" rating is being made that this is the case. The individual will then be given the opportunity to provide a written comment on this rating for consideration by the SARD Panel.

3.2 Meets Expectations

To achieve the category "meets expectations" the individual would be required to give evidence of significant achievement/outputs as appropriate for a Strathclyde Professor in the following activities: research, teaching, knowledge exchange and citizenship with reference to the [Professorial Zoning Descriptors](#) for the relevant zone. It would be expected that the performance of most Professorial staff would fall within this category.

The salary of individuals in this category will not be adjusted beyond the nationally negotiated general increase and a communication to this effect will be issued following the meeting of the SARD Panel.

3.3 Exceeds Expectations

To achieve this category the individual would be required to give evidence of sustained excellent achievement/outputs in most of the following activities: research, teaching, knowledge exchange and citizenship with reference to the [Professorial Zoning Descriptors](#) for the relevant zone. Individuals in this category will be excellent Strathclyde Professors.

Whilst commending the performance of individuals in this category, it will not always be possible to adjust their salary beyond the nationally negotiated general increase.

3.4 Significantly Exceeds Expectations as a result of outstanding performance

To achieve this category the individual would be required to give evidence of sustained and outstanding achievement/outputs in most of the following activities: research, teaching, knowledge exchange and citizenship with reference to the [Professorial Zoning Descriptors](#) for the relevant zone. Individuals in this category will be outstanding Strathclyde Professors.

Individuals in this category will be considered by the SARD Panel and a formal letter will be issued giving details of any bonus or recurrent adjustment to salary following the meeting, normally held in November. It should be noted that, due to funding limitations and the need to ensure consistency across the University in interpreting “significantly exceeds expectations”, it may not always be possible to award additional remuneration to everyone allocated this rating.

4 Meeting of Head of Department/School and Executive Dean

The meeting between the Head of Department/School and Executive Dean will be a formal meeting, planned in advance in a confidential setting.

The Head of Department/School will make available to the Executive Dean a copy of the completed ADR Review Record Forms and supply a note of the provisional ratings in advance of the meeting.

HR will forward a spreadsheet to the Executive Dean in advance of these meetings. The spreadsheet will have a facility to rate each case following the structure outlined above (i.e. 1. does not meet expectations for the zone, 2. meets expectations for the zone, 3. exceeds expectations for the zone or 4. significantly exceeds expectations for the zone). For cases where the rating is “does not meet expectations”, the spreadsheet will also allow for the proposed intervention to be recorded, again following the structure outlined above (i.e. A. support and encouragement meeting, B. developmental meeting, C. performance improvement meeting).

Recommendations will be discussed at the meeting and the Executive Dean will organise for the spreadsheet to be updated and returned to HR.

5 Following Submission by Executive Deans

The Director of HR, the Executive Deans and the Vice Principal will meet to review performance rating recommendations in advance of the SARD panel in order to ensure consistency of approach across the University.

6 Senior Academic Review and Development Panel

The Senior Academic Review and Development (SARD) Panel will be convened annually following the conclusion of the ADR process, the additional consideration by the Heads of Department/School and Executive Deans regarding performance ratings and the consistency meeting outlined in paragraph 5, above. The SARD Panel will normally only discuss cases where a bonus or a recurrent salary increase has been recommended or where a “does not meet expectations” rating has applied.

The SARD Panel will be constituted as below:

- A Lay Member of Court (Chair)
- The Principal
- Vice Principal

In attendance:

- The Executive Deans
- Director of Human Resources
- Human Resources Adviser