



INSTITUT DE HAUTES
ÉTUDES INTERNATIONALES
ET DU DÉVELOPPEMENT
GRADUATE INSTITUTE
OF INTERNATIONAL AND
DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

RENEWAL AND PROMOTION REGULATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of these Regulations (hereafter “Regulations”) is to specify the procedures for 1) the renewal and promotion of members of the *Collège des professeur·e·s*, and 2) the renewal of other teaching and research staff members (hereafter “TRS Members”) at the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies (hereafter the “Institute”).

The Institute promotes equal rights and opportunities for men and women, notably by taking all appropriate steps to ensure equal treatment and balanced representation within the various categories of TRS Members and the different bodies contemplated in the Regulations.

In the event of discrepancy between these Regulations and the Regulations for Teaching and Research Staff (hereafter “TRS Regulations”), the provisions of the TRS Regulations take precedence.

PART I – BODIES

- a) If the TRS Regulations or these Regulations so provide, decisions may be adopted by circular letter.
- b) Unless otherwise provided in the TRS Regulations or these Regulations, the word “Day” means any day of the week, including Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays.

Consequently and by way of example, unless otherwise provided in the TRS Regulations or these Regulations, Saturdays, Sundays, and public holidays are taken into account in calculating the time limits 1) under the TRS Regulations, 2) under these Regulations, and 3) by the bodies referred to in the TRS Regulations or these Regulations.

The term “Working Day(s)” is understood to mean all days of the week except Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays in accordance with the legislation applicable in Geneva (Switzerland).

CHAPTER I

Standing Committee for Renewals and Promotions

To facilitate the process of contract renewals and promotions, the Institute shall establish a Standing Committee for Renewals and Promotions (hereafter “Standing Committee”) consisting of the Director and a full professor from each department.

Article 1 Formation of the Standing Committee

1. The name of each full professor considered for designation to the Standing Committee is proposed by the Head of Department to the Director; the list is then submitted for approval to a vote of the *Collège des professeur·e·s*.

The list must be composed in a manner ensuring the best possible balance between genders and geographical origin. If that is not the case, the Director will revert to the Heads of Department.

2. The list must be approved by the *Collège des professeur·e·s* in a secret ballot held at its first meeting of the academic year in which the Standing Committee is to be renewed. Approval requires an absolute majority of the votes cast. Blank votes, invalid votes or abstentions, if any, are disregarded in the absolute majority count.
3. Professors whose names are on the list may not vote in the ballot.
4. If the proposed list does not obtain the absolute majority of votes cast, a new list must be compiled following the same procedure; the list is submitted to a vote at the next meeting of the *Collège des professeur·e·s* as provided in paragraph 2 above.
5. If the second list also fails, the process and voting are repeated until a list is approved by an absolute majority of votes cast.
6. The full professors elected to the Standing Committee are elected for a two-year term of office, renewable for a single consecutive term.
7. The Director is a member *ex officio* of the Standing Committee; the Director chairs the Standing Committee as “President”.

The Director may take part in the deliberations and make proposals. Unless otherwise provided in the Regulations, the Director is not entitled to vote in Standing Committee ballots.

Article 2 Functioning and general powers of the Standing Committee

1. The Standing Committee is convened by the President as often as business requires; the invitation includes an agenda containing the items to be discussed.

Any member of the Standing Committee may demand that the President immediately convene a meeting of the Standing Committee, indicating the grounds for the request.

2. Unless otherwise provided in these Regulations, meetings of the Standing Committee are quorate when the President and at least four other members are present.

3. At the first meeting of each academic year, the five voting members of the Standing Committee elect a vice president (with voting rights) (hereafter "Vice President") from their circle who is responsible, for the entire year, for writing the first draft of the reports and presenting the recommendations of the Standing Committee to the *Collège des professeur·e·s*.

Before the start of the application assessment period, the Director shall send the members of the Standing Committee an electronic link to pedagogical materials designed to raise awareness of the biases implicit in the assessment process.

4. The meetings of the Standing Committee are chaired by the President.

The Standing Committee meets behind close doors.

When absent, the President may ask a member of the Standing Committee to chair the meeting instead.

5. The deliberations of the Standing Committee are confidential.

All members of the Standing Committee are bound to a duty of confidentiality; they shall safeguard the confidential nature and ensure the non-disclosure of all documents and information received and handled by the Standing Committee, including in particular exchanges of correspondence (emails, etc.), agendas, deliberations, discussions and meetings, minutes and decisions of the Standing Committee and any documents pertaining to renewal or promotion files.

6. The Standing Committee has broad powers and may take all appropriate action to ensure that its deliberations and decisions are based on the most comprehensive assessment of the files of the candidates for renewal or promotion.
7. If a decision is not consensual, or if the Standing Committee deems it necessary, the Standing Committee may request supplementary documentation (for example, new letters of recommendation in accordance with the procedure set forth in Part III on "Promotions", Article 36).

The Standing Committee may also organise additional meetings, in particular with members of the *Direction académique*, heads of department and other members of the *Collège des professeur·e·s*.

8. The Standing Committee makes its recommendations relying on detailed written reports and communicates them to the *Collège des professeur·e·s* and then to the Foundation Board.

The reports are signed by the President and the Vice President.

9. The President ensures minutes are kept of the meetings and decisions. The minutes are signed by the President and, if applicable, by the person entrusted with keeping the minutes.
10. The Standing Committee may designate an ad hoc secretary who is not a member of the Standing Committee to keep the minutes and ensure their follow-up.

The secretary is bound by the same duty of confidentiality as the members of the Standing Committee.

11. In all other respects, the Standing Committee sets its own rules of procedure (working languages, etc).

Article 3 Standing Committee deliberation method and voting

1. As a rule, the Standing Committee takes its decisions, especially in the matter of renewals and promotions, and approves the reports to be sent to the *Collège des professeur·e·s* by consensus with a show of hands.
2. When no clear consensus emerges from the deliberations, the President may define a voting procedure and organise one or more rounds of voting (by show of hands or secret ballot) to obtain a better understanding of the orientation in the Standing Committee.
3. For decisions on the promotion of TRS Members, the Head of the department concerned communicates the department's preliminary decision on the promotion to the Standing Committee by a letter with the recommendation of the department.

In cases concerning the promotion of candidates in their own department, the members of the Standing Committee must vote as instructed by their department.

Each member of the Standing Committee has one vote.

Absent members may not delegate their vote to other members or empower other members to vote on their behalf.

If a vote is tied, the President (or in their absence, the person chairing the meeting) has the casting vote.

CHAPTER II Ad hoc Committee

Article 4 Formation of the Committee

1. When a (full, associate or assistant) professor's contract comes up for renewal, if serious and/or sustained shortcomings are found in the performance of their duties, notably under their terms of reference, by the various bodies (the Head of Department, then the Standing Committee) entrusted with overseeing the due performance of the latter, the Director may, on the proposal of the Standing Committee, decide to set up an ad hoc committee to rule on such shortcomings (hereafter "ad hoc Committee").
2. The Director may set up an ad hoc Committee only on the recommendation of the Standing Committee.

If, by way of exception and contrary to the recommendation of the Standing Committee, the Director decides not to set up an ad hoc Committee, the Director shall prepare a substantiated opinion and communicate the complete file to the Foundation Board for approval of the contract renewal.

3. Notwithstanding, if an ad hoc Committee is set up, the Director must ensure that the delay, if any, will not cause the contract to be interrupted while the procedure is under way.
4. The Director is empowered to designate the ad hoc Committee which shall be composed of three members selected from the circle of full professors; at least two of the selected

professors must belong to a department other than that of the person whose contract is up for renewal.

Members of the Standing Committee may not be members of the ad hoc Committee.

Subject to the aforesaid requirements concerning the composition of the ad hoc Committee, the Director must ensure a balance between the genders if possible.

In all other respects, the ad hoc Committee is responsible for its own organisation and designates its own chair.

Article 5 Procedure

1. Once the ad hoc Committee is constituted, its work is strictly confidential.

Members of the ad hoc Committee are bound to a duty of confidentiality; they shall safeguard the confidential nature and ensure the non-disclosure of all documents and information received and handled by the ad hoc Committee including, in particular, exchanges of correspondence (emails, etc.), agendas, deliberations, discussions and meetings, minutes and decisions of the ad hoc Committee and any documents pertaining to renewal or promotion files.

The Director and the other members of the Standing Committee may not communicate in this matter with any members of the *Collège des professeur·e·s* who are not members of the ad hoc Committee or of the appeals commission, as the case may be.

2. The ad hoc Committee may recommend all steps it deems appropriate, from an extension of the existing contract on the same terms to its non-renewal, or from the partial amendment of the employment contract to the issuance of an oral or written warning or reprimand.
3. The ad hoc Committee conducts one or more in-depth discussions with the professor concerned to determine the scope and veracity of the alleged offences and to apprehend the underlying reasons.

These discussions will be recorded in brief minutes kept by a member of the ad hoc Committee.

The meetings take place behind closed doors. Only the members of the ad hoc Committee and the professor concerned may participate. The chair of the ad hoc Committee may decide to invite a third party to join a meeting.

4. The ad hoc Committee conducts in-depth discussions with the Direction académique (Direction of Studies, Direction of Research, Direction of Executive Education, Head of the Interdisciplinary Study Programme), with the Head of the department concerned and at least two other members of that department.

These discussions will be recorded in brief minutes kept by a member of the ad hoc Committee.

The persons heard may ask to have a statement entered in the minutes.

In principle, once it is formed, the ad hoc Committee should finish its work within thirty Working Days.

5. Once it has reached its conclusions, the ad hoc Committee may discuss its preliminary conclusions and possible remedial action with the person concerned if the situation observed is problematic in terms of the professor's obligations under their terms of reference in particular.

These discussions are recorded in brief minutes kept by a member of the ad hoc Committee.

The person concerned may ask to have a statement entered in the minutes.

6. When the ad hoc Committee is ready to deliver its conclusions, it shall do so in a written report which it sends to the Director.
7. The report must be signed by all members of the ad hoc Committee.

In case of disagreement, each member of the ad hoc Committee may write one part of the report (majority section, minority section) and clearly sign the part authored by them.

8. Once the report of the ad hoc Committee has been delivered to the Director, the Director has 15 Working Days to take a decision in conformity with the applicable regulations, and the TRS Regulations in particular, and to communicate the decision by registered letter or by hand to the person concerned.

The report of the ad hoc Committee is appended to the Director's decision.

9. In all other respects, the ad hoc Committee adopts its own rules of procedure (working languages, voting rules, etc.).

CHAPTER III **Internal Appeals Commission**

Article 6 Form, time limits and content of internal appeals

1. After receiving the decision of the Director referred to in Article 5 above, the person concerned has thirty Days to submit an internal appeal ("Appeal") with the *Collège des professeur·e·s*; the Appeal must be addressed to the Director.
2. Appeals must be filed in French or English, by registered letter.

An Appeal must contain:

- a) the appellant's first names and surname and domicile (street, town, country);
- b) the designation of the contested decision, the statement of facts motivating the Appeal and the grounds for complaint;
- c) the appellant's conclusions; and
- d) the date and signature of the appellant.

If the above conditions are not respected, the Appeal will be declared inadmissible.

Article 6a Formation of the Appeals Commission

1. At the Director's request, the *Collège des professeur·e·s* designates a commission (hereafter "Appeals Commission") composed as a rule of three members selected from the *Collège des professeur·e·s*.
2. Members of the Standing Committee and members of the ad hoc Committee may not be designated to the Appeals Commission.

Article 7 Procedure

1. The Appeals Commission is entrusted with the task of delivering a written opinion to the Director in principle within thirty Working Days of its designation.
2. The Appeals Commission must have access to the minutes of the meetings conducted by the ad hoc Committee with the different parties. It may conduct new meetings only by way of exception. The Appeals Commission may ask the ad hoc Commission to provide written comments.
3. The opinion (hereafter "Opinion") issued by the Appeals Commission must be signed by all its members.

In case of disagreement, each member of the Appeals Commission may write part of the report (majority section, minority section) and clearly sign the part authored by them.

4. Once the Appeals Commission has reached its conclusions, the Opinion of the Appeals Commission, comments of the ad hoc Committee, and proposal of the Director are referred to the Foundation Board which decides within the limits of the law and the regulatory framework set by the Institute.
5. In all other respects, the Appeals Commission adopts its own rules of procedure (working languages, voting rules, etc.).

PART II – RENEWAL

CHAPTER I

General conditions and special conditions

Article 8 General conditions

1. Contracts for TRS Members are renewed for a fixed term.

The procedure followed in each individual case is designed to ensure:

- a) that the person concerned is able to continue devoting themselves to their activities at the Institute at their existing degree of employment and in accordance with their terms of reference;
- b) a high scientific standard of teaching, research and publications;
- c) irreproachable supervision of master's dissertations, PhD theses and other works;
- d) that the person's participation in and commitment to the collective life of the Institute are fully satisfactory and their contribution enhances its influence;
- e) that, where applicable, the special objectives set in the existing contract have been reached; and

- f) that, moreover, the person fulfils all their obligations under the employment contract, notably with regard to Article 7 of the TRS Regulations, and duly performs any administrative duties entrusted to them.
2. TRS Members are expected to be active in all the activities constituting their terms of reference and to attain the objectives set therein.
3. The renewal procedure is designed to ensure that candidates meet these objectives, in particular as reflected in the annual review reports, research assessment grid (CERES), bibliometric measures of the research impact in the tables compiled by the departments, and in students' teaching evaluations.

Article 9 Special conditions

1. In principle and subject to Articles 30 to 33 of the TRS Regulations, appointments of full professors and associate professors are automatically renewed for a new fixed term in accordance with the provisions of the TRS Regulations.
2. For full professors, associate professors and *professeur·e-s titulaires*, the renewal procedure must be completed one year before the end of the existing employment contract.
3. In the case of assistant professors, contracts are automatically renewed for a second and final term in accordance with the applicable procedure described in Chapter III of this part of these Regulations.

Any other procedure presupposes shortcomings pursuant to the terms and conditions of the TRS Regulations and these Regulations.

4. For all categories of TRS Members other than full professors, associate professors and assistant professors, renewal is determined by the Institute's general policy objectives and available resources.

For teaching and research collaborators (hereafter "Collaborators"), renewal may involve a change in activity rate or special conditions.

5. For adjunct professors and professors of practice, renewal is also determined by:
 - a) the needs of the Institute in terms of teaching and research, and its budgetary resources;
 - b) the pedagogical and scientific skills of the person concerned as evidenced in the performance of their functions.
6. The criteria mentioned in paragraph 5 of this Article apply analogously to senior lecturers, lecturers and research fellows where a renewal of their appointment is under consideration.
7. In the case of assistant professors, adjunct professors and Collaborators, the renewal procedure must be completed six months before the end of their existing employment contract.

CHAPTER II

Renewal of full professors and associate professors

Article 10 **Compiling the file**

1. Approximately sixteen months before the end of their current contract, the Director shall invite the professor concerned to submit the following documents in English or French:
 - a) a curriculum vitae;
 - b) an activity report including all accomplishments during the term of contract, and 1) the candidate's willingness to assume any administrative duties (Direction of Studies, Research or Executive Education, or Head of a department, a centre or the Interdisciplinary Study Programme) during the term of the next contract or, on the contrary, 2) a possible reduction of the work rate if the candidate is considering taking on subsidiary duties;
 - c) a memo on the candidate's ongoing and upcoming research work with a precise time schedule for the term covered by the next contract, including any submissions to external funding agencies;
 - d) a copy of all teaching assessments with a table listing all courses taught at the Institute during the term of the current contract, number of students and satisfaction rate compared with other courses taken at the Institute;
 - e) a summary of the research credits obtained during the term of the contract applying both the CERES system and the department's assessment grid (to be prepared with the Director's Office).

The Director may ask the candidate to provide additional explanatory documentation.

2. Once these documents have been delivered to the Director, *Direction académique*, and Head of Department, the professor concerned meets with:
 - a) the Head of Department in the presence of at least one member of the *Direction académique* (Direction of Studies, Direction of Research, Direction of Executive Education, Head of the Interdisciplinary Study Programme) to discuss the terms and conditions of their employment within the different Institute programmes during the new contractual term;
 - b) the Director.

These meetings are designed to ensure *inter alia* that the professor concerned will be able to develop their project as well as possible, and that no changes in their terms of reference are necessary.

3. Based on the contents of these documents and the talks with the professor concerned, the Head of Department will prepare a draft letter with a summary description of the candidate's past and projected professional accomplishments for circulation and validation by all the professors in the department; the final version is then sent simultaneously to the Standing Committee and to all members of the department.

If the draft letter prepared by the Head of Department mentions any shortcomings, within the meaning of the Regulations, the Head of Department shall arrange a meeting with the full and associate professors of the department; this meeting will decide on the draft of the letter confirming that shortcomings have been found to exist within the meaning of the Regulations.

Article 11 Examination by the Standing Committee

1. The candidate's file and the letter of the Head of Department are communicated to the Standing Committee, which considers the case relying only on the submitted documentation.
2. The Standing Committee ascertains that the file is complete (and contains the letter of the Head of Department); it accordingly takes note of the accomplishments of the candidate and the latter's project for the next contractual term.
3. If the letter of the Head of Department, acting on behalf of the department, does not mention any shortcomings, within the meaning of these Regulations, the Standing Committee approves the renewal. It then automatically forwards the file to the Director so that the Foundation Board may approve the renewal and the Director may sign the contract in good time before the end of the current employment contract.
4. Otherwise, the Standing Committee examines the file and writes a motivated recommendation in favour or against the creation of an ad hoc Committee. The applicable procedure is governed by the Regulations.

Article 12 Director's announcement to the *Collège des professeur·e·s*

Once the Foundation Board has approved a renewal, the Director announces it to the next meeting of the *Collège des professeur·e·s* and inserts the research programme and the curriculum vitae of the renewed professor in the information documentation circulated to the *Collège des professeur·e·s*.

CHAPTER III Renewal of assistant professors

Article 13 Compiling the file

1. Approximately six months before the end of their first and second-to-last contract as assistant professor, the Director invites the candidate to submit the following documents in English or French:
 - a) a curriculum vitae;
 - b) an activity report covering all their accomplishments during the contractual term;
 - c) a summary of the research credits obtained during the term of the contract applying both the CERES system and the department's assessment grid (to be prepared with the Director's Office);
 - d) a memo about their ongoing and upcoming research work with a precise research time schedule;
 - e) a memo on teaching pedagogics and possibly a proposal for new courses during the second contractual term;
 - f) a copy of all teaching assessments with a table listing all courses taught at the Institute during the term of the current contract, the number of students and the satisfaction rate compared with other courses taken at the Institute.

The Director may ask the candidate to provide additional explanatory documentation.

2. Taking due account of the opinion of the other department members, the Head of Department drafts a letter assessing the professional accomplishments of the candidate and the latter's contribution to the objectives of the department in terms of research, teaching and services.

Before finalising the letter, the Head of Department consults the Head of the Interdisciplinary Study Programme to establish that the candidate for renewal meets expectations as regards their involvement in this programme (both in terms of teaching and supervision). The Head of Department also consults the Director of Executive Education and possibly the Director of Research to cover any possible administrative duties (participation in the Ethics Committee, etc.).

The letter must include an assessment, based on the promotion criteria defined by the department, of the candidate's expected progress in developing knowledge in their field of specialisation.

3. Relying on this comprehensive information, the Head of Department prepares a first version for circulation to all professors members of the department, and makes the requested changes, if any.

The Head of Department must ensure that the final version of the letter has been approved by all full professors and associate professors before sending the final version simultaneously to the Standing Committee and to all department members.

Article 14 Assessment by the Standing Committee

1. The candidate's file and the letter of the Head of Department are communicated to the Standing Committee, which considers the case relying on the submitted documentation.

The Standing Committee may request supplemental documentation and if necessary meet with the Head of Department and/or the full professor of the department designated as "reference person" for the assistant professor in order to determine the candidate's progress based on the department's promotion criteria for associate professorship.

2. Since renewal between the first contract and the second (and last) contract is as a rule automatic for assistant professors, the Standing Committee verifies that no shortcomings, within the meaning of the Regulations, are mentioned in the letter of the Head of Department acting on behalf of the department.

In this case, the Standing Committee approves the renewal and forwards the file to the Director so that the Foundation Board may approve the renewal and the Director may sign the new contract in good time before the end of the current contract.

Otherwise, the Standing Committee proposes the creation of an ad hoc Committee. The applicable procedure is governed by the Regulations.

3. In addition to validating the contract renewal, the Standing Committee must draft a report ("Review") summarising its deliberations on the candidate's chances of appointment; the first version of this report is prepared by the Vice President.

The Review must assess the candidate's strengths and potential weaknesses and define priorities for maximising the candidate's chances for promotion and appointment to the rank of associate professor.

Before sending the Review to the Foundation Board, the Standing Committee may elect to circulate a draft version to the Head of Department and to the candidate's "reference person".

Article 15 Referral of the file by the Director to the Foundation Board

1. The Director communicates the file submitted by the candidate for the renewal of the first contract by a second contract, together with the letter of the Head of Department, the Review of the Standing Committee and, if applicable, the experts' report, to the Foundation Board and makes a proposal.
2. The Director communicates the proposal for the renewal of the contract to the candidate.
3. The procedure under the Regulations in the event of an ad hoc committee is reserved.

Article 16 Director's announcement to the *Collège des professeur·e·s*

Once the Foundation Board has approved the renewal, the Director announces it to the next meeting of the *Collège des professeur·e·s* and inserts the research programme and the curriculum vitae of the renewed professor in the information documentation communicated to the *Collège des professeur·e·s*.

CHAPTER IV Renewal of professors of practice

Article 17 Principles

1. The renewal of professor-of-practice appointments is the ultimate responsibility of the Director to propose and of the Foundation Board to validate.
2. If there are sufficient means, before submitting the proposal to the Foundation Board the Director must first obtain the opinion of the department or study programme to which the professor of practice belongs and the opinion of the Standing Committee which assesses the motivation for the renewal and, if necessary, discuss the matter within the *Collège des professeur·e·s*.
3. Renewals are determined by:
 - a) the needs of the Institute in terms of teaching and research, and its budgetary resources;
 - b) the pedagogical and scientific skills of the person concerned, as evidenced in the performance of their functions.

Article 18 Compiling of the file

1. Approximately twelve months before the end of a contract as professor of practice, the Director invites the candidate to submit the following documents in English or French:
 - a) a curriculum vitae;
 - b) an activity report comprising all their accomplishments during the contractual term;
 - c) a summary of the research credits obtained during the term of the contract applying both the CERES system and the department's assessment grid (to be prepared with the Director's Office);
 - d) a memo about the ongoing and upcoming research work, with a precise research time schedule;

- e) a memo on teaching pedagogics and possibly a proposal for new courses during the renewed contractual term;
- f) a copy of all teaching assessments with a table listing all courses taught at the Institute during the term of the current contract, the number of students and the satisfaction rate compared with other courses taken at the Institute.

The Director may ask the candidate to provide additional explanatory documentation.

2. The Head of Department or the Head of the study programme drafts a letter, taking due account of the opinion of the other members of the department or study programme to which the professor concerned belongs, assessing the professional accomplishments of the candidate and the latter's contribution to the relevant teaching, services or research objectives of the Institute.

The Head of Department or the Head of the study programme prepares a first version which is circulated to all professors who are members of the department or who co-head the study programme ("heads of track" of the Interdisciplinary Study Programme, for example), then makes the requested changes, if any, before sending the final version simultaneously to the Standing Committee and to all members of the department or study programme.

Article 19 Assessment by the Standing Committee

1. The file of the professor concerned and the letter of the Head of Department or the Head of the Interdisciplinary Study Programme are communicated to the Standing Committee, which considers the case relying on the submitted documentation.

The Standing Committee may request additional documents and talk with the Head of Department and/or the Head of the Interdisciplinary Study Programme if necessary.

2. After consulting the members of the Standing Committee, the Vice President determines whether the renewal is motivated in accordance with these Regulations by:
 - a) the needs of the Institute in terms of teaching and research, and its budgetary resources;
 - b) the pedagogical and scientific skills of the person concerned as evidenced in the performance of their functions.

The Vice President's report is submitted to a vote in the Standing Committee and communicated to the Director.

Article 20 Director's decision and referral to the Foundation Board

1. Based on the file of the professor concerned and the report of the Standing Committee, and considering the financial projections of the Institute, the Director decides whether or not to propose the renewal of the professor's contract to the Foundation Board. The complete file is communicated to the Foundation Board for a decision.
2. If not in line with the general policy objectives and available resources of the Institute, the Director may decide to propose the non-renewal of the contract to the Foundation Board after informing the *Collège des professeur·e·s*.
3. The professor concerned has no internal possibility to appeal the decision since the employment contract signed on hiring does not guarantee an automatic renewal.

Article 21 Director's announcement to the *Collège des professeur·e·s*

1. Once the Foundation Board has approved the renewal, the Director announces it to the next meeting of the *Collège des professeur·e·s* and inserts the research programme and the curriculum vitae of the renewed professor in the information documentation circulated within the *Collège des professeur·e·s*.
2. A decision not to renew the contract of a professor of practice must be communicated to the person concerned at least six months before the end of their appointment.

CHAPTER V

Renewal of adjunct professors, senior lecturers, honorary professors, lecturers, and research fellows

Article 22 Principles

1. The renewal of the appointment of adjunct professors, senior lecturers, honorary professors, lecturers, and research fellows is the responsibility of the Director, who consults the department or study programme to which the person concerned belongs before taking a decision.
2. For these categories of TRS Members, non-renewal decisions must be communicated to the person concerned at least six months before the end of their appointment.
3. In the event of non-renewal, these categories of TRS Members have no internal possibility to appeal the Director's decision since the employment contract signed on hiring does not guarantee automatic renewal.

Article 23 Composition of the file

1. Approximately twelve months before the end of their contract, the Director invites the person concerned to submit the following documents in English or French:
 - a) a curriculum vitae;
 - b) an activity report comprising all their accomplishments during the contractual term;
 - c) a summary of the research credits obtained during the term of the contract applying both the CERES system and the department's assessment grid (to be prepared with the Director's Office);
 - d) a memo about the ongoing and upcoming research work with a precise research time schedule;
 - e) a memo on teaching pedagogics and possibly a proposal for new courses during the new contractual term;
 - f) if applicable, a copy of all teaching assessments with a table listing all courses taught at the Institute during the term of the contract, the number of students and the satisfaction rate compared with other courses taken at the Institute.

The Director may ask the person concerned to provide additional explanatory documentation.

2. The Head of Department or the Head of the study programme drafts a letter, taking due account of the opinion of the other members of the department or study programme to which the person concerned belongs, assessing the professional accomplishments of the person in question and the latter's contribution to the relevant teaching, services or research objectives of the Institute.

The Head of Department or the Head of the study programme prepares a first version which is circulated to all professors who are members of the department or who co-head the study programme (“heads of track” of the Interdisciplinary Study Programme, for example), then makes the requested changes, if any, before sending the final version simultaneously to the Standing Committee and to all members of the department or study programme.

Article 24 Director’s decision

1. Based on the file of the person concerned and an analysis of the financial projections of the Institute, the Director decides whether or not to renew the contract of the person concerned.
2. Adjunct professors, senior lecturers, honorary professors, lecturers, and research fellows have no internal possibility to appeal the Director’s decision since the employment contract signed on hiring does not guarantee automatic renewal.

Article 25 Director’s announcement to the *Collège des professeur·e·s*

1. Once a renewal is decided by the Director, the latter announces it to the next meeting of the *Collège des professeur·e·s* and inserts the research programme and the curriculum vitae of the renewed person in the information documentation circulated within the *Collège des professeur·e·s*.
2. A decision not to renew the contract of an adjunct professor, senior lecturer, honorary professor, lecturer, or research fellow must be communicated to the person concerned at least six months before the end of their appointment.

CHAPTER VI

Renewal of PhD students with a teaching or research assistant contract

Article 26 Procedure

1. The renewal of the appointment of PhD students with a teaching assistant contract is the responsibility of the Director, on the proposal of the Head of the department or the Head of the Interdisciplinary Study Programme to which they belong, in accordance with jointly defined procedures and with due regard to the available budgetary or financial means.
2. The renewal of the appointment of PhD students with a research assistant contract is the responsibility of the Director; renewals depend on the conditions set by the funding agencies and on the Principal Investigator’s assessment of the candidate’s performance in achieving the objectives of the contractual term to be renewed.
3. In any event, renewal is determined by:
 - a) the teaching and research requirements of the Institute, and its budgetary availabilities and/or external funding resources;
 - b) the pedagogical and scientific skills of the person concerned, as evidenced in the performance of their functions.
4. PhD students with a teaching or research assistant contract have no internal possibilities to appeal the Director’s decision since the employment contract signed on hiring does not guarantee automatic renewal.

PART III – PROMOTIONS

CHAPTER I General conditions

Article 27 General principles

1. An associate professor or an assistant professor with a solid file may be promoted to a higher rank at the earliest during their second period of appointment.
2. Promotion is subject to the recommendation of the *Collège des professeur·e·s*.
3. The Foundation Board decides on promotions relying on the proposal of the Director supported by the file and the recommendation of the *Collège des professeur·e·s*.

CHAPTER II Promotion procedure for assistant and associate professors

Article 28 Principles

1. The Institute strives to ensure the diversity of its faculty in terms of age, gender and geographical origin. This concern for diversity is in tune with its concern for academic excellence since diversity broadens the perspectives and insights on the subjects addressed.
2. The Institute is committed to offering assistant and associate professors opportunities for promotion.
3. Assistant professors and associate professors have a different status.

Associate professors are fully-fledged members of the *Collège des professeur·e·s*.

Assistant professors must go through a probationary period. They are required to file an application for promotion to the rank of associate professor during the term of their second contract. Pursuant to the TRS Regulations, they must leave the Institute at the end of their second contract as assistant professor if they do not obtain the promotion.

4. Promotion is a sign of the Institute's confidence in the development of a young professor's career, in their contribution to the search for excellence, in their disciplinary and interdisciplinary leadership, commitment to teaching and contribution to academia and the life of the Institute.

Article 29 Reference person for assistant professors and third-year review

1. The Institute undertakes to create conditions conducive to promotion for assistant professors and to guide them along a successful academic career path.
2. To this end, the Institute offers periods of teaching exemptions. Moreover, when an assistant professor is first appointed, the Head of Department proposes, in consultation with the hiree, the name of a "reference person": the purpose of this reference person (an associate or full professor) is to facilitate the assistant professor's integration and professional development.

When their contract is renewed for the first and only time, assistant professors are entitled

to a feedback on their performance in view of promotion from the Head of Department and the Standing Committee.

3. A key career-monitoring mechanism is the third-year review (hereafter the "Review"), a formal assessment which assistant professors must undergo in their third year at the Institute. The Review is primarily designed to enable the assistant professor to obtain an assessment from the department's professors and the Standing Committee regarding their progress towards promotion as well as guidance on how best to maximise their chances.
4. The Review is initiated when the assistant professor applies for renewal. In accordance with Article 13 of these Regulations, assistant professors are invited to submit their curriculum vitae, a memo on their research time schedule, a memo on their teaching philosophy and other documents.

Relying on these documents, the Head of Department consults the department's full and associate professors to assess the candidate's progress towards promotion.

5. Once these documents have been communicated to the Standing Committee, the latter undertakes an in-depth examination of the written assessment provided by the Head of Department in the light of the promotion criteria set by the department.

The members of the Standing Committee may decide to invite other colleagues.

At the candidate's request, or if the Director so decides, the Standing Committee may ask three external experts for an opinion on the candidate's progress in view of a promotion.

6. The Standing Committee examines the strategy devised by the candidate and communicates its findings to the candidate once the renewal has been decided.
7. Once the renewal is granted, the candidate meets with the Head of Department, possibly with the reference person, and with the Director to discuss the Standing Committee's assessment of their accomplishments to date and to prepare a strategy with a view to maximising their chances of promotion.

Article 30 Eligibility of assistant professors for promotion to associate professor

1. During their second year at the Institute, assistant professors may apply for promotion to the rank of associate professor.
2. Unless otherwise agreed in writing when they were hired, they may not apply before the fourth year or later than the sixth year following their appointment.
3. Before applying, they are encouraged to sound out the Head of Department, who consults the department and acts on its behalf, for an opinion on the merits of their file.
4. If they had to interrupt their activities (by reason of accident, illness or other exceptional circumstances) for at least six months during one of the two contractual terms, the assistant professor may ask the Director for an exceptional extension of their existing contract for one year at the most.
5. In the event of pregnancy or maternity leave, the existing contract is automatically extended for a period not exceeding one year.

Article 31 Eligibility of associate professors for promotion to full professor

1. Associate professors are eligible for promotion to the rank of full professor at the earliest two years after their appointment.

If an associate professor does not obtain a promotion to full professor when they apply for it, very clear conditions will have to be set to facilitate their understanding of the progress to be made in advancing their career so that they may re-apply for promotion.

Failure to obtain a promotion in no way affects the eligibility of the associate professor to apply for promotion again once these conditions are satisfied.

2. Under no circumstances shall the non-promotion of an associate professor to the rank of full professor be construed as a dilution of the principle whereby the status of associate professor shall be tenure-based in accordance with the terms and conditions of the TRS Regulations.

Article 32 Promotion criteria

1. Promotions presuppose a comprehensive assessment of the achievements of an assistant or associate professor with a view to expressing a judgement regarding the person's professional future.

The purpose of assessing a promotion file is to appraise, relying on their up-to-date file, the candidate's position and their potential in their scientific field of activity, their quality as a teacher and their contribution to the academic life of the Institute.

2. Promotions are based exclusively on merit.

For assistant professors, promotions are decided on the basis of their achievements since the completion of their PhD, with a focus on their work at the Institute.

For associate professors, promotions are decided based on their achievements, in particular since their promotion or appointment to associate professor.

3. The promotion criteria follow different disciplinary conventions but share a focus on excellence of research, teaching and service at the Institute.
4. Each department prepares and makes available to its members a series of written promotion criteria specifying the qualitative and quantitative elements to be taken into account in assessing research, teaching and service performance at the Institute.

Each department also identifies comparable departments for benchmarking purposes and whose promotion standards can serve to guide practice at the Institute.

The department's promotion criteria and the departments selected for benchmarking are reviewed and approved by the Academic Committee, and referred to the Director's Office.

5. For all departments, the first and primary promotion criterion is that candidates must have attained a high level of academic distinction, that they compare favourably with the best internationally in their cohort, and that they have the potential to be among the best in their broadly defined chosen field.
6. The second criterion is high-level teaching quality.

This criterion includes classroom teaching, successful supervision of PhD theses and master's dissertations, and student guidance.

7. The third criterion is service.

This criterion comprises service to the Institute as well as to the profession and community.

Associate professors in particular may contribute added value to the Institute, its centres and research programmes, to professional associations and to promoting the Institute's mission vis à vis international Geneva and political spheres.

The bodies responsible for assessing promotions to full professor shall take service into account to the same extent as research and teaching.

For promotions of assistant professors to the rank of associate professor, the primary criterion is not service, but research and teaching.

In any event, service cannot compensate any academic or teaching weaknesses.

Article 33 Applying for promotion and promotion file

1. The first step in the promotion procedure is for candidates to file their letter of application with the Director, who refers it to the department concerned.
2. Together with their letter of application, candidates must submit a file containing the following documents, in French or English:
 - a) a curriculum vitae;
 - b) an activity report covering all their achievements since completion of their PhD (for assistant professors) or their appointment to associate professor (for associate professors);
 - c) a memo on their accomplished and upcoming research, with an accurate time schedule;
 - d) copy of all publications since completion of their PhD (for assistant professors) or since their appointment to associate professor (for associate professors), indicating the three publications they consider most important;
 - e) a summary of the research credits obtained since completion of their PhD (for assistant professors) or since their appointment to associate professor (for associate professors) applying both the CERES system and the department's assessment grid (to be prepared with the Director's Office);
 - f) a memo on teaching, explaining their approach and philosophy;
 - g) a copy of all teaching assessments with a table listing all courses taught at the Institute or in the centres and joint programmes during the term of the contract, the number of students and the satisfaction rate compared with other courses taken at the Institute.

The Director may ask the candidate to provide supplemental documentation.

3. On receipt, the Director sends all the documents to the candidate's Head of Department and to the members of the Standing Committee so that they may start their assessment in good time to read the candidate's articles and all the other documents already assembled in the file.

Article 34 External assessments

1. The candidate's file includes five assessment letters prepared in English or French by external assessors.

The procedure for requesting those letters is the following:

The Head of Department draws up a list of fifteen possible assessors (hereafter "Assessors"). The Head of Department consults the candidate, who may suggest up to three Assessors and indicate any persons they do not wish to be included on the list due to a strong negative personal bias or a conflict of interest.

In preparing the list, the Head of Department also consults the colleagues in the department and the Institute and sends them the list before communicating it to the Director.

The list includes a short bibliography for each of the proposed Assessors, as well as their titles, institutional affiliations and status in their respective field.

2. The Head of Department communicates the list to the Director, who submits it to the *Collège des professeur·e·s* for approval.
3. The list must include a combination of Assessors with expertise close to that of the candidate and Assessors from connected fields who can testify to the scope of the candidate's work and the potential of the latter to resonate beyond their sole discipline.

The Assessors must come from academic institutions of international repute with a strong research orientation or from the benchmarking institutions of the Institute and the department.

Persons close to the candidate, such as their thesis supervisor or close research collaborators, are not eligible as Assessors. Any other conflicts of interest must also be avoided in compliance with the relevant directive. By way of example, the spouse or partner of a member of the *Collège des professeur·e·s* who holds a position in the same academic field as the candidate to promotion may not act as an Assessor.

The Director will send the Assessors an electronic link to pedagogical materials designed to raise awareness about the inherent biases of the assessment process.

The Assessors are given a copy of the department's promotion criteria and the candidate's file together with assessment support materials.

In the case of assistant professors, this includes all the candidate's publications; in the case of associate professors, all their publications since their appointment to the rank of associate professor.

The Assessors assess the candidate's rigour, innovative capacity, and academic impact. The Assessors are encouraged to draw comparisons with other academics of the candidate's cohort who work in broadly the same field.

4. The Assessors' letters are added to the candidate's file which is then communicated to the department's professors and to the members of the Standing Committee for appraisal.

Article 35 Recommendation of the department

1. The department meets to discuss the file and assess the candidate's academic achievements, teaching and services.

It votes on whether or not to recommend the candidate's promotion.

2. The department proceeds in two separate meetings:
 - a) one meeting is exclusively devoted to a common discussion by all the professors about the candidate's academic achievements relying on a perusal of the complete promotion file delivered by the candidate (before the members of the department read the letters of the Assessors);
 - b) the second meeting, or round of meetings, is devoted to a discussion of the complete file, including the Assessors' letters, with a view to reaching a decision.
3. Assistant, associate and full professors are encouraged to participate in the discussions; in accordance with the TRS Regulations, however, assistant professors are not entitled to vote.

For the promotion of assistant professors to the rank of associate professor, only associate and full professors may participate in the voting by secret ballot.

For the promotion of associate professors to the rank of full professor, only full professors may participate in the voting by secret ballot.

All associate and full professors of the department are required to participate in the voting procedure within the above-mentioned limits; voting members who cannot participate for imperative reasons must take the necessary steps to access the file and vote in absentia.

Research professors, professors of practice and adjunct professors of the department, as well as the department's other teaching and research collaborators, may be informally consulted by the Head of Department if the latter deems it appropriate, but they do not participate in the deliberations or in the voting on the promotion decision.

4. The Head of Department, acting on behalf of the department, prepares a report summarising the department's deliberations, weighing the merits of the case, and reporting the result of the vote.

The Head of Department must take into account the arguments put forward by the majority and the minority in the event the department does not reach a consensus. The report must be approved by all department's professors entitled to vote, subject to the aforesaid limits.

5. The final report is added to the candidate's file and communicated to the Standing Committee.

Article 36 Procedure before the Standing Committee

1. The Standing Committee receives the candidate's file at the same time as the department and commences its assessment immediately.
2. The Standing Committee receives the department's report. The Standing Committee assesses the candidate's academic achievements, teaching and services. It starts work on its assessment as soon as it receives the file compiled by the candidate; it reviews the file at the same time as the department. Once it receives the department's report, it shall take the latter's opinion into account and finalise its assessment within a reasonable time frame.

It also receives the Assessors' letters, at the same time as the department.

During the preliminary deliberations on the candidate's file, then on the Assessors' letters, the Standing Committee may meet without the Director with the latter's consent.

3. Once it has the department's report, the Standing Committee may request additional documents and/or conduct meetings with the members of the *Collège des professeur·e·s*, and especially with the "reference person" of the candidate for promotion to the rank of associate professor; the Standing Committee must, however, complete its deliberations within a reasonable time frame.
4. The Standing Committee assesses the impact of the candidate's work beyond the discipline and the candidate's contribution to the intellectual life of the Institute, in particular. It also considers the candidate's teaching performance, institutional commitment and services.
5. The Vice President prepares a report for the *Collège des professeur·e·s* summarising the deliberations of the Standing Committee, assessing the candidate's merits and including a recommendation for or against promotion.
6. The Standing Committee adopts the report. If a vote is organised within the Standing Committee, the results of the vote are recorded in the report which is then added to the candidate's file.

Article 37 Procedure before the *Collège des professeur·e·s*

1. The *Collège des professeur·e·s* receives the report of the Standing Committee, the candidate's file, the department's report and the letters of the Assessors.
2. The deliberations of the *Collège des professeur·e·s* must focus primarily on the report of the Standing Committee, which is considered in terms of its external validity (determined relying on the other documents) and its internal validity (whether or not it contains inconsistencies).

All ranks of professors are encouraged to participate in the deliberations on the Standing Committee's report. However, only associate and full professors are entitled to vote on a Standing Committee report concerning the promotion of an assistant professor, and only full professors are entitled to vote on a Standing Committee report concerning the promotion of an associate professor to the rank of full professor.

The *Collège des professeur·e·s* takes its decision by an absolute majority of the votes cast (any blank votes, invalid votes and abstentions are disregarded in the vote count).

3. Once the deliberations are completed, the *Collège des professeur·e·s* issues a positive or negative recommendation on the report of the Standing Committee so that it may be sent directly, or not, to the Foundation Board with the opinion of the Director (hereafter "Opinion").

If the *Collège des professeur·e·s* approves the report of the Standing Committee, the report with all other elements of the file and the Opinion are sent to the Foundation Board for a decision.

If the *Collège des professeur·e·s* does not approve the report of the Standing Committee, the promotion file is reassessed by the Standing Committee in the light of the arguments put forward during the deliberations of the *Collège des professeur·e·s*. The Vice President of the Standing Committee must write a report within thirty Working Days responding to the objections and clarification requests raised during the deliberations of the *Collège des*

professeur·e·s; if necessary, the previous recommendation will be reviewed and a new recommendation issued to the Director.

Ideally, unless the Director has decided additional measures designed to finalise the academic assessment of the file, this recommendation is submitted for deliberation to the next meeting of the *Collège des professeur·e·s*.

When the new report of the Standing Committee is presented to the *Collège des professeur·e·s*, the same voting procedure is followed in respect of the new recommendation.

If the *Collège des professeur·e·s* again declines to approve the report of the Standing Committee, the Director prepares the Opinion taking into account both the vote of the *Collège des professeur·e·s* and that of the Standing Committee.

Article 38 Powers of the Director

1. Before communicating the Opinion to the Foundation Board, the Director shares it with the members of the Standing Committee.

In the exceptional case where the Director's Opinion diverges from that of the Standing Committee, the Director may decide to organise an extra-ordinary meeting of the Standing Committee to discuss the reasons for the divergency.

In this case, the Vice President communicates a summary of the discussion to the *Collège des professeur·e·s*.

2. The file, including the report of the Standing Committee, the recommendation of the *Collège des professeur·e·s* and the Assessors' letters, is delivered to the Director, who communicates their Opinion to the Foundation Board relying on the documents received.

Article 39 Procedure before the Foundation Board

1. On the proposal of the Director and the recommendation of the Standing Committee and/or the *Collège des professeur·e·s*, the Foundation Board decides on the promotion of the candidate and the continuation of the candidate's activities in accordance with the Institute's regulations on the status of teachers.

If the Foundation Board expresses reservations with regard to the proposal before it, the arguments put forward will be presented.

2. The decision of the Foundation Board is final.

In the event of a positive decision, the promotion takes effect at the start of the autumn or spring semester, depending on when the decision is taken, unless the Foundation Board decides otherwise.

In the event of a negative decision on a promotion to the rank of associate professor, the candidate may not re-apply for promotion and their second contract as assistant professor will be their last.

In the event of a negative decision on a promotion to the rank of full professor, the candidate may re-apply for promotion when they satisfy the conditions indicated in the report of the Standing Committee approved by the *Collège des professeur·e·s*. The candidate then starts the above-described procedure over again.

PART IV – FINAL PROVISIONS

Article 40 Intry into force

1. After the positive recommendation of the *Collège des enseignant·e·s*, these Regulations were adopted by the Foundation Board on 18 November 2022 and came into force on their adoption date.
2. These Regulations apply to all renewal and promotion procedures initiated after the effective date.
3. The French-language version is the authentic one.