

JWSE PDR Reviewer Checklist (Academic Staff)

Minimum standards for consistency, quality and completeness

1. Core principles and allocation approach

- Deliver a consistent, high-quality and evidence-based approach across all reviews.
 - Reviews are allocated to ensure consistency, rigour and alignment:
 - R&T reviewed by R&T; LTS by LTS (defined exceptions apply);
 - continuity of reviewer maintained where possible;
 - maximum 8 academic reviews per reviewer, reduced for significant PDRA supervision.
 - One reviewer leads and owns each review; teaching line managers may join R&T reviews and must notify the reviewer in advance.
 - All reviews must:
 - distinguish between expected and exceptional performance and ensure judgements are evidence-based, proportionate and calibrated across reviewers;
 - avoid over-emphasising a single strength at the expense of overall performance.
-

2. Mandatory requirements (non-negotiable)

- ✓ Be cognisant of PDR expectations and updates, including participation in relevant training and reference to [PDR guidance](#), to ensure reviews remain rigorous and meaningful.
- ✓ Consult BOTH solid line managers (where not acting as reviewer) and confirm this in the review summary.
- ✓ Seek input from relevant roles where appropriate (e.g. PGR Director, Executive Dean (Student and Staff Experience)).
- ✓ Plan and manage reviews to ensure completion within the PDR window (including scheduling, preparation time and prompt write-up).
- ✓ Share the full and final review, including your reviewer summary, by email with both line managers.

3. Core topics (minimum coverage)

Reviews must include focused discussion on:

- **Research** (R&T staff) – proposals, outputs, impact, income and awards (including trajectory toward 4* quality and a focus on strategic/large opportunities) – discussion should be informed by available HESA benchmarking data in the PIA dashboard, including research income performance relative to appropriate disciplinary and sector comparators.
- **Teaching** (all staff) – delivery, student experience and engagement, fulfilment of teaching, administrative and regulatory responsibilities; pedagogical scholarship for LTS staff;
- **PGR supervision** (where relevant) – effectiveness of supervision and arrangements supporting timely completion;
- **Collegiality** – appropriate engagement with School, College and University activities and contribution to the wider academic community.

4. Review summary and objectives

Summary:

- concise, clear, evidence-based and balanced (strengths and areas for improvement);
- include key priorities and associated support or resource requirements;
- confirm input from BOTH solid line managers has been obtained (including consultation where they are not acting as reviewer).

Objectives (SMART):

- Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound;
- clearly aligned to role and priorities;
- all staff should have core objectives aligned to the key activity areas relevant to their role, including at least one objective focused on enhancing the student experience, with clear actions and defined measures of success;
- must demonstrate clear focus and planning (not generic statements).

Example:

- Weak: *Submit a grant application by June 2027*
- Strong: *Submit a proposal to [funder/programme] in [defined research area] by June 2027*