

Guidance on Elections 2021-2022

A. THE ELECTORAL PROCESS: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The Charter and Bye-Laws provide for the election of Fellows, Corresponding Fellows and Honorary Fellows. Nothing in this document overrides the provisions in the Bye-Laws.
2. The Academy's process for election includes the following:
 - i. Identification of qualified candidates by thorough searching by Section Standing Committees (SSCs), suggestions from individual Fellows ('Call for Names') and from heads of universities and relevant organisations.
 - ii. Supply of information from candidates that is accurate, full, and up to date.
 - iii. Discussion of strengths of candidates by Sections before agreeing to put names to the ballot.
 - iv. Commissioning of independent assessments from leading (usually overseas) scholars.
 - v. Ballot by Section members to elicit views of the most outstanding candidates.
 - vi. Discussion by Sections, considering the outcome of the ballot, and recommendations to Groups. (These are the Humanities and Social Sciences Sections gathered together in two groups, one representing the former set of Sections and one the latter.)
 - vii. Discussion by the Groups and ranking of the candidates put forward by their Sections.
 - viii. Discussion by Fellowship and Structures Committee (FSC) of candidates through the interstitial ballot route and from the Ginger Groups if there are any. (Ginger Groups are gatherings of Fellows who share a field of expertise not currently within a Section.)
 - ix. Discussion by Council and agreement of candidates to nominate to AGM.
 - x. Election by AGM.

April-August: Identification of qualified candidates by thorough searching by SSCs, by suggestions from individual Fellows: 'Call for Names', and by heads of universities and other relevant organisations. Agreement of scholars to go to Sections for consideration, and disclosure.

April-September: Supply of information from candidates that is accurate, full, and up to date.

September: Discussion of relative strengths of candidates by Sections before agreeing to put names of candidates to the ballot.

October-December: Commissioning of independent assessments from leading (usually overseas) scholars.

February: Ballot by Section members.

March: Discussion of candidates by Section, considering ballot results, and making recommendations to Groups.

April (Overlap of electoral cycles): Discussion by Groups of candidates put forward by Sections, and ranking candidates for Council.

May (Overlap of electoral cycles): Discussion of candidates through the interstitial route by Fellowship & Structures Committee (FSC).

June (Overlap of electoral cycles): Discussion by Council and agreement of candidates to recommend to AGM.

July (Overlap of electoral cycles): Election by AGM.

B. DIVERSITY OF THE FELLOWSHIP

3. Elections to the Fellowship in 2022 will draw on a ballot in early 2022, and Section meetings are held in September 2021 and March 2022.
4. Section Standing Committees meet between late May and August to prepare for Sections in September, in particular to choose names for Section to consider for inclusion on the ballot. These candidates will be disclosed to and invited to supply CVs. *The Good Practice Guidance* (annexed to this Guidance) should be circulated to Section chairs and distributed at every Section meeting in advance of decision-making, with the purpose of encouraging Sections to search for candidates from as wide a background as possible. Sections should regularly review long lists to ensure that new names are being promoted, and, where necessary, should remove from long lists candidates who are judged to be unlikely to achieve the Fellowship.
5. In their search for candidates, Sections should have regard to the Academy's Strategic Plan for 2018-22. This plan identifies diversity as 'a strategic priority', promising to 'ensure that our community is representative of all corners of the UK, reflects new subjects and developments within disciplines as well as acting to preserve those subjects that are at risk'. The strategy also commits the Academy to examining 'the barriers that prevent people of particular backgrounds from progressing in their academic careers.'
6. Following work by the Fellows Diversity Working Group(FDWG), Council in 2021 adopted the following statement articulating why diversity is important for the Fellowship:

“Diversity is important and valuable to the Academy and Fellowship for reasons that map on to our three key roles as an independent fellowship of world-leading scholars and researchers; as a forum for debate and engagement; and as a funding body that supports new research, nationally and internationally.

- First, we need to ensure that the Academy engages effectively with the frontiers of our disciplines as well as consolidating existing research. A more diverse Fellowship should mean a more vibrant and intellectually challenging environment, bringing with it new ideas, new areas of research, and innovative approaches.
- Secondly, where there is currently a lack of diversity – as measured against indicators such as gender and ethnicity, geographical region, and fields of research - it alerts us to the high probability that we are failing to recognise excellence, because we are looking too narrowly for people who mirror the existing Fellowship.
- Finally, we need to ensure that the Fellowship has the necessary spread of expertise effectively to assess applications for funding. A greater diversity within the Fellowship would enable a tighter fit between funding applications and assessors' expertise.”

7. The Academy last approached Vice-Chancellors and heads of national organisations (British Museum, NHM, Tate, etc) in 2019 and will do so again in 2022 for suggestions of names to consider (this is usually done every three years). Names received are forwarded to Section chairs for consideration by Standing Committees.
8. In September Sections agree candidates for the ballot. Independent assessments are then sought for these candidates during the Autumn, and made available for Fellows to consult. The ballot is held online in February. Following the ballot, Sections meet in March to agree candidates for the consideration of Groups and Council for election in 2022. Fellowship and Structures Committee (FSC) meets in November and May to look at candidates for Honorary

Fellowship, and those that have emerged through the interstitial ballot route, and from the Ginger Groups (if any exist; none do in 2021).

9. Elections for Corresponding and Honorary Fellows run in parallel – without disclosure or assessments. Sections consider names for the ballot in September 2021 and agree recommendations to Groups and Council in March 2022.

C. ELECTION TO FELLOWSHIP

Criteria for election to Fellowship

10. The Academy's Charter (§6) defines Fellows as “persons who have attained distinction in some one or more of the branches of scientific study which it is the object of the Academy to promote”. The Bye-Laws (§2) prescribe that:
A person may be elected a Fellow if they:
(2.1.1) [have] attained distinction in any of the branches of study which it is the object of the Academy to promote;
(2.1.2) [are], in the judgment of Council, whose decision on the matter shall be final, habitually resident in the UK, the Isle of Man, or the Channel Islands.
11. The prime criterion for election to Fellowship of the Academy is academic distinction as reflected in scholarly research activity and publication. Candidates, of whatever age, are expected to be demonstrably active in research and scholarly publication and to be able to contribute to the work of Academy. Eminent research leadership and other forms of contribution to the objects of the Academy may be taken into account if there is a need to choose between scholars of comparable scholarly distinction.
12. Council in 2013 adopted the following statement about research:
Research is understood by the British Academy as original and rigorous investigation undertaken in order to advance knowledge and understanding. It includes analytical, empirical, and normative inquiry and argument. It includes the creation, development, and maintenance of the intellectual infrastructure of subjects and disciplines, in forms such as translations, dictionaries, scholarly editions, catalogues and contributions to research databases. It includes the development of interpretative models and research methodologies. It includes, within a suitable scholarly context, the generation of ideas, images, performances, and artefacts, where these lead to new or improved scholarly understanding. It includes teaching materials and publications where these embody original research.
13. Council has resolved to encourage Sections actively to seek younger candidates, with the aim of ensuring a sufficient number of Fellows still in post and clearly in touch with developments in the contemporary world of scholarship and research. Following the removal of the Senior Fellowship quota for candidates over the age of 70, by agreement of AGM in 2009, there is no formal age criterion at election and all candidates, of whatever age, will be considered on their merits. However, Sections will be expected to explain, where relevant, why a candidate had not been brought forward earlier. Council has agreed that particular scrutiny will be given to candidates whose major contribution to scholarship does not appear to be a recent one.
14. Council has agreed that the question of gender balance is of particular importance, while rejecting specific quotas for ballots or numbers to be elected. Sections are encouraged to look

actively for qualified female candidates, reflecting the percentage of women in the Professoriate in the discipline, with a minimum expectation of at least one woman in their annual ballot, or to explain why in any given year that was not done. Council agreed to advise the Groups to take into account, when ranking candidates from Sections, the record of a Section that persistently fails to meet this expectation, without adequate explanation.

15. The criterion of “habitually resident” implies a settled intention to reside in the UK, the Isle of Man, or the Channel Islands at the time of the scholar’s election to the Academy. There is no prescribed length of residence necessary before the date of election. A scholar who divides their time between the UK and another country is expected normally to spend half of the year in the UK. A candidate will be regarded as meeting the habitual residence test if they would otherwise meet the test but are on a temporary posting (for example on secondment) overseas and retains a primary contractual link with a UK organisation. A temporary posting is normally regarded as up to three years, but this is considered on a case-by-case basis. Under the Bye-laws Council remains the final arbiter of whether a candidate meets the test.
16. A candidate proposed for election is expected to maintain links with the Academy and to play an active part in the Fellowship if they take up a temporary posting at an overseas institution shortly after election. Section chairs in need of advice should consult the Chief Executive.

Elections to Fellowship

17. Bye-Law 34 prescribes that election to Fellowship is made only at a General Meeting and only on the nomination of Council. In making its nominations to AGM, Council takes into account recommendations from the Groups and the FSC.
18. Bye-Law 3 prescribes that the maximum number of Fellows that may be elected in any year is 52. It is Academy policy to elect a balanced number of scholars in the humanities and social sciences. Therefore, each Group may look to achieve 50% of elections (subject to what is said below about candidates proposed by the FSC). The 50% figure given to the Groups is a guideline, not a quota, per annum.
19. There is no quota of elections per Section. The table at Appendix 1 shows the number of elections for each Section in each of the last ten years. The expectation that there is one election per Section is not a requirement or entitlement.
20. In their work related to the election of Fellows, Sections should have regard to the *Good Practice Guidance* drafted by the Reviews of Structures and Diversity group and approved by Council in July 2017, and annexed to this Guidance Paper as Appendix 7.

Disclosure to candidates

21. It is Academy policy, pursuant to data protection obligations, to inform scholars, once a Proposal Form (PF) has been lodged, that information about them is being assembled and held. Candidates are asked to confirm that they are content for their name and biographical information to be held on a database for four years for the purposes of the Academy. Candidates are also asked to supply a full *curriculum vitae* and a summary CV – thus relieving proposers of the task and ensuring that information used in the electoral process is accurate, complete and up-to-date. They are also asked, where relevant, to supply other information, e.g. citation scores. They are asked to declare that they are habitually resident in the UK and to

undertake to let the Academy know if that changes, or if they are going to take up a posting at an overseas institution. They are also asked, for monitoring purposes, to declare, if they wish, their membership of an ethnic minority. A copy of the disclosure letter is at Appendix 5.

22. Disclosure does not apply to candidates for Corresponding and Honorary Fellowship.
23. Fellows should, therefore, be aware when completing a Proposal Form (PF) (the form is available from the Fellowship Manager) that the scholar in question will be informed that their name has been put forward for consideration. In order to contain the numbers to whom disclosure is made, Fellows are asked in the first instance to communicate names informally to their Section chair – a name and a brief statement (say 50 words) describing the scholar's achievements will suffice. If the Section Standing Committee agrees that the candidate is a strong enough possibility for disclosure to be reasonable, a PF can be completed at that point.
24. Disclosure to individuals does not imply that their candidacy is in the public domain. So far as the Academy is concerned, candidacy remains confidential. Proposers and chairs should not communicate with candidates.
25. Candidates are asked to let the Academy hold information about them for four years, and to update it annually in the event of material change. They are not informed of their individual progress within the electoral system, save in the case of election. If a candidate is still under consideration after four years, the request is renewed.

Elections in 2021

26. Names of candidates to go for independent assessment will be agreed at the September Section meetings. Normally this will be the same (save for those for whom assessments are already in hand) as the list of candidates to go to the ballot in February in the following year. After independent assessments are received by the Academy, they will be checked with the Section chairs and Section Standing Committees.
27. **Nomination Forms and signatories:** Nomination forms will be completed, in the light of independent assessments, and signed by at least three and up to six Fellows. It is the Section chair's responsibility to make sure that the nomination text makes the full case for election, and includes any information that might be judged relevant in light of the Academy's strategic goal with regard to diversity. Fellows are able to sign in support of more than one candidate. To retain impartiality, chairs should not act as signatories to a nomination form. Fellows should not be a signatory to a nomination for a candidate from their own institution (for this purpose, colleges at Oxford and at Cambridge are regarded as part of a single institution, whereas colleges of the University of London are not).
28. **Personal connection:** Fellows are asked to be scrupulous in declaring an institutional interest or any personal connection with a candidate under consideration. Personal connection might mean being a relative, or a member of the same academic department, or being a research collaborator, joint author, former supervisor, etc. Fellows are not debarred from voting for candidates from their own institution. Where there is a 'close personal connection' (spouse, partner, sibling, etc.) then Fellows are advised to leave the meeting room (whether real or virtual) at the relevant discussion point and should abstain from voting in a round where there is a candidate with whom they have a close personal connection. If the candidate in question is balloted as an interstitial candidate, the Fellow may still take part in

the ordinary ballot (and vice versa). Fellows with close personal connections are encouraged to contact the Fellowship Manager for advice.

29. The ballot should be completed online in February, or by post and email if Fellows do not have access to the electronic version. The date for the return of the ballot will be circulated. The Fellowship Manager will convey the basic results data to individual Section chairs ahead of March Section meetings.
30. All members of the Section (except Emeritus Fellows and Corresponding Fellows) are eligible to participate in the ballot. Fellows are not debarred from voting for candidates from their own institution. Fellows are asked to complete the ballot regardless of whether they intend to be present at the March Section meeting – attendance at the March Section meeting is not a substitute for completing the ballot. Fellows may only vote for candidates nominated by their own Section (or Sections, in the case of cross-members).
31. Cross-members in Sections where a candidate is balloted interstitially in both Sections concerned, are reminded to only vote once on the candidate. The electronic ballot should be set up so that this is enabled.
32. Section chairs receive guidance on recommended ways of analysing the ballot results, should they wish to analyse results further. The results are reported to the March Section meeting. Sections then choose which candidates to recommend to Group for election. Sections are asked to place candidates in rank order, and not to use the formula joint first, joint second, etc. Bye-laws 36.4 & 5 prescribe that it is the Spring meeting of the Section that decides which names from the ballot to recommend to Group; and that ‘in making the recommendation the result of the ballot shall be regarded as only one of the factors to be considered; but any recommendation to the relevant Group shall include a statement of the votes cast in the ballot’.
33. Following the March meetings, the Sections’ ranked recommendations with supporting summary will be forwarded to the Humanities or the Social Sciences Group as appropriate.
34. Sections are encouraged to express informed views about other Sections’ candidates, even where they have not been specifically invited to do so. It may be difficult to subject such candidates to the same rigorous scrutiny as is given to the Section's own candidates; nevertheless, the degree and extent of support within the Section, and the reasons for it, should be fully minuted, to ensure that the Section's representatives on the relevant Group are as fully briefed as possible. Prompt communication of any such views to the Fellowship Manager will ensure that they are taken into account by the other relevant Section. They will in any event be drawn to the attention of the relevant Group.
35. There are four ‘hybrid’ Sections, H4 Linguistics and Philology, H3 Africa, Asia and the Middle East, Culture, Media and Performance (CMP), and Education (Edu), which are represented on both Groups. Each of these hybrid Sections chooses, in the light of candidates’ fields, which Group to recommend them to.
36. The Groups scrutinise the recommendations with the aim of ensuring a balance between disciplines, and compare candidates in related fields through an informed and considered discussion so as to ensure that the same standards and criteria are met across all the Sections. In their scrutiny work the Groups also take into account guidance from Council as to the Academic’s strategic priorities on other matters (such as, for example, on the nature of academic research (para 11 above) and on questions of diversity (para 5 above)). In presenting

the case for their own Section's candidates and in reporting the results of the ballot, Section chairs are at liberty to draw attention to any particular voting patterns that emerged and to interpret the results so that full justice to candidates is done. The Groups are responsible for recommending to Council a ranked list of the most distinguished candidates in any one year. Council will then recommend to the AGM a list of candidates for election.

Independent assessment

37. Independent assessment aims to strengthen the evidence base that underpins the electoral process and to support Sections and Groups in comparing and considering candidates. Sections remain the Academy's primary repository of expertise on the qualifications and assessment of candidates for the Fellowship. Independent assessors, chosen by Sections, supply assessments to assist the work of Sections, Groups and Council in comparing and ranking candidates, and help ensure that the Academy's procedures are demonstrably robust. A copy of the letter to assessors is at Appendix 6.
38. Assessors are agreed by Sections, often at the suggestion of Section Standing Committees or nominators, at the September Section meetings (or by the chair, following the Section meeting). Sections are invited to select at least one assessor per candidate (the norm is now two). It is the chair's responsibility to ensure that assessors of appropriate independent standing are selected. Because the referees may often not be able to do their assessments in the time available, it is helpful if the Section proposes a selection of more than two names, preferably with an indication of the order in which they should be approached: any subsequent additions to the list of assessors must be submitted to the Section chair for approval. When selecting assessors, Sections are asked to consider:
 - i. Corresponding Fellows of the British Academy;
 - ii. Fellows of an appropriate overseas academy;
 - iii. Other overseas academics of appropriate standing;
 - iv. UK experts outside of the Fellowship may in certain cases be appropriate (after consideration on a case-by-case basis).
39. In all cases it is important that the assessor is a scholar of appropriate standing – not someone who is themselves likely to be a candidate for election – and also demonstrably independent of the Academy and of the candidate. Assessors will be asked to declare any conflicts of interest, including being a recent co-author, colleague, etc.
40. Following September Sections, invitations to submit assessments will be issued by the President. Fellows or chairs should have no contact with assessors. The President's letter of invitation includes:
 - i. Information about the Academy, guidance on the criteria for election, and the form of response that would be helpful;
 - ii. Information about the Academy's approach to research excellence and, where relevant to the process of election, its strategic priorities;
 - iii. A list of the current members of the Section/s in question as a guide to the eminence expected of Fellows of the Academy;
 - iv. A copy of the main text of the candidate's Nomination Form and CV;
 - v. Relevant data protection information.
41. Assessors will be asked to indicate:
 - i. their judgement of the significance of the candidate's work and achievements;

- ii. whether the candidate would merit election to the equivalent Academy in the assessor's country.
42. Assessments are part of the evidence base to assist Sections, Groups and Council – to supplement, and not to supplant, the judgement of Fellows in Sections. Assessors will be sent the text from the completed Proposal Form containing the structured case for election and informed that their assessment will be shared with Fellows of the Academy. Assessors are invited to write their assessment in any language. Assessments will be available for consultation electronically, and at Section Standing Committees, Section meetings and Groups, together with other nomination material. Assessments remain confidential and should not be shared outside of the Fellowship.
43. Assessments remain part of the evidence base for the period under which a candidate is under consideration for election, and for a maximum of five years. Sections are at liberty (e.g. in a subsequent year) to seek additional assessments beyond those initially commissioned, and should do so if earlier assessments have been held for over five years. Where an assessment appears to be unsatisfactory (e.g. slipshod or showing evidence of bias; not simply lukewarm or critical) the Section chair should approach the Chief Executive with a request that the President be consulted as to whether the assessment should be disregarded, and another sought in its place.

D. ELECTIONS TO CORRESPONDING FELLOWSHIP

44. Bye-Law 8.2 prescribes that up to 30 scholars may be elected annually to Corresponding Fellowship. Each Group may look to achieve up to 15 elections, but this number is to be regarded as a guideline, rather than a quota in any one year or over a period of years.
45. The Academy's Charter defines Fellows as "persons who have attained distinction in some one or more of the branches of scientific study which it is the object of the Academy to promote". The Bye-laws clarify the expected difference between Fellows on the one hand, and Corresponding Fellows on the other. Corresponding Fellows are not habitually resident in the UK, the Isle of Man or the Channel Islands. Bye-law 8.1 states:
A person may be elected a Corresponding Fellow if he or she has attained distinction and high international standing in any of the branches of study which it is the object of the Academy to promote.
 Council's advice to Sections is that this is to be interpreted as meaning that *a higher level of distinction is called for in Corresponding Fellows than in Fellows*. Council has noted that a large proportion of Corresponding Fellows are affiliated to institutions in North America and Western Europe and encourages Sections and Groups to look for breadth of geographical coverage when considering potential Corresponding Fellowship candidates.
46. The case for election as a Corresponding Fellow should include evidence of:
- i. academic distinction and recent scholarly activity;
 - ii. connection with and/or influence on the UK scholarly community;
 - iii. the availability of the candidate to contribute to the work of the Academy;
 - iv. the ability of the election to strengthen the Academy's international links.
47. Candidates, of whatever age, are expected to be demonstrably active in research and scholarly publication, and nominations should be drawn up with this in mind. There is no formal age criterion for election as a Corresponding Fellow and all candidates, of whatever age, will be

considered on their merits. However, Sections will be expected to explain, where relevant, why a candidate had not been brought forward earlier. Council has agreed that particular scrutiny will be given to candidates whose major contribution to scholarship does not appear to be a recent one.

48. Council's expectations about gender also apply to the Corresponding Fellowship: Council has agreed that the question of gender balance is of particular importance, while rejecting specific quotas for ballots or numbers to be elected. Sections are encouraged to look actively for qualified female candidates and expected to include at least one woman in their annual ballot, or to explain why that was not done in any given year. Council has agreed to advise the Groups to take into account, when ranking candidates from Sections, the record of a Section that persistently fails to meet this expectation, without adequate explanation. Consistent with excellence, Sections are encouraged to consider geographical diversity (e.g. there is presently a high percentage of Corresponding Fellows from North America).
49. Disclosure and Independent Assessment do not apply to candidates for Corresponding Fellowship. This means that CVs are not supplied by candidates for Corresponding Fellowship, and a summary one-page CV is produced by the proposer.
50. Names of candidates to be balloted are agreed at the September 2021 Section meetings. Nomination Forms will be required by the date shown on the form, and signed by between three and six Fellows. To maintain impartiality, chairs should not act as signatories to a nomination form. Following the ballot, results will be reported to the March 2021 Section meetings. Sections are asked to place candidates in rank order, and not to use the formula joint first, joint second, etc. The process, involving Groups and Council, then follows the same pattern as for elections to the Fellowship.
51. There is no quota of elections per Section. The table at Appendix 2 shows the number of elections for each Section made in each of the last ten years.

E. ELECTIONS TO HONORARY FELLOWSHIP

52. There is no maximum limit, but it is expected that up to four Honorary Fellows may be elected each year. The table at Appendix 3 shows the current number of Honorary Fellows and their year of election.
53. The Bye-laws state that "Honorary Fellows shall be either -
 - i. persons of academic distinction in fields other than those specified within Article 2 of the Charter whose work has a bearing on the humanities or social sciences; or
 - ii. leading figures or philanthropists who have themselves done distinguished work in the Academy's field of interest or promoted or advanced the causes for which the Academy was founded."
54. Nominators are requested to make the case for election, highlighting how the candidate could help promote the Academy and humanities and social science research, and state under which category of Bye-Law the candidate is proposed.
55. Candidates may be recommended to Council from Sections, or by any individual Fellow. Fellowship and Structures Committee (FSC) review the suggestions that have come through each year and also review any names previously considered, at their November meeting. A

shortlist of names is then circulated to March Sections for feedback. FSC makes final recommendations to June Council at their meeting in May. In addition to names proposed through Sections or by Fellows, FSC or Council may themselves propose names in November. Council decides in June, taking into account comments from Sections, on nominations to AGM.

56. Independent assessment and disclosure do not apply to candidates for Honorary Fellowship.
57. Fellows are welcome to suggest possible candidates to their Section chair, and Sections will be asked to agree any suggestions at their September meetings. Feedback on why any particular nominee was unsuccessful will be provided by the Chief Executive upon request.
58. The following questions should be addressed in completing the case for election (up to 500 words /one page in length):
 - i. What is the person's principal area(s) of expertise?
 - ii. For which disciplines is the work significant?
 - iii. What original contribution have they made e.g. in what ways has the work influenced the humanities or social sciences?
 - iv. How has any philanthropic support impacted on the humanities and social sciences?
 - v. What evidence is there of the esteem in which this person is held, including internationally?
 - vi. Other relevant points e.g. evidence of academic/research leadership, public service, impact on policy etc.
 - vii. Those completing the form are invited to include, where relevant, information about ways in which a candidate contributes to diversity in the Section, by virtue of e.g. their subject area or methodological approach. Such information would be used only where it is relevant and not a general requirement for election. This would be then available to the Section in voting, but also to any further decision-making process upstream.

F. VOTING PROCEDURES AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST

59. Members eligible to vote are all the active members of a Section – i.e. including cross-members but not those Fellows who have opted for Emeritus status, or Corresponding Fellows.
60. Cross-members in Sections where a candidate is balloted interstitially in both Sections concerned, are reminded to only vote once on the candidate. The electronic ballot should be set up so that this is enabled.
61. In discussion at Section meetings, Fellows are asked to be scrupulous in declaring any institutional interest or personal connection with a candidate under consideration. Fellows should abstain from voting in a round where there is a candidate with whom they have a 'close personal connection'. Fellows should not be a signatory to a nomination for a candidate from their own institution or where there is a personal connection. In order to maintain impartiality, chairs should also not be a signatory to any candidate. Declarations of interest should be declared at the beginning of Section Standing Committee meetings and at Section meetings.
62. **Personal connection:** As indicated above, Fellows are asked to be scrupulous in declaring an institutional interest or any personal connection with a candidate under consideration. Personal connection might mean being a relative, or a member of the same academic

department, or being a research collaborator, joint author, former supervisor, etc. Where there is a 'close personal connection' (spouse, partner, sibling, etc.) then Fellows are advised to leave the meeting room at the relevant discussion point (whether 'real' or virtual) and should abstain from voting in a round where there is a candidate with whom they have a close personal connection. If the candidate in question is balloted as an interstitial candidate, the Fellow may still take part in the ordinary ballot (and vice versa). Fellows with close personal connections are encouraged to contact the Fellowship Manager for advice.

63. In the ballot, Section members should rank candidates by placing a number in the appropriate box in one of the three categories 'Outstanding', 'Clearly electable' or 'Case Inconclusive'. Note that '1st equal/2nd equal, etc' is not acceptable, and if ALL candidates *on whom an opinion has been expressed* are not ranked the Ballot Paper will be deemed invalid. (The electronic system will not enable an incomplete or inaccurate response to be submitted.) Candidates about whom 'No Opinion' has been expressed should not be ranked; this column on the ballot paper will be a tick option only; the remaining candidates should be ranked in order.
64. Fellows may express an opinion where an interstitial candidate appears on the ballot form by a tick option only in the appropriate column. Interstitial candidates on the ballot paper are not ranked, nor ranked against each other (if there is more than one interstitial candidate on the ballot form).

| Candidate | Outstanding | Clearly electable | Case Inconclusive | No opinion | Should not be elected |
|-----------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|-----------------------|
| BROWN | | | 3 | | |
| JONES | 1 | | | | |
| ROBINSON | | 2 | | | |
| THOMAS | | | | ✓ | |

INTERSTITIAL CANDIDATE – please MARK in the applicable column below – DO NOT RANK

| Candidate | Outstanding | Clearly electable | Case Inconclusive | No opinion | Should not be elected |
|------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| ADAMS | | | | | |

65. Fellows are strongly discouraged from voting 'Case Inconclusive' in the event of unfamiliarity. A 'Case Inconclusive' vote indicates that a candidate is close to the minimum requirement for election, but not clearly electable, or that the candidate is not yet ready for election.
66. Fellows are strongly discouraged from voting 'No Opinion'. Fellows are encouraged to familiarise themselves with candidates' work and make a considered judgement on the evidence presented; if, however, despite their best efforts they are unable to form an informed opinion on a candidate's work they may indicate by a tick to express 'No Opinion', which indicates that a Fellow regards themselves as not qualified to judge, rather than that they are unfamiliar with a candidate's work.
67. A negative vote ('should not be elected') is a serious matter: it triggers significant processes, and should not be cast lightly, or where Case Inconclusive is the appropriate vote. A negative

vote should be a very rare occurrence – Fellows have the opportunity and responsibility to register any concerns at earlier stages of the electoral process. Notification of such a view should be signalled to the Section chair and Standing Committee at an early stage in the electoral round and preferably by the time of the September Section meeting. The electronic system will pick up where a negative vote has been received and the Fellowship Manager will check that the voter is aware that this is a serious matter before following the procedures below.

68. A negative vote is not a relative judgement, but a judgement that the candidate in question is unqualified. A negative vote is not a vote like others – it is not a vote to be counted and analysed for ranking purposes – it is a call for the candidacy to cease, on the grounds that the candidate is unworthy of election. If upheld by a majority vote, it ends the candidacy. If overridden, it is then ignored, and not given further consideration.
69. Any Fellow who wishes to record a negative vote (by a tick) signifying that a candidate should not be elected must submit a written supporting argument to the chair of the Section. The supporting argument should be no more than 500 words: it has to be able to be read by members of the Section on arrival. The case should be focused on the academic record and conduct of the candidate – a difference of scholarly opinion is not sufficient. The negative vote and written supporting argument must reach the Section chair not later than the due date, in order to give time for the chair to alert the candidate's signatories listed on the nomination paper, and elicit from them any counter-arguments, in time for these comments to be tabled together with the negative argument/s at the March Section meeting. The chair should inform the whole Section that a negative vote will be discussed at the Section meeting. *In the absence of a written argument submitted by the due date, no note will be taken of a negative vote.*
70. It is important that a negator declares any real, potential or apparent conflict of interest, including whether there is any personal connection or any history of scholarly dispute with the candidate in question. A negator should not circulate the case against to other members of the Section, either before the ballot deadline or before the Section meeting (owing to the risk of breach of confidentiality, a possible exposure to a suit for defamation, and damage to the reputation of the Academy). More generally, canvassing and encouraging others to cast negative votes is strongly discouraged. There should be no contact with the independent assessors.
71. Section members will be informed by the chair in advance that a negative vote has been lodged (and against whom), but will not see any documentation until the meeting (documents are not circulated to those unable to attend the meeting). Fellows who have cast a negative vote or who have signed the nomination form are strongly encouraged to attend the Section meeting and, if they do not, they are discouraged from commenting on decisions taken in their absence. The chair will lead, with advice from the Chief Executive, on how to approach the negative ballot within the Section meeting, due to the individual nature of the case. All written comments will be treated as in strict confidence and collected at the end of the meeting and destroyed. The minute of the Section discussion will be reported to Group and to Council.
72. If a negative vote is upheld by a majority vote, the candidacy ceases for the year in question. A Section is not barred from putting the candidate in question to the ballot in a subsequent year, if the case against no longer applies, e.g. if the objection had been that the body of work was insufficient to merit election.

73. If the Section meeting overrides the negative vote, the negator should cease activity (during that electoral cycle). The case against should not be pursued outside of the meeting, or after the Section's discussion and decision. There is no appeal against the Section's decision, although Group and Council will consider the minute of the Section's discussion.

G. SECTION STANDING COMMITTEES

74. Section Standing Committees play an important role in preparing for Section deliberations. They maintain "long lists" of eligible candidates, sift names brought to their attention by Fellows or put forward by Vice-Chancellors and others, and agree on those to be put before the Section (including the preparation of Proposal Forms and identification of names of Independent Assessors).
75. Section Standing Committees are tasked with doing all that they can to ensure that the field of candidates they consider is as broad and representative as possible, and complies so far as possible with the guidance that is issued from time to time by Council on relevant aspects of the electoral process (as set out, for example, in paras 5 and 11 above). In order to achieve this, they should:
- i. Survey the Section's fields and keep under review the subject areas within the field; monitor the strength of representation in the current Fellowship in each area.
 - ii. Extend the subject coverage when the intrinsic nature and the intellectual quality of the best work undertaken in a new field appear to justify an enlargement of the scope of the Section's subject coverage.
 - iii. Monitor gender, ethnic diversity, age and institutional balance, and encourage diversity.
 - iv. Inform the Vice Presidents for Humanities and Social Sciences as appropriate on the names that have emerged from the search for names that is occasionally undertaken by the Academy involving Vice-Chancellors and others (see para 6 above).
 - v. Be alert to potential candidates, including those balloted but not elected and those discussed but not balloted; consider the claims of staff in university departments which achieve high recognition, for example in research assessment exercises; and weigh the claims of outstanding scholars in other, less highly rated, institutions and those outside the university system.
 - vi. Consult Corresponding Fellows where appropriate.

H. THE GROUPS

76. The Humanities and Social Science Groups consist of representatives of Sections. They play an important part in the electoral process. The Groups meet in the Autumn for planning and other purposes, and in Spring to consider names for election put forward by Sections.
77. The Groups scrutinise the recommendations from Sections with the aim of ensuring a balance between disciplines, and compare candidates in related fields through an informed and considered discussion so as to ensure that the same standards and criteria are met across all the Sections. The Groups advise Council on the relative merits of the claims of candidates, with particular regard to the desirability of ensuring that distinction in all branches of study which it is the object of the Academy to promote is fairly recognised. Where, for whatever reason, a higher ranked candidate from a Section is not endorsed, the Group will look at the subsequently ranked candidate on their own merits.

78. Council has agreed to ask the Groups, when ranking candidates from Sections, also to be mindful of and in its decision-making to take into account:
- i. any relative under-representation of Sections with regard to the discipline in the professoriate;
 - ii. gender;
 - iii. ethnic minority status;
 - iv. institutional affiliation/geography.

I. FELLOWSHIP AND STRUCTURES COMMITTEE (FSC)

79. The FSC is responsible for oversight of the efficiency and integrity of the Academy's processes for election to the Fellowship.
80. The remit of FSC is:
- i. to review the representation within the Fellowship of the subjects that make up the humanities and social sciences, and to recommend to Council any structural changes;
 - ii. to monitor the process of election to the Fellowship, and to report to Council, together with any recommendations for change;
 - iii. to consider the claims of persons whose work does not sufficiently fall within the purview of any one Section, and to make recommendations for election, directly to Council.

Referral to Fellowship and Structures Committee

81. **Interstitial Candidates:** The intention behind the creation of this category of candidates was to create an opening for those scholars who did not fit squarely into the Sectional structure, but who crossed boundaries into more than one Section area. The reasoning behind this was that a candidate for whom this was an appropriate route to election might never gain enough ballot support in one Section where only part of their research lay, but that a combined ballot support across two or more Sections would give them a fairer chance at election. The desired outcome was that such candidates would not be disadvantaged by the Academy's Sectional structure and Sectional ballot.
82. It is also possible that there will be potential candidates for election whose work establishes their distinction but for whom no Section or Sections provides even a partial home, it is acknowledged that this is likely to be an exceptional category. Fellows are advised to consult with the Fellowship Manager and the relevant Vice-President.
83. Sections (or their Standing Committees or their Fellows) are invited to refer the name of potentially suitable such candidates to FSC. This applies for both Fellowship and Corresponding Fellowship.
84. Referrals should be made to the Fellowship Manager (thefellowship@thebritishacademy.ac.uk). They may be made informally, at an early stage, with brief details of the scholar's work (such as not to trigger disclosure), with an explanation of why the work of the scholar in question does not fall sufficiently within the Section's purview, for example candidates who straddle two or more Sections' coverage, or candidates where no Section appears to cover the field.

85. Referrals normally come to FSC through Section chairs, together with a statement of explanation. It is recognised however that part of the problem for such potential candidates is that they lie outside the bandwidth of all the Sections and so it may be hard for them to emerge through a process that is Section-centred. In light of this, and as set out above, individual Fellows are also encouraged to refer candidates to the Committee where, for example they feel that there is no relevant Section, or that the Section/s in question could not be expected to or have not given the case adequate consideration. They should attach a statement of explanation (including an account of why the referral does not come via a Section). Such referrals may be by a single Fellow or by more than one Fellow acting together.
86. Except in those cases where they result from a Fellow's nomination, referrals usually come to FSC following a discussion at a Section Standing Committee or full Section. (A Fellow making an individual nomination is encouraged but not required to seek the views of Sections they judge to be relevant to the scholar in question.) Section chairs are encouraged to consult one another where a scholar may appear to merit consideration by more than Section. The proposal form should be submitted, together with an explanation of why the work of the scholar in question does not fall sufficiently within the Section's purview and (in the case of a Fellow's individual nomination) why this route has been taken. This procedure applies for both Fellowship and Corresponding Fellowship.
87. FSC will determine whether the scholar referred is a candidate for FSC to pursue (an "interstitial candidate"), or whether to refer the candidate back to a Section as within its purview.
88. FSC encourages Sections considering interstitial candidates to provide ballot evidence of the extent of support for a candidate across the Sections in question (which may be minority support in any one Section, but collectively amount to a significant extent). Support from the Fellowship should also be sought by a Fellow seeking to make (whether alone or with other Fellows) a referral of a potential candidate to FSC. Where the referral is via the Sections' route, simultaneous balloting of a candidate in more than one Section is a useful way of generating that evidence.
89. If it wishes, a Section may choose to identify an interstitial candidate as such on its ballot form, which means that members are not asked to rank the interstitial candidate against the Section's other candidates. A Section's decision to include a candidate on its ballot as an interstitial is contingent on another Section's including that candidate (either as a mainstream or an interstitial) on its ballot. The efficient conduct of simultaneous elections requires appropriate consultation and preparation by the Section chairs involved, both in the approach to the Autumn Section meeting (where decisions are taken about putting candidates to the ballot) and at the Spring Section meeting (where the outcome of the ballot is considered). It includes an indication of which Section is the lead Section, who will be responsible for drafting the nomination and who will be the primary Section for the candidate, if elected.
90. FSC considers candidates referred to it (whether by a Section or an individual Fellow) and decides which candidates it wishes to bring forward as its own candidates for election. Sections in March are notified, and may comment on these candidates if they wish. The Groups will be aware of any recommendations from FSC and comments from Sections, and will be free to comment on them, but FSC's recommendations are made direct to Council for decision. It is for Council to determine whether any of the FSC's recommendations are to be preferred to any from a Group. This applies for both Fellowship and Corresponding Fellowship.

91. Upon election, in addition to a primary Section, cross-membership will be assumed if a Section agrees to put a scholar on the ballot as an interstitial candidate and they are elected – unless the Section agrees at the Spring meeting NOT to (e.g. if the ballot result in that Section is weak or for some other reason). After election, these candidates' cross-memberships will go to Council in September for approval. The new Fellows are then able to participate at Autumn Sections in both their primary and cross-Sections (though the cross-Sections may want to formalise their membership at the beginning of the meeting).
92. Upon election of an interstitial candidate who has not come through Sections, the proposer of the successful candidate shall liaise with heads of Sections to identify an appropriate Section or Sections for the elected Fellow. The relevant Vice-President shall assist in this process of Section selection.

J. GUIDANCE TO PROPOSERS

93. The chair and Section Standing Committees maintain and update the longlists of eligible candidates. Due to data protection laws, these are not held or updated by the Academy, but the latest versions can be distributed with papers. Any Fellow may suggest the name of a candidate for consideration by their Section, or bring a name to the attention of the chair of another Section. An annual letter from Section chairs invites suggestions from Section members.
94. *Suggested names*: Fellows who wish to bring a name to the attention of their Section's Standing Committee are asked to send a short note of the name and principal achievements to their Section chair. Disclosure to candidates does not apply at this stage.
95. *Proposal Forms (PF)*: It is Academy policy to disclose to scholars, on receipt of a PF, that they are under consideration for the Fellowship. Fellows are asked initially to send a short note of the name and principal achievements to the Section chair for consideration by Section Standing Committee, which will then commission the completion of a PF. PFs are the basis on which the Section decides whether to commission an independent assessment. They contain the case for election which will also be shown to the independent assessor, together with the summary CV supplied by the candidate. Proposers will be sent the candidate's full CV.
96. The following questions should be addressed in completing the case for election (up to 500 words /one page in length):
 - i. What is the person's principal area(s) of expertise?
 - ii. For which disciplines is the work significant?
 - iii. Have they been active in the last 3 years, and are there prospects of continued activity?
 - iv. What original contribution have they made for example in what ways has the work changed the subject, or influenced other scholars?
 - v. What evidence is there of the esteem in which this person is held, including internationally?
 - vi. Other relevant points e.g. evidence of academic/research leadership, public service, impact on policy etc.
 - vii. What are the principal relevant publications (noting that the candidate will be asked to supply a CV containing publication information)?
 - viii. Those completing the form are invited to include, where relevant, information about ways in which a candidate contributes to diversity in the Section, by virtue of e.g. their subject area or methodological approach. Such information would be used only where

it is relevant and not a general requirement for election. This would be then available to the Section in voting, but also to any further decision-making process upstream.

97. *Nomination Forms*: Following discussion by a Section and decision to put the candidate to the ballot, and subsequent receipt of assessments, the proposer completes a Nomination Form, adjusting the text of the case for election, as desired, in the light of the assessors' reports and Section discussion. Reference may be made to the summary CV and CV supplied by the candidate, and independent assessments. Fellows will have the candidate's summary CV in their papers; there will be no need to repeat what is in the CV, but proposers are encouraged to add anything relevant from the candidate's CV or record that the candidate has failed to include or highlight. They may also wish to refer to any relevant points made by assessors (Fellows will have access to assessments but may find it useful to be reminded of any key points from assessors). The Nomination Form is signed by between three and six Fellows (none of them from the same institution as the candidate). Signatories are normally, but not necessarily, drawn from the primary or cross-members of Section. Fellows are able to sign in support for more than one candidate. The Section chair does not sign a Nomination Form, in order to avoid any possible conflict of interest.
98. In addition, Fellows are advised to bear in mind that:
- i. The nomination is for the wider Fellowship (including Groups and Council), not simply the Section;
 - ii. It should present considered statements of the evidence of achievement, i.e. the case for election, rather than personal judgments;
 - iii. It should not refer to the candidate by first name or give any other impression of familiarity, except with the candidate's work;
 - iv. It can usefully refer to any relevant information in the candidate's CV (e.g. evidence of recent research activity) or in the independent assessments.
99. *Citations*: Nomination Forms contain a box asking for a summary citation of up to 50 words. This citation is used for publicity purposes in the event of election, and it is read out by the President at the Ceremony of Admission of New Fellows. For these reasons, it is important that citations are neutral and factual statements of a scholar's area of interest and achievement. It is helpful if citations avoid exaggerated claims or other possibly erroneous (even embarrassing) formulations. They ought *not* to be seen as part of a rhetorical case for election.

MP
September 2021

Approved by FSC, [May 2021]; by Council: [June 2021]; by AGM: [July 2021]

FELLOWSHIP: Numbers elected to the Fellowship 2012-2021, by Section
Appendix 1

| Section | No. of elections in 2012 | No. of elections in 2013 | No. of elections in 2014 | No. of elections in 2015 | No. of elections in 2016 | No. of elections in 2017 | No. of elections in 2018 | No. of elections in 2019 | No. of elections in 2020 | No. of elections in 2021 |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| H1 <i>Classical Antiquity</i> | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| H2 <i>Theology and Religious Studies</i> | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 +1FSC |
| *H3 <i>Africa, Asia and the Middle East</i> | 1 | 2 | 1 (H) | 2(1H+1S) + 1FSC | 1 (H) | 2 (H) +1FSC | 2 (H) | 2 (1H + 1SS) | 2 (1H + 1SS) | 2 (2H) +1FSC (H) |
| *H4 <i>Linguistics and Philology</i> | 1 (SS) | 1 (H) | 1 (H) | 2 (1H+1SS) | 1 (H) | 2 (1H+1SS) | 2 (1H+1SS) | 2(1H+1SS) +1FSC (H) | 2(1H+1SS) +1FSC (H) | 2 (1H + 1SS) |
| H5 <i>Early Modern Languages & Literature to 1830</i> | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| H6 <i>Modern Languages, Literatures and Other Media from 1830</i> | 2 | 2 +1FSC | 2 +1FSC | 2+1FSC | 2+1FSC | 1+1FSC | 1+1FSC | 2+1FSC | 2 | 2 |
| H7 <i>Archaeology</i> | 1 | 2 | 1 +1FSC | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| H8 <i>Medieval Studies</i> | 3 | 2 | 1 +1FSC | 2 | 1+1FSC | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2+1FSC | 2 |
| H9 <i>Early Modern History to 1850</i> | 1 +1FSC | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3+1FSC | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| H10 <i>Modern History from 1850</i> | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2+1FSC | 2 |
| H11 <i>History of Art and Music</i> | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1+1FSC | 3 | 2+1FSC | 2 | 2 |
| H12 <i>Philosophy</i> | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1+1FSC | 1 | 1+1FSC | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| * <i>Culture, Media & Performance (CMP)</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 3(1H+2SS) | 2 (1H+1SS) | 2 |
| <i>Humanities Group</i> | 20 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 20 | 22 | 26 | 27 | 26 | 28 |
| S1 <i>Law</i> | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| S2 <i>Economics and Economic History</i> | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3+1FSC | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| S3 <i>Anthropology and Geography</i> | 3 +1FSC | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2+1FSC | 2 | 4+1FSC | 3 | 2 | 2 + 1FSC |
| S4 <i>Sociology, Demography & Social Statistics</i> | 3 +1FSC | 2 +2FSC | 2 + 1FSC | 2+2FSC | 4+2FSC | 3+1FSC | 4+1FSC | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| S5 <i>Political Studies: Political Theory, Government, & International Relations</i> | 3 | 3 | 3 +1FSC | 2+1FSC | 2+1FSC | 2+1FSC | 3 | 3+1FSC | 3 | 3 |
| S6 <i>Psychology</i> | 3 | 4 | 4 +1FSC | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3+1FSC | 2 |
| <i>Management & Business Studies (MBS)</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| * <i>Education Group</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 3 + 1FSC |
| <i>Social Sciences Group</i> | 18 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 22 | 20 | 26 | 25 | 26 | 24 |

*hybrid Section (H) indicates the election of a Humanities scholar, (SS) the election of a Social Scientist

CORRESPONDING FELLOWSHIP: Numbers elected to the Corresponding Fellowship 2012-21, by Section

Appendix 2

| Section | No of Corresponding Fellows | No. of elections in 2012 | No. of elections in 2013 | No. of elections in 2014 | No. of elections in 2015 | No. of elections in 2016 | No. of elections in 2017 | No. of elections in 2018 | No. of elections in 2019 | No. of elections in 2020 | No. of elections in 2021 |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| H1 <i>Classical Antiquity</i> | 20 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| H2 <i>Theology and Religious Studies</i> | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| H3 <i>Africa, Asia and the Middle East</i> | 16 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| H4 <i>Linguistics and Philology</i> | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| H5 <i>Early Modern Languages & Literature to 1830</i> | 19 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| H6 <i>Modern Languages, Literatures and Other Media from 1830</i> | 14 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| H7 <i>Archaeology</i> | 15 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| H8 <i>Medieval Studies</i> | 20 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0+1FSC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| H9 <i>Early Modern History to 1850</i> | 24 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0+1FSC | 1 + 1FSC |
| H10 <i>Modern History from 1850</i> | 19 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| H11 <i>History of Art and Music</i> | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| H12 <i>Philosophy</i> | 23 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| <i>Culture, Media and Performance (CMP)</i> | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 +1FSC |
| <i>Humanities Group</i> | 224 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 13 | 18 |
| S1 <i>Law</i> | 34 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| S2 <i>Economics and Economic History</i> | 33 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2+1FSC | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| S3 <i>Anthropology and Geography</i> | 29 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1+1FSC | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| S4 <i>Sociology, Demography & Social Statistics</i> | 20 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2+1FSC | 0+2FSC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| S5 <i>Political Studies: Political Theory, Government, & International Relations</i> | 28 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2+1FSC | 2 |
| S6 <i>Psychology</i> | 21 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1+1FSC | 2 |
| <i>Management & Business Studies (MBS)</i> | 7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| <i>Education Group</i> | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1 |
| <i>Social Sciences Group</i> | 176 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 17 | 12 |

HONORARY FELLOWSHIP AT 2021
Appendix 3

| Name | Current Post Title | Elected |
|--|--|----------------|
| Sir David Cox FRS | Honorary Fellow, Nuffield College, Oxford | 1997 |
| Rt Hon Lord Rothschild OM, GBE | Chairman RIT Capital Partners; formerly Chairman, National Gallery; and National Heritage Memorial Fund | 1998 |
| Dr Seng T Lee | Director, Lee Foundation | 1998 |
| Mr Neil MacGregor OM | Formerly Director of the British Museum and National Gallery | 2000 |
| Rt Hon Lord Woolf PC | Formerly Lord Chief Justice of England, President Commercial and Civil Court Qatar, additional Judge Hong Kong Final Court of Appeal, Chancellor The Open University of Israel | 2000 |
| Professor David Rhind CBE, FRS | Non-Executive Director, UK Statistical Authority | 2002 |
| Sir Michael Rutter FRS, FMedSci | Professor of Developmental Psychopathology, Institute of Psychiatry, KCL | 2002 |
| Rt Hon Baroness Hale DBE | Justice of the Supreme Court; Chancellor, University of Bristol | 2004 |
| Dr David Packard | President, Packard Humanities Institute | 2006 |
| Dr Lisbet Rausing | Senior Research Fellow, Centre for the History of Science, Technology and Medicine at Imperial College, and Chair of the Lisbet Rausing and Peter Baldwin Trust | 2006 |
| Professor Sir Michael Marmot FMedSci | Director, International Institute for Society and Health; MRC Research Professor of Epidemiology and Public Health, UCL | 2008 |
| Lord Bragg of Wigton FRS, FRSL, FRTS | Chancellor, University of Leeds; independent writer and broadcaster | 2010 |
| Sir Tim Berners-Lee OM, KBE, FRS, FEng, FRSA | Director, World Wide Web Consortium, 3Com Founder Professor, MIT | 2011 |
| Professor Sir Richard Brook OBE, ScD, FEng | Former Director, Leverhulme Trust | 2011 |
| Baron Rees of Ludlow OM, FRS | Astronomer Royal; Former President, Royal Society; Master, Trinity College, Cambridge | 2012 |
| Dame Fiona Reynolds DBE | Master, Emmanuel College, Cambridge; Former Director, The National Trust | 2012 |
| Baroness Kennedy of The Shaws QC, FRSA | Principal, Mansfield College, Oxford | 2013 |
| Dame Elizabeth (Liz) Forgan DBE | Journalist and media executive | 2014 |
| Lord O'Donnell GCB | Former Cabinet Secretary and economist; Visiting Professor LSE and UCL | 2014 |
| Dame Lynne Brindley DBE, FRSA | Master of Pembroke College, Oxford | 2015 |
| Dame Carol Ann Duffy DBE, FRSL | Professor of Contemporary Poetry and Creative Director of the Manchester Writing School, Manchester Metropolitan University; Poet Laureate | 2015 |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|------|
| Sir John Eliot Gardiner CBE | Founder and Artistic Director, Monteverdi Choir, Orchestre Révolutionnaire et Romantique and English Baroque Soloists; President, Bach-Archiv Leipzig | 2015 |
| Sir Paul Nurse FRS, FMedSci | Former President, Royal Society | 2016 |
| Justice Catherine O'Regan | Former Judge, Constitutional Court, South Africa | 2016 |
| Lord Sainsbury of Turville | Founder, Gatsby Charitable Foundation | 2016 |
| The Honorable Janet L Yellen | Former Chair, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System | 2016 |
| Dame Antonia Byatt DBE, CBE, FRSL | Novelist | 2017 |
| Mrs Graça Machel Hon DBE | Chancellor, University Cape Town; Chancellor, African Leadership University; President, SOAS, University of London; Founder and Chair, The Graça Machel Trust | 2017 |
| Mr George Soros | Chairman, Soros Fund Management; Founder and Chairman, Open Society Foundations | 2017 |
| Sir Tom Stoppard OM, CBE, FRSL | Playwright and screenwriter; Cameron Mackintosh Visiting Professor of Contemporary Theatre, St Catherine's College, Oxford | 2017 |
| Baroness Joan Bakewell DBE | President of Birkbeck, University of London; writer and broadcaster | 2018 |
| Sir Andrew Dilnot CBE | Warden, Nuffield College, Oxford; Chair, UK Statistics Authority | 2018 |
| Tony Harrison | Poet, translator, and playwright | 2018 |
| Ms Mary-Kay Wilmers | Editor, <i>London Review of Books</i> | 2018 |
| Sir John Chilcot GCB, PC | Chairman, Iraq Inquiry; President, The Police Foundation | 2019 |
| Mr Michael Frayn FRSL | Writer | 2019 |
| Professor Margaret MacMillan CC, CH | Emeritus Professor of International History, University of Oxford; Professor of History, University of Toronto | 2019 |
| Advocate General Eleanor Sharpston QC | Advocate General, Court of Justice of the European Union | 2019 |
| Dr Robin Jackson CBE | Former Chief Executive & Secretary, The British Academy | 2020 |
| Ms Bridget Kendall MBE | Journalist, diplomatic correspondent; Master, Peterhouse, Cambridge | 2020 |
| Mrs Mary Robinson | Adjunct Professor of Climate Justice, Trinity College Dublin; Chair of The Elders; former President of Ireland | 2020 |
| Professor Gary Younge FAcSS | Professor of Sociology, University of Manchester; Journalist and author | 2020 |
| Professor Simon Armitage CBE, FRSL | Poet Laureate; Professor of Poetry, University of Leeds | 2021 |
| Baroness Minouche Shafik DBE | Director, London School of Economics and Political Science | 2021 |
| Mr Darren Walker | President, Ford Foundation | 2021 |

AGE RANGE OF FELLOWSHIP**Table 1: Average Age at election of Fellows 2002-2021**

| | Average Age at Election | Average Age at Election minus Senior Fellow elections | Average Age at Election of Corresponding Fellows |
|------|-------------------------|---|--|
| 2002 | 57.6 | 55.9 | 64.8 |
| 2003 | 56.5 | 54.9 | 59.2 |
| 2004 | 56.6 | 55.1 | 63.9 |
| 2005 | 56.6 | 55.3 | 67.4 |
| 2006 | 57.2 | 55.4 | 64.7 |
| 2007 | 57.4 | 55.7 | 61 |
| 2008 | 58.4 | 57.1 | 66.7 |
| 2009 | 58.7 | 57.3 | 67.9 |
| 2010 | 59.3 | 58.1 | 60.9 |
| 2011 | 56.6 | 56.6 | 62.5 |
| 2012 | 59.9 | 59.9 | 65.6 |
| 2013 | 55.8 | 55.8 | 62.9 |
| 2014 | 55.5 | 55.5 | 65.7 |
| 2015 | 57.6 | 57.6 | 65.9 |
| 2016 | 59 | 59 | 62.1 |
| 2017 | 58.9 | 58.9 | 62.2 |
| 2018 | 57 | 57 | 68.5 |
| 2019 | 57 | 57 | 69.6 |
| 2020 | 61.2 | 61.2 | 65.7 |
| 2021 | 59.8 | 59.8 | 65.9 |

Table 2: Age Range of all UK Fellows

| | 1987 | % | 1998 | % | 2008 | % | 2018 | % | 2021 | % |
|--------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|------------|-----|-------------|-----|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 40-49 | 32 | 6% | 28 | 4% | 22 | 2% | 27 | 3% | 24 | 2% |
| 50-59 | 104 | 21% | 173 | 25% | 161 | 18% | 148 | 14% | 164 | 14% |
| 60-69 | 152 | 31% | 206 | 29% | 326 | 37% | 334 | 31% | 322 | 27% |
| 70-79 | 144 | 29% | 177 | 25% | 228 | 26% | 377 | 35% | 438 (of whom 54 are Emeritus) | 37% (33% excl Emeritus) |
| 80-89 | 60 | 12% | 102 | 15% | 125 | 14% | 164 | 15% | 191 (of whom 82 are Emeritus) | 16% (9% excl Emeritus) |
| 90+ | 5 | 1% | 13 | 2% | 27 | 3% | 20 | 2% | 32 (of whom 20 are Emeritus) | 2.7% (1.7% excl Emeritus) |
| Total | 497 | | 699 | | 889 | | 1070 | | 1171 (of whom 156 Emeritus) | |

The average age of all UK Fellows is 70. For UK Fellows under 70, it is 61. In 2014 the average age of UK Fellows under 70 was 62, in 2004 60, in 1998 59, and in 1987 57.

GENDER DISTRIBUTION

Table 3: Elections to UK Fellowship in the last ten years, Men and Women

| | Men | | Women | | Elections each year |
|-------------|------------|-----|--------------|-----|----------------------------|
| 2012 | 32 | 84% | 6 | 16% | 38 |
| 2013 | 27 | 64% | 15 | 36% | 42 |
| 2014 | 19 | 45% | 23 | 55% | 42 |
| 2015 | 27 | 64% | 15 | 36% | 42 |
| 2016 | 25 | 60% | 17 | 40% | 42 |
| 2017 | 26 | 62% | 16 | 38% | 42 |
| 2018 | 27 | 52% | 25 | 48% | 52 |
| 2019 | 26 | 50% | 26 | 50% | 52 |
| 2020 | 29 | 56% | 23 | 44% | 52 |
| 2021 | 29 | 56% | 23 | 44% | 52 |

Women make up 45% of the elections to the UK Fellowship over the last 10 years; 45% over the last 5 years.

Table 4: Total Number of UK Fellows, Men and Women

| | Men | | Women | |
|-------------|------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| 2012 | 785 | 83% | 163 | 17% |
| 2013 | 795 | 82% | 177 | 18% |
| 2014 | 794 | 80% | 195 | 20% |
| 2015 | 790 | 79% | 207 | 21% |
| 2016 | 796 | 78% | 219 | 22% |
| 2017 | 810 | 78% | 232 | 22% |
| 2018 | 815 | 76% | 255 | 24% |
| 2019 | 830 | 75% | 281 | 25% |
| 2020 | 838 | 73% | 303 | 27% |
| 2021 | 845 | 72% | 324 | 28% |

The % of women in the active UK Fellowship overall is 30% in 2021, and in Fellows under 70 it is 39%. 24.3% of staff holding the title of Professor in HE overall are female (Universities UK Patterns and Trends 2017), and in H&SS the figure is 29% (Equality Challenge Unit based on HESA 2014/15).

INSTITUTIONAL DISTRIBUTION

Table 5: Regional diversity in the active UK Fellowship 2017-21

| | 2021 | 2020 | 2019 | 2018 | 2017 |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| England – Golden Triangle | 56% | 55% | 54% | 58% | 54.5% |
| Rest of England | 29.7% | 29% | 33% | 26% | 29.2% |
| Scotland | 6.5% | 7% | 6% | 7% | 6% |
| Wales | 1.4% | 2% | 1.4% | 2% | 2% |
| Northern Ireland | 0.9% | 1% | 0.8% | 0.8% | 0.8% |
| Overseas | 5.5% | 6% | 5% | 7% | 7.5% |

(England Golden Triangle = UCL, Imperial, KCL, QMUL, LSE, Oxford, Cambridge)

Dear

I write to invite you to consent to the gathering, holding, and sharing of information about you as part of the electoral processes of the British Academy. The British Academy, the UK's academy for the humanities and the social sciences, exists to promote and represent advanced research. It is an independent, self-governing Fellowship of over 1000 scholars. Each year the Academy recognises academic excellence and achievement by electing new Fellows. For information about the Academy, see the website: www.britac.ac.uk.

Election to the Fellowship is strictly limited. Each year no more than 52 UK Fellows are elected across all disciplines. This inevitably means that the majority of those on whom data is collected are not elected, and those who are successful are rarely elected immediately after initial data collection. The number of scholars on whom data is held at any time is approximately 400. Any communication about election to the Academy should be exclusively with me: any form of lobbying is forbidden.

Your co-operation will help ensure that the information used is accurate, complete, and up to date. If you are content, please sign and return the attached declaration form by email, to confirm that you have read the Privacy Notice and agree to the Academy holding your details for a period of four years. Please also forward electronically a copy of your full CV and a one-page summary CV (a template is enclosed), to the Fellowship Manager (email: thefellowship@thebritishacademy.ac.uk). I also enclose a voluntary monitoring form for ethnicity. Please return everything by 17 August 2021. We undertake to hold all personal data in confidence, and to use them only for the purposes of fair and rigorous procedures.

I also invite you, in the event of any material changes, to send an update of your CV and summary CV at this point in the year during each of the next four years. After four years, information will no longer be retained without renewed permission. If, after four years, you do not hear from the Academy then you can assume that your information is no longer required. Elections to the Fellowship are announced following the Annual General Meeting in July each year.

Yours sincerely

Enclosures:

Privacy Notice Electoral Processes

Ethnicity Monitoring Form

Template for summary CV

The British Academy is the national academy for the humanities and the social sciences, and exists to promote, sustain, and represent advanced research in these fields. It was established by Royal Charter in 1902 and is an independent, self-governing Fellowship of more than 1200 scholars, both UK and overseas. Each year the Academy recognises academic excellence and achievement by electing new Fellows in the disciplines that it serves and promotes. Fellows of the Academy can also expect to become involved in the electoral, research awards or committee work of the Academy. More information about the Academy is available from our website.

I am writing to ask whether you could help the Academy by providing an assessment of the academic standing and achievements of XXX, who has been placed on a shortlist by Fellows in the relevant field for consideration for election to the Fellowship of the Academy. In order to help us rank candidates in a particular discipline against one another, and against those working in other fields, we are seeking independent assessment. The evidence on which election is based will be greatly strengthened by your contribution. Election to the Academy is highly competitive and a critical assessment, supported by evidence of scholarly achievement, would be of great help. You are invited to mention any reservations you may have about the candidate. I know all too well that there must be many such calls on your time, but also that you will understand that we can ask only the most distinguished scholars to make these judgments.

What I am looking for is a short letter – no more than 800 words – that provides your frank judgment on the following points:

- i. What has been the importance of the candidate's contribution to the field in which he or she works? Has their work changed this field? What evidence is there of the esteem in which the candidate is held?
- ii. Has the candidate's work achieved, or is it likely to achieve, significance comparable to that of the work of those already elected to the Fellowship of the British Academy in this discipline?
- iii. Is the candidate a credible candidate for Fellowship of the British Academy when compared with those elected by other academies with which you are familiar, or with other candidates whom you may have been asked to assess for election to the British Academy?
- iv. You are invited to include, where relevant, information about ways in which a candidate contributes to diversity by virtue of e.g. their subject area or methodological approach.

I would be grateful if you could let the Fellowship Manager know (preferably by e-mail: thefellowship@thebritishacademy.ac.uk) whether you can help us on this occasion. If you can, she will then provide the candidate's *curriculum vitae* and other materials, together with a succinct account of the Academy and its electoral procedures and its criteria for election, and a list of Fellows in the relevant disciplinary Section. Your assessment letter should be addressed to me personally and can be sent by e-mail (preferably) or in hard copy. It will be very helpful if it can be received by **7th December 2021 at the latest**. You are free to write in any language.

The Academy's electoral procedures are undertaken in strict confidence, although your assessment letter may be shared in confidence with Fellows of the Academy. I ask you not to contact the candidate (who will be aware that his/her name is under consideration, but not that it is on a shortlist of those for whom independent assessment is being sought) or to discuss the case for election with third parties. To repeat, election is intensely competitive, and your assessment will assist us greatly in the selection process. Assessments are held for a maximum of 5 years. We may ask you to update your assessment within this time.

The results of the current electoral cycle will be announced in July 2022. With many thanks for your help.

GOOD PRACTICE GUIDANCE NOTE FOR SECTIONS

Suggested Actions for Section Chairs and Standing Committees to increase Fellowship Diversity

1. This short document is suggestive not prescriptive. It is expected that Sections will adapt the suggested actions to their own needs and circumstances. It is assumed that research excellence is always the fundamental criterion by which possible candidates for the Fellowship (and the Corresponding Fellowship) are judged. Sections are advised to be pro-active and unrelenting, if they are not already, in trying to increase the diversity of the individuals that are balloted for the Fellowship (and Corresponding Fellowship).
2. Section Chairs and SSC members should see it as their responsibility to take the initiative in identifying suitably qualified (that is, intellectually outstanding) individuals from under-represented groups. Although, in principle, 'under-represented groups' include all 'legally protected categories' as defined by equality legislation, in practice most Sections will probably need to focus primarily on trying to increase diversity in terms of gender, age, geographical location (non-Golden Triangle institutions) and ethnicity.

Suggested Actions

3. Sections should be as systematic as possible in the management of long-lists. This could include:
 - Restricting the number of long-list names to perhaps no more than 20-25 individuals (ideally culling names if others are added) who are genuinely likely to be elected to the Fellowship within the next 5 years or so;
 - Insisting that a written case be made for inclusion on the long-list, in which the individual's key intellectual contribution is clearly and compellingly stated.
4. Section Chairs should actively solicit views from Fellows on possible women candidates for the Section shortlist. A similar approach could be adopted, where relevant, for other underrepresented groups. When views are solicited, those suggesting names should be reminded that any written case needs to be very strong: the proposers need to put a lot of effort into the proposals.
5. Every 2-3 years, SSCs could assemble a list of all Professors and Readers in the profession in the UK (remembering that the Fellowship is also open to independent scholars). If helpful, this could be cross-referenced to departmental performance in the previous REF, with particular emphasis on identifying potentially strong candidates who might otherwise be overlooked.
6. Where relevant, citations data (over the previous 5-10 years) on individuals in the profession could be obtained. There may be individuals who are very widely cited but who are otherwise not on the Section's radar. SSCs could also check the publications of the top publishers and journals in the field, again to identify individuals who might not otherwise be considered by the Section. In any such case, the SSC would need to be proactive in persuading a Section member to write a strong supporting case.
7. SSCs could institute a regular agenda item to consider whether there are any 'new' or 'non-mainstream' areas of the discipline(s) where the Section is underrepresented and where there are excellent scholars who might merit short-listing for the Fellowship. Again, if there are, SSC would need to take the initiative in soliciting written recommendations from existing Fellows.

Index

- Ballot/Voting procedures – Paragraphs 59-73
 - Negative votes – Paragraphs 67-73
- Conflict of Interest – Paragraphs 59-62
- Diversity of the Fellowship – Paragraphs 3-9
- Electoral Process: Executive Summary – Paragraphs 1-2
- Election to Fellowship – Paragraphs 17-20, 26-36
 - Criteria for Election to Fellowship – Paragraphs 10-16
 - Disclosure process – Paragraphs 21-25 Appendix 5
 - Independent assessment process – Paragraphs 37-43, Appendix 6
 - Interstitial candidates – Paragraphs 81-92
 - Nomination Forms – Paragraphs 27, 97-98
 - Number of elections to the Fellowship over 10 years – Appendix 1
 - Personal connections – Paragraph 28
 - Proposal Forms – Paragraphs 95-96
 - Statistical analysis of Fellowship – Appendix 4
- Election to Corresponding Fellowship – Paragraphs 44-51
 - Criteria for Election to Corresponding Fellowship – Paragraph 45
 - Interstitial candidates – Paragraphs 81-92
 - Nomination Forms – Paragraphs 27, 97-98
 - Number of elections to the Corresponding Fellowship over 10 years – Appendix 2
 - Personal connections – Paragraph 28
 - Proposal Forms – Paragraphs 95-96
- Election to Honorary Fellowship – Paragraphs 52-58
 - Criteria for Election to Honorary Fellowship – Paragraph 53
 - List of Honorary Fellows – Appendix 3
- Fellowship and Structures Committee (FSC) – Paragraphs 79-92
- Groups – Paragraphs 76-78
- Section Standing Committees – Paragraphs 74-75
- Timetable of Electoral Cycle – Paragraph 2
- Appendix 1 – Number of elections to the Fellowship over 10 years
- Appendix 2 – Number of elections to the Corresponding Fellowship over 10 years
- Appendix 3 – List of Honorary Fellows
- Appendix 4 – Statistical analysis of Fellowship
- Appendix 5 – Draft letter to candidates re disclosure
- Appendix 6 – Draft letter to assessors re independent assessment
- Appendix 7 – Good Practice Guidelines