

King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals

DHAHRAN - SAUDI ARABIA



Faculty Promotion Regulations and Guidelines

OFFICE OF THE VICE RECTOR FOR GRADUATE STUDIES & SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

**(Revised Jumada II, 1421)
(Corresp. to September, 2000)**

378.12 dc
2000

King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals, 200
Dhahran
Faculty Promotion Regulations and Guidelines - Dhahran
53 p.; 16.5 × 23.5 cm
1. King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals - Faculty -
Regulations
2. Universities and Colleges - Saudi Arabia - Faculty -
Regulations
I - Title
ISBN 9960-07-160-X

FACULTY PROMOTION REGULATIONS AND GUIDELINES

Copyright © 2000 by the
King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals
Dhahran, Saudi Arabia

All Rights Reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, medium or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Registered at
King Fahd National Library
under Legal Deposit No. 1903/21 on 22/7/2000

Printed in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia by
King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals Printing Press

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Preamble	5
II. Criteria for Promotion	6
1. Teaching	6
2. Research	7
3. Departmental, University & Public Service	9
III. Minimum Qualifications	10
1. Degree Requirement	10
2. Assistant Professor	10
3. Associate Professor	10
4. Professor	11
5. Special Cases	12
IV Promotion to Professorial Ranks	13
1. Assistant Professor	13
2. Associate Professor	13
3. Professor	14
Appendix A:	16
Policies and Procedures for KFUPM Faculty Promotions	
Appendix B:	21
Guidelines for Internal Ad-hoc Committees	
Appendix C:	24
Guide to the Preparation of Dossier	
Appendix D:	28
Format for Listing of Publications	
Appendix E:	29
Selection of External Referees (by the Applicant)	

(TOC Contd. to next Page)

	<u>Page</u>
Appendix F1:	31
Format of Letter Soliciting Willingness for External Evaluation	
Appendix F2:	32
Format of Letter Forwarding the Review Material	
Appendix G1:	33
Research Performance Evaluation Form for Promotion To the Rank of Associate Professor.	
Appendix G2:	38
Research Performance Evaluation Form for Promotion To the Rank of Full Professor.	
Appendix H:	43
Committee Member Commitment Statement	
Appendix I:	44
Candidate Commitment Statement and Conflict of Interest	
Appendix J:	45
Declaration of Conflict of Interest	
Appendix K:	46
Policy on Misconduct in Research	
Appendix L:	51
Summary of Steps in Chronological Order for Promotion to Professorial Ranks.	

I - PREAMBLE

The primary goals of a university are the advancement and dissemination of knowledge. The modern university provides a fertile environment where knowledge is transmitted and advanced. In order that the university as an institution may accomplish its goals, faculty must first and foremost be scholars who have depth and wisdom. They must also be able to communicate their scholarship to others. The effectiveness of a faculty is essentially the product of (a) depth of individual scholarship and (b) quality of teaching.

The promotion process aims to advise the university on the promotability of a candidate and provide feedback to the candidate through the appropriate dean of his performance in research, teaching and public and university service. The university shall use the promotion process to encourage academic excellence and rectify mediocrity and marginal contribution in a fair and constructive manner. It is to be noted that the University is determined to evaluate the achievements of its faculty by comparison with international standards in all the fields of knowledge, which are relevant to the University program.

While approving these regulations and guidelines, the Scientific Council asserts that these regulations and guidelines are in accordance with the 'unified bylaws for faculty' that were adopted by the Higher Education Council No.4-6-1417H in its sixth meeting on 26-8-1417H. On 22-8-1418H, the Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques approved the decision of the Council.

II - CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

Faculty members applying for promotion will be evaluated on the basis of the following:

1. Teaching
2. Research and Scientific Contributions
3. University, Departmental and Public Service

While University, Departmental and Public Service should be recognized and encouraged, high quality teaching and research are of primary importance and are indispensable qualifications for promotion to higher professorial ranks.

1. TEACHING

Since teaching is a primary function of all KFUPM faculty, a candidate for promotion is required to demonstrate his ability to teach effectively in addition to his other responsibilities. The following factors and criteria are to be considered in the evaluation of teaching performance:

- a.* Demonstrated competence in the subject matter in classroom and public presentations (e.g. colloquia, seminars, symposia, short courses, conferences, etc.).
- b.* Effectiveness in the development and use of innovative methods in teaching such as computer aided instructions.
- c.* Guidance and leadership in student activities.
- d.* Initiation and participation in curriculum development (e.g. new courses, new programs, etc.).
- e.* Effectiveness in the development and use of Instructional Laboratories.
- f.* Level of participation and effectiveness in the continuing education programs.
- g.* Textbook authoring.
- h.* Effectiveness in supervising senior projects, Summer Training and Coop Programs (if applicable).
- i.* Teaching Load.

Information regarding these aspects of the candidate's teaching performance can be sought from his chairman, peers, students (preferably senior) alumni and course files. It is noted that student's evaluation should not be accepted without qualification. It may serve, however, as an indicator of competence. It is not to be used as an absolute

and final measure of the teaching performance. It is expected that each faculty member maintains course files that include the syllabi, outlines of materials covered, homework, lab assignments, exams, and other pertinent information. Such files should be made available to the committee on request. In the case of multiple-section courses where a number of instructors are involved, the input from the coordinator may also be sought through the Chairman of the Department.

In judging the effectiveness of the candidate's teaching, the committee (see Appendix B) shall consider the candidate's command of his subject; his continuous growth in his field; his ability to organize and present his materials with clarity and force; his capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of his subject to other fields of knowledge; his grasp of general objectives; the spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize his learning and teaching; his ability to excite intellectual curiosity in freshmen and to stimulate advanced students to original work; his personal attributes as they affect his teaching, his students, and his colleagues; and the extent and skill of his participation in the general guidance and counseling of students.

2. RESEARCH AND SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTIONS

It is a truism that the quality of teaching at the University and the viability of its graduate programs are directly related to the quality of research and scholarship of its faculty. Consequently, the university shall promote those members of faculty who are actively engaged in research and creative scholarship of demonstrable quality.

There are basically five different types of research, which are recognized and supported by the University. One is Independent Research, based on the faculty's interests and capabilities in the academic colleges and departments of the University. It is necessary for keeping the faculty abreast of the *state of the art* in their professional specialization.

The second is University Sponsored Research, based on specific areas of interest to the University, and funded with subsidies in the form of research grants and released time of academic personnel. This type of research may be either basic or applied, and it is directed at some specific objectives.

The third type is Contract Research, based on specific needs and interests of external clients who finance the research in return for access to the results. The client usually identifies the problem, while the task of the researchers is to find viable and economical solution to that problem and to deliver the results on schedule and within the time frame set by the contract. The results of such research are usually delivered to the client as reports, software or prototypes. Contract research may entail confidentiality and restriction on publication. In conformity with its goals the University encourages and values research that may lead to solutions of problems that are of local concern, and believes that such research should also be considered of paramount importance.

Moreover, it recognizes that successful solution of many practical problems requires the effort of multi-disciplinary research teams.

The fourth type constitutes published textbooks and scientific reference books, translations of specialized scientific books, reviews of rare books and published research by scientific societies approved by the Scientific Council.

The fifth type consists of inventions and novelties that have patents from recognized agencies approved by the Scientific Council and distinguished creative activities recommended by the Scientific Council and approved by the University Board.

It is acknowledged that measuring scholarship and the resultant effectiveness of the candidate is a task fraught with difficulties. One must keep in mind, that the aim is the evaluation of *depth of scholarship*, which is directly correlated to the degree of creativity, and significance of the research work undertaken. It is also related to the scholarly stature and effectiveness of the researcher in question. Evidence of creative research should be sought in the candidate's published research in refereed journals, conference proceedings, monographs, technical reports or in original professional work such as architectural and engineering designs, and computer software.

In published scholarly work, a key ingredient is significance rather than volume. A judgement can be made by examining the quality of the journals in which the publications appeared, the use which other researchers make of an individual's publications, or by requesting testimony from other distinguished workers in the field. Since the task of choosing reviewers is rather critical, extra care is needed in the selection of peers who should be asked to evaluate a candidate's research accomplishments. Contributions in the area of coordination of knowledge such as survey articles, and books are evidence of effective scholarship. Other evidence in this area includes supervision of master and doctoral theses. Moreover, articles, textbooks, reports, and similar publications normally considered as contributions to the professional literature or the advancement of the professional practice or of professional education, should be judged as evidence of effective scholarship especially, when they present new ideas or incorporate scholarly research. Evidence of scholarly stature may include services on editorial boards of scholarly journals, invitations to give keynote addresses in conferences or symposia, membership in technical committees of international/national conferences, symposia, acting as referee for scholarly journals, conferences, symposia, books, and technical reports, prizes and awards received and high level consulting work. Confidential and secret reports, software or prototypes may be evaluated by an ad-hoc committee of cleared university personnel of higher rank than the candidate. This committee shall report its findings to the promotion committee.

3. DEPARTMENTAL, UNIVERSITY AND PUBLIC SERVICE

The faculty plays an important role in administration within the University and in the formulation of its policies. Recognition shall therefore be given to scholars who prove themselves to be able administrators and developers of their respective departments and who participate effectively and imaginatively in Departmental, College, and University committees. Service rendered by members of the faculty to the local community and the Kingdom, both in their special capacities as scholars and in areas beyond these special capacities when the work done is at a sufficiently high level and quality, shall likewise be recognized in the promotion process. These may include organizing short courses, national/international conferences, seminars, workshops, technical projects, authoring articles for the general public, translations, etc. Contributions might also include identifying industry needs and elaborating coherent training programs in some areas of expertise, as well as establishing a link for technical cooperation between KFUPM and other institutions in specific areas of expertise. Similarly, contributions to the students' welfare shall also be recognized and considered.

III - MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

The following minimum qualifications are required for all professorial ranks of the KFUPM faculty. For research, the minimum qualifications are determined on the basis of a specific number of “units”. A scholarly work is to be counted as “1 unit” if it is single authored; “1/2 unit” if it has two authors. If the research was carried out by more than two individuals, it will be regarded as “1/2 unit” for the principal author and “1/4 unit” for each of the others. If another collective work is considered for promotion, then it will count as “1/4 unit” for each researcher.

1. DEGREE REQUIREMENT

Earned Ph.D., or equivalent degree, in the subject area from an institution whose graduate programs correspond to those of reputable universities, is required for all professorial ranks. However, in certain fields of study and in special cases, exceptions can be made (refer to article 12 of the “Unified Regulatory Charter for Saudi Faculty and their Equivalence”). *Ph.D. degrees obtained by correspondence, during breaks/vacation periods, and through continuing education courses are not accepted as equivalent to an earned Ph.D. degree.*

2. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

A candidate for this rank must show promise of successful research performance. Publications resulting from his Ph.D.-dissertation may be accepted as evidence of such promise. In addition, it is desirable that he has some teaching experience at the university level.

3. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Four or more years of successful teaching and research at a recognized University, subsequent to attaining the requisite degree, are required; of which at least a one-year service in a Saudi University is required. For candidates with an industrial or professional background, the time requirement of combined university teaching and pertinent experience after the completion of the doctorate or equivalent degree is given in section 5 below. An Associate Professor should demonstrate mature and independent scholarship. Research and other scholarly activities should indicate creativity, significance and effectiveness. The candidate for promotion must satisfy the following minimum requirements in Research and Scientific Contributions:

Four published and/or accepted-for-publication units; two of these units, at least,

must be single authored (*exceptions to single-authorship in some fields will be determined by the University Board*). In determining the minimum number of units, the following categories and rules should be considered:

1. Papers in internationally recognized refereed journals; a *minimum of one* unit is required.
2. Papers in refereed proceedings in international conferences and specialized symposia; a *maximum of one* unit is accepted.
3. Refereed, published, or accepted for publication technical reports from specialized university research centers; a *maximum of one* unit is accepted.
4. Refereed textbooks and reference books; a *maximum of one* unit is accepted.
5. Refereed authentication reviews of rare books; a *maximum of one* unit is accepted.
6. Refereed translations of specialized scientific books; a *maximum of one* unit is accepted.
7. Refereed books and research reports published by scientific societies/authorities approved by the Scientific Council; a *maximum of one* unit is accepted.
8. Inventions and novelties that have patents from recognized patent agencies approved by the Scientific Council.
9. Distinguished creative activities according to a basis recommended by the Scientific Council and approved by the University Board; a *maximum of one* unit is accepted.

In determining the minimum number of units, it must be ascertained that Research and Scientific Contributions were published or accepted-for-publications while the candidate was at the rank of Assistant Professor.

Furthermore, it must be ascertained that material submitted for consideration for promotion must have been published or accepted-for-publication in more than one publication channel (i.e. different journal publishers and different university and scientific establishments). It must also be ascertained that material submitted for consideration is not exactly extracted from the candidate's MS-thesis, Ph.D.-dissertation or previous publications.

4. PROFESSOR

Eight or more years of successful teaching and research work at a recognized University subsequent to attaining the requisite degree are required. For candidates with an industrial or professional background, the time requirement of combined University teaching and pertinent experience after the completion of the doctorate or equivalent degree, with at least four years of teaching is given in Section 5 below. Candidates applying for promotion to this rank must have at least four years of service in the

Associate Professor rank, of which at least a 1-year service in a Saudi University is required. Bestowal of this rank indicates a recognized scholar of authoritative reputation. It indicates that the individual has demonstrated substantial scholarly achievement, and his work in a given discipline is widely known and respected. In promotion to this rank, contributions in teaching and service are important, however, the main emphasis is on research and scholarly achievements. Thus all candidates to this rank must demonstrate that their research achievements have had a recognized impact on the advancement of knowledge in their subject area. The candidates for promotion to this rank must satisfy the following minimum requirements in Research and Scientific Contributions: *six* published and/or accepted-for-publication units; *three* of these units, at least, must be single-authored (exceptions to single-authorship in some fields will be determined by the University Board).

In determining the minimum number of units for promotion to the rank of Professor, the same nine categories of scholarly activities listed in Section III.3 (*i.e.* items 1 - 9) and the unit *maxima* for each category are applicable. However, for consideration for promotion to this rank, a *minimum* of *two* units in category “1” (*i.e.* refereed journal papers) is required.

In determining the minimum number of units, it must be ascertained that Research and Scientific Contributions were published or accepted-for-publication while the candidate was at the rank of Associate Professor.

Furthermore, it must be ascertained that material submitted for consideration must have been published or accepted-for-publication in more than one publication channel and not all channels are associated with one single university or a single society. It must also be ascertained that material submitted for consideration is not exactly extracted from the candidate’s M.S.-thesis, Ph.D.-dissertation, or previous publications.

5. SPECIAL CASES

The minimum time requirement for a faculty member who had been on loan or assignment to other non-university organizations for a specific duration is to be counted as follows:

1. The *full* duration should be counted, if the loan or assignment was to a scientific organization and the work was in his field of specialty.
2. *Half* duration should be counted, if the loan or assignment was to a non-scientific organization but the work was in his field of specialty.
3. *No* part of the duration should be counted, if the work done during the loan or assignment was not in his field of specialty.

IV - PROMOTION TO PROFESSORIAL RANKS

The minimum qualifications stated in Section III above must be satisfied for all ranks.

1. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

No elaboration over what has been stated in the Minimum Qualifications in Section III.

2. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

- 2.1 The candidate should satisfy the teaching and research requirements as listed in Sections II-1 and II-2 of the Criteria for Promotion. Also, he should have demonstrated teaching effectiveness at various levels of the undergraduate and, where applicable, graduate programs.
- 2.2 Normally the candidate for promotion shall have a record of successful research achievements, which demonstrate his capability to conduct independent and original research. This would be evidenced by scholarly publications in refereed journals, in the refereed proceedings of international conferences. (See section II-2). While numerical standards might vary from one discipline to another, a normal requirement would be the publication, during the period preceding the application, of several scholarly articles in refereed journals of good repute, with the candidate being the sole or the principal author of some of them. The quality and significance of the Research and Scientific Contributions shall be the primary criteria in assessing the candidate's application. In no case will the number of publications alone be considered tantamount to meeting the research criterion for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.
- 2.3 In case where the publications have several authors, the numerical expectations would be correspondingly higher. However, in making such judgments, attention must be given to certain special disciplines where research is necessarily collaborative. Conversely, in cases of publications documented to have had a major impact on their field, the numerical requirements may be lowered. The promotion committee may request the candidate to elaborate on his specific contributions in joint publications.
- 2.4 Papers presented at reputable international conferences, refereed and published in full in the proceedings thereof, will be accepted.

- 2.5 In certain disciplines where opportunities for publications are limited, or where emphasis is placed instead on professional accomplishments such as designs, patents, books, computer software, and so on, these accomplishments may be used in partial satisfaction of the normal publication requirement. In such cases the promotion committee shall carefully scrutinize the quality of the work in question in order to assess its equivalence to more conventional indicators.
- 2.6 All faculty are expected to share the service responsibilities of their Department, College and the University, and are encouraged to provide professional service to their disciplines and the community. While service cannot be considered equivalent to teaching or research, the candidate's service activities enhance his qualifications for advancement. Record of such services should be compiled and documented by the candidate. The committee may ask for comments on their quality from the department chairman and others.
- 2.7 The candidate's application will be evaluated on a 100 point scale, which is composed of:
- Sixty (60) points for Research and Scientific Contributions.
Twenty-five (25) points for Teaching.
Fifteen (15) points for University, Departmental and Public Service.

Criteria and Standards for the evaluations in the three categories will be set by the University Board, based on recommendation of the Scientific Council.

The candidate will be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor if his total number of points is not less than sixty (60) points, of which at least thirty-five (35) points must be from Research and Scientific Contributions. However, a second condition is that at least two of the three external reviewers (see Appendix A, Sec. 2.4) must recommend promotion of the candidate.

3. PROFESSOR

- 3.1 The requirements stated in the Minimum Qualifications must be satisfied.
- 3.2 Throughout his service as Associate Professor, the candidate must have served at a level of effectiveness and accomplishment consistent with the criteria for advancement to that rank and the expectations of its holders.
- 3.3 The candidate should be a recognized scholar within his discipline, and have a record of successful research achievements. He should be well recognized for the extent and significance of his contributions to the discipline. His work should have demonstrated originality and significance as manifested by citations by others in the literature.

- 3.4 While numerical standards might vary from one discipline to another, it is expected that, during the period preceding his application, the candidate should have maintained an active involvement in research as shown by a persistent record of publication in refereed journals or significant professional accomplishments in fields where publications are limited. This requirement is qualified by statements made in paragraphs 2.2 and 2.3 of the requirements for promotion to Associate Professor. In no case will the number of publications alone be considered tantamount to meeting the research criterion for promotion to the rank of Professor.
- 3.5 The candidate's contributions must indicate a consistent commitment to improving the department's and his own role in training undergraduate and graduate students.
- 3.6 When opportunities exist, the candidate is expected to have taught a number of graduate level courses and supervised a number of M. S. and Ph.D. theses.
- 3.7 The candidate must have a demonstrated ability as an educator, proven by his participation and leadership in the development of undergraduate and graduate programs.
- 3.8 During his tenure as Associate Professor, the candidate must have played an effective part in the service activities of his Department, University and Community.
- 3.9 The candidate's application will be evaluated on a 100 point scale, which is composed of:
- Sixty (60) points for Research and Scientific Contributions.
Twenty-five (25) points for Teaching.
Fifteen (15) points for University, Departmental and Public Service.

Criteria and Standards for the evaluations in the three categories will be set by the University Board, based on recommendation of the Scientific Council.

The candidate will be promoted to the rank of Professor if his total number of points is not less than sixty (60) points, of which at least forty (40) points must be from Research and Scientific Contributions. However, a second condition is that all three external reviewers must recommend promotion of the candidate. In case two of the three external reviewers recommend promotion and one does not recommend promotion of the candidate, a fourth external reviewer shall be asked to evaluate the candidate's achievements in Research and Scientific Contributions, and his opinion will be final.

Appendix ‘A’

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR KFUPM FACULTY PROMOTIONS

1. POLICIES

- 1.1 The principal criteria for evaluation and academic promotion of faculty are : (i) Teaching, (ii) Research and Scientific Contributions and (iii) University, Departmental and Public Service.
- 1.2 Special internal ad-hoc promotion committees shall be formed of college faculty members and researchers from the Research Institute for evaluation of the promotion case. The membership of these should include distinguished faculty and researchers holding a higher rank than the applicant. In all cases, the evaluation committees shall report in detail their findings about the candidates and their qualifications to hold the academic ranks for which they are applying.

The departments concerned shall submit to the committee information on the candidates’ performance in teaching, research, and contribution to community service. The Scientific Council will make its decision on the candidates’ promotion after evaluating all the aforementioned reports.

However, the Scientific Council may request a promotion committee, the departments concerned, or the candidate to submit supplementary details or information which may help the Council in making the proper decision regarding the promotion.

- 1.3 The promotion request of a faculty member will be evaluated by an internal ad-hoc promotion committee comprising five faculty members (including the Chairman of the committee) or researchers from the Research Institute. Such committees are formed by the Vice-Rector for GS&SR on the basis of nominations by the Deans of the respective colleges. For faculty members who are working at the Research Institute, the committees shall be formed by the Vice-Rector for GS&SR in consultation with the Vice Rector for Applied Research.

1.3.1 The internal ad-hoc promotion committees shall comprise:

- (a) At least two faculty members from the college or the Research Institute in the same or closely related field of specialization as that of the applicant for promotion.
- (b) A minimum of two and a maximum of three members in fields of specialization related to that of the candidate.

- (c) The chairman of the committee shall be appointed by the Vice-Rector for GS & SR
 - (d) The committee should not include the present chairman of the academic department.
- 1.3.2 If the candidate is a college Dean or holds a similar position, a committee will be formed by the Rector based on nominations by the Vice-Rector for GS&SR in consultation with the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs. If the candidate is a manager of a Center at the Research Institute or the like, a committee will then be formed by the Rector based on the Vice-Rector for GS&SR's nomination made in consultation with the Vice Rector for Applied Research.
- 1.3.3 If the candidate is a Chairman, the Dean of the College concerned should chair the meeting of the Departmental Council.
- 1.3.4 If the candidate is a Dean, the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs should chair the meeting of the College Council.
- 1.4 In evaluating a candidate's performance, a promotion committee shall give special consideration to his qualifications and contributions in scientific research, teaching, and public services.
- 1.5 The following procedures should be used in the evaluation process:
 - 1.5.1 Confidentiality shall govern all activities related to the formation of committees, their discussions, proceedings, and reports.

All proceedings of the Scientific Council concerning the evaluation of a candidate, and every other action pertaining to his performance and promotion, shall be confidential.
 - 1.5.2 In case the candidate for promotion is a member of the Department, College or Scientific Councils he should not attend the meetings of the relevant councils or know of their proceedings when his case is reviewed. He may not see any report or decision relevant to the evaluation of his performance.
 - 1.5.3 The Internal Ad-hoc Promotion committees must consider the opinions of recognized scholars from outside KFUPM in evaluating the candidates. This is mandatory for promotions to Associate and Full Professorship.

2. PROCEDURE

- 2.1 A request for promotion may be initiated by the candidate six months before fulfilling the minimum time requirements. The request should be addressed to

the chairman of the department and accompanied by supporting documents as outlined in the Guide to the Preparation of a Dossier (see Appendix 'C').

- 2.2 Upon receiving the application, the Department Council (or whoever it delegates) *examines* the case; ascertains the candidate's eligibility (according to the regulation stated in section III), and proposes a list of, at least, 8 *external referees* in the candidate's area of specialization. In the case of eligibility, the department chairman should expeditiously notify the Dean of the college of the candidate's request. The request should be accompanied by a letter of evaluation providing details of eligibility, together with the list of external referees. This letter and all supporting documents, as well as the candidate's dossier, should be forwarded to the Dean as soon as possible but not later than three weeks after receipt of the application. At this point the dossier should be complete with all internal documents necessary for the internal ad-hoc promotion committee to make its judgement. The candidate should be informed in writing that his dossier has been forwarded to the Dean.
- 2.3 Upon receiving the application, the College Council *examines* the case, and proposes a list of, at least, 8 *external referees* in the candidate's area of specialization. This list can include referees other than the ones nominated by the Departmental Council. Within three weeks, the Dean should notify the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs of the application; the notification should include the College Council's report along with a list of referees and the candidate's dossier. The Vice Rector for Academic Affairs shall forward the material to the Chairman of scientific Council.
- 2.4 The Vice Rector for GS & SR presents the application to the Scientific Council for further examination and selection of 5 *referees* to evaluate the candidate's research and scientific contributions. The 5 *referees* can be selected from the list provided by the College Council or others. Three of the 5 referees are principal referees, the fourth is a first reserve referee; and the fifth is a second reserve referee. The reserve referees will be consulted, if needed. Furthermore, at least two of the 3 principal referees must be external (i.e. from outside KFUPM). The external referees must be internationally well known researchers with significant contribution in the area of specialization of the candidate. They must hold the rank of full professors or equivalent. In case of promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, one of the external referees could be an Associate Professor. Moreover, it is not desirable to select referees who have personal association with the candidate.

The Scientific Council (or whoever it delegates) shall solicit the external evaluations and forward them to the internal promotion committee. The internal promotion committee is formed by the Vice Rector for GS & SR, as given in Sec. 1 of this Appendix. The suggested format of letters and evaluation forms to be used is given in Appendices (F) and (G), respectively.

- 2.5 The Scientific Council (or whoever it delegates) confidentially sends the research contributions and applicant's resume to the 3 principal referees for evaluation, according to the format attached in the Appendix: G1 for Associate Professor and G2 for Full Professor.
- 2.6 In some cases where confidential or classified research is to be evaluated, the committee may request the input of the Vice Rector of Applied Research. The Vice Rector of Applied Research may form a sub-committee to evaluate the classified work or send his own evaluation.
- 2.7 In the event of an unfavorable recommendation, the ad hoc internal promotion committee, before finalizing its recommendation, can ask the applicant (through the Dean of the College) to comment on specific negative aspects. These comments shall be taken into consideration by the committee and presented to the Scientific Council along with the committee's final report and the additional new information submitted by the applicant.

3. PROMOTABILITY

- 3.1 After careful analysis of the external evaluations and the candidate's qualifications, the internal ad-hoc promotion committee evaluates the application on a 100 point scale as follows:

Sixty	(60) points for Research and Scientific Contributions.
Twenty-five	(25) points for Teaching.
Fifteen	(15) points for University, Departmental and Public Service.

The committee then summarizes its findings, and the chairman of the committee drafts a report.

- 3.2 A faculty member will be promoted provided his total is not less than 60 points: of which at least 35 points should be in Research & Scientific Contributions for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor; and at least 40 points in Research & Scientific Contributions for promotion to the rank of Full Professor. Moreover, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor should be based on majority recommendation of the 3 external referees. Promotion to the rank of Full Professor must be based on *unanimous* recommendation of the three external referees; in case only 2 referees recommend promotion, the opinion of the fourth referee will be sought and it shall be final.
- 3.3 The Scientific Council shall carefully study the reports of the external reviewers and the internal ad-hoc promotion committee, and take a decision to promote or not to promote the applicant.
- 3.4 If the Scientific Council decides not to promote the candidate for weakness in

the applicant's Research and Scientific contributions, it shall also decide what parts of his Research & Scientific contributions will be discarded in a future re-application for promotion. In case of a future re-application, the minimum requirements shall include, at least one new research unit in case of application to the rank of Associate Professor and 2 new research units for application to the rank of Full Professor.

In case the Scientific Council finds that some of the submitted publications were exactly extracted from the candidate's M.S. thesis, his Ph.D. dissertation, or from his previous work, the candidate will be denied consideration for promotion for one year, effective from the date of the Scientific Council's decision.

4. WITHDRAWAL OF PROMOTION REQUEST

The applicant for promotion has the right to withdraw his application at any stage. Such cases will not be presented to the Scientific Council. However, these candidates will be eligible to reapply for promotion on production of new evidence, after a period of 12 months from the date of withdrawal of the promotion request.

5. ACTION BY THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

The Vice Rector for GS&SR shall present the report of the ad-hoc promotion committee to the Scientific Council. The Scientific Council then carries out a comprehensive review and decides for or against promotion of the candidate.

6. NOTIFICATION TO CANDIDATE

The Scientific Council's decision on the candidate's application for promotion, if favorable, shall be communicated to the candidate by the Dean of Faculty and Personnel. In case of unfavorable decision, the College Dean concerned shall communicate to the faculty member the detailed evaluation of his performance with recommendation for improvement, if any. Promotion of a faculty member, is effective from the date of decision of the Scientific Council. However, his promotion to an equivalent position is considered from the date of the Executive Order whenever a vacant position is available for his promotion to it.

7. REAPPLICATION FOR PROMOTION

In case of unfavorable decision by the Scientific Council, the candidate may reapply for promotion at least six months after the date of the decision. The reapplication shall be acted upon only if new evidence has been presented to justify reconsideration, as explained in Section 3.4 of Appendix A.

Appendix ‘B’

GUIDELINES FOR INTERNAL AD-HOC PROMOTION COMMITTEES

In their deliberations, preparation of reports, and recommendations, the internal ad-hoc promotion committees shall be guided by the regulations and procedures set forth in this document. For faculty members assigned to the Research Institute, the same regulations and guidelines are used except when otherwise stated.

1. PURPOSE AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PROMOTION COMMITTEES

The process of recommendation for promotion is largely the responsibility of internal ad-hoc promotion committees formed by the the Vice-Rector for Graduate Studies & Scientific Research. (For the policies and procedures regarding formation of promotion committees, see Appendix ‘A’).

Promotion Committees have the implied role of building and maintaining a faculty of the highest standards. Through the process of evaluating the performance of faculty members, and in supporting or denying promotion, the Committee should strive to use these processes to encourage academic excellence and rectify mediocrity and marginal contributions, in a fair and constructive manner.

2. MAINTENANCE OF THE COMMITTEE’S EFFECTIVENESS

- 2.1 The membership, deliberations, and report of the internal ad-hoc promotion committee are to be strictly confidential. The chairman of each committee should remind its members of the confidential nature of their assignment. This should be kept in mind in the transaction of all written and oral communications. When final recommendations and supporting documents are forwarded, it is the responsibility of the Chairman of the promotion committee to destroy all copies and preliminary drafts.
- 2.2 The whole system of academic review by committees depends for its effectiveness upon each committee’s prompt attention to its assignment and its conduct of the review with all possible dispatch, consistent with judicious and thorough consideration of the case.
- 2.3 The chairman of an internal ad-hoc promotion committee has the responsibility of ascertaining that each member of the committee has read and understands the regulations, guidelines and instructions in this document.

3. THE REPORT

- 3.1 The report of the internal ad-hoc promotion committee forms the basis for further review by the Scientific Council. The report should include an evaluation of all significant evidence, both favorable and unfavorable. It should be specific and analytical, and adequately documented by reference to supporting material.
- 3.2 The internal ad-hoc promotion committee has the responsibility of making a clear recommendation based on the average of the number of points assigned by each of the committee members in each category. The number of points can be solicited by secret ballot. The report must include a table of points as follows:

	# of Points in Teaching (Out of 25)	# of Points in Research & Sc. Contributions (Out of 60)	# of Points in University, Departmental and Public Service (Out of 15)
Member A			
Member B			
Member C			
Member D			
Member E			
Average # of Points			

Note: Names of members must not be disclosed.

Total # of Points (out of 100)	
-----------------------------------	--

The average number of points in each category and the total number of points shall also be qualified whereby it is understood that a rating of ‘Excellent’ is equivalent to ≥ 90 percent of the maximum number of points in each category. Similarly :

‘Very Good’ is equivalent to		75 – 89%	of the maximum number of points in each category.
‘Good’	”	60 – 74%	”
‘Fair’	”	50 – 59%	”
‘Poor’	”	< 50%	”

- 3.3 All members of the internal ad-hoc promotion committee should sign the report which, with all supporting documents, is submitted in the form of a memo addressed to the Vice Rector for GS&SR.
- 3.4 The committee should aim to complete its deliberations in the time period of a maximum of *six (6) months*.

4. DISSOLUTION OF THE INTERNAL AD-HOC PROMOTION COMMITTEE

The Vice-Rector for GS & SR shall hold the right to dissolve the internal Ad-hoc Promotion Committee in case of serious violation of the promotion regulations and guidelines.

Appendix ‘C’

GUIDE TO THE PREPARATION OF DOSSIER

In order to expedite the review process, the candidate and his department should provide all input and documentation necessary for the committee’s deliberations and recommendations. The documentation assembled in one package is referred to as the candidate’s file or dossier. The following should be included in a well-prepared dossier.

1. INPUT FROM THE CANDIDATE

1.1 Summary of Experience Record (Resume)

A brief account of the candidate’s career and qualifications. It should include basic personal data, record of academic accomplishments, employment history, and other information such as special recognitions, professional certifications, membership in societies etc.

1.2 Teaching

- a.* A list of courses taught, in each semester, at KFUPM and other educational institutions, including student evaluations.
- b.* Course coordination assignments.
- c.* Course and lab development responsibilities.
- d.* Participation in short courses.
- e.* Public lectures.

1.3 Research

- a. List of Publications:*

Such a list should be arranged in chronological order. In particular, the list must indicate items published since the last appointment or promotion.

Furthermore, the list should be subdivided into the following categories:

1. Papers in internationally recognized refereed journals
2. Papers in refereed proceedings in international conferences specialized symposia.

3. Refereed, published, or accepted for publication technical reports from specialized university research centers.
4. Refereed textbooks and reference books.
5. Refereed authentication reviews of rare books.
6. Refereed translations of specialized scientific books.
7. Refereed books and research reports published by scientific societies/ authorities approved by the Scientific Council.
8. Inventions and novelties that have patents from recognized patent agencies approved by the Scientific Council.
9. Distinguished creative activities according to a basis recommended by the Scientific Council and approved by the University Board.

It is essential to have clear identification of items accepted but not yet in print (copies of the acceptance letters should be enclosed), and of items submitted. In preparing such a list, the candidate shall follow the recommended format given in Appendix 'D'.

- b.* List of research projects at KFUPM (completed or in progress).
- c.* List of citations by other researchers.
- d.* List of 5-7 publications considered by the candidate as his main contributions, with justification.

1.4 Professional Activities

This is a category in which the activities and accomplishments may vary widely from discipline to discipline. Therefore, it is very helpful to include a brief explanation of whatever may constitute pertinent activity in the given discipline, followed by a description of the candidate's activities and accomplishments and their significance. Examples of activities and accomplishments recognized as being of significant importance include:

- a.* Conference Organization
- b.* Awards
- c.* Editorial
- d.* Consulting

1.5 University, Departmental and Public Service

- a.* Administrative positions and appointments held, with clear indication of their duration.
- b.* Committee Work.

In addition to a tabulation of the committees, the candidate should indicate whether he has served as chairman or member, including dates and level (University or departmental). It is helpful to point out which of the committee assignments have been more than normally important.

1.6 Submission of Dossier

The candidate should submit 8 copies of his dossier accompanied by one copy of the scientific publications and any other relevant information to be considered for promotion of the candidate. Such research material should not be exactly extracted from the candidate's M.S. thesis, Ph.D. dissertations or from his previous publications. (In case the Scientific Council finds that some publications submitted are exactly extracted from the candidate's M.S. thesis, Ph.D. dissertation or from his previous works, he will be denied consideration for promotion for one year, effective from the date of the decision of the Scientific Council).

Also, five reprints (copies) of the 5-7 papers considered by the candidate as his main contributions should be submitted.

2. INPUT FROM THE DEPARTMENT

2.1 Teaching

Teaching evaluation for the period since the candidate's appointment or last promotion should be provided by the chairman based on the following: student evaluations, student overall performance in course offered, candidate's effectiveness in thesis guidance and supervision, innovative teaching projects, and other teaching activities outside the conventional classroom situation such as seminars, short courses, public lectures and other factors as detailed in II.1.

2.2 Research

The department should provide supplementary information, if available, pertaining to the research accomplishments of the candidate. Such information may address the following questions: What is the significance of the candidate's research accomplishments? Are there known reactions from the candidate's peers? Has the candidate stimulated research activities of his colleagues within the University?

2.3 University, Departmental and Public Service

The department should provide all available information on the effectiveness with which the candidate has discharged his committee assignments, and the

degree of his involvement and leadership in other departmental and university affairs. The candidate's service to the community and his profession, if any, should be described and documented.

3. Input From Faculty and Personnel

The Faculty and Personnel department shall provide the annual performance evaluation reports of the candidate for the period since the candidate's appointment or last promotion to the Dean of the College on request.

Appendix ‘D’

FORMAT FOR LISTING OF PUBLICATIONS

Papers in Refereed Journals

Andrews, J. M. and Baker, L. A., “*Decay Schemes for Radioactive Halogenes*,” Journal of Chemical Physics. Vol. 16 (1979), pp. 386–394.

Conference presentations

1. Ibrahim, N.I., “*Boundary Layer Motion of Gas-Solid Suspension*,” Proceedings of the Symposium of Interaction between Fluids and Particles, Institute of Chemical Engineers, Vol. 1 (1982), pp. 50–63.
2. Eggeman G. W., “*Synthesis of Conjugate Gear Profiles*,” ASME Paper No. 84-DET-178 presented at the 18th Mechanisms Conference, October 7-10, 1984.

Technical Notes

Azad, A. K., “*Optimum Design of I -Columns and Beam-Columns*,” The Arabian Journal of Science and Engineering Vol. 10 (1985), pp. 89–92.

Reports

Sarkar, A. D., “*An Evaluation of Wear Particle Characteristics with the Aid of Ferrography*,” Final Report, KACST Project AR-4-062, September 1984.

Books and Book Chapters

1. Turnbull, D. E., *Fluid Power Engineering*, Newes-Butterworth, London, 1979.
2. Hulbert, S. F. and Charles, W., in *Human Factors in Highway Traffic Safety Research*, ed. Forbes, T. W., Wiley Inter-science Publication, New York, 1972.

Invited Lectures

Hussain, M. S., “*Superconductors: Present Status and Future Outlook*”. Lecture delivered to Dhahran Saudi Arabian Interest Group of the American Chemical Society at Ramadah Inn, October 23, 1989, Dhahran, Saudi Arabia.

Seminars

Darwish, M.A., “*Multi-effect Boiling (MEB) Desalination System*,” WSIA/SWCC Desalination Seminar Proceedings, December 1-5, 1985, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, pp.135–152.

Appendix ‘E’

SELECTION OF EXTERNAL REFEREES FOR EVALUATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR PROMOTION

NAME:
(Applicant for promotion)

The candidate is requested to provide a list of reputable scholars who are qualified to evaluate his research profile. These scholars should be **internationally well known researchers with significant contribution in the area of specialization of the candidate**. They should hold the rank of Professor or its equivalent in their institutions. The candidate is also requested to refrain from suggesting referees who have personal association with the candidate.

Please note that the referees nominated by the candidate may not necessarily be selected for the purpose of evaluation.

NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF INTERNATIONALLY REPUTED REFEREES,
INCLUDING THEIR GENERAL AND SPECIALIZED AREAS OF RESEARCH

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

PLEASE CLASSIFY THE AREAS OF RESEARCH OF THE CANDIDATE:

.....

.....

Name: Signature:

Date:

Appendix 'F1'

FORMAT OF LETTER SOLICITING WILLINGNESS FOR EXTERNAL EVALUATION

[Address]

e-mail / Fax

[Date]

Dear Professor :

The College of :
at the King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals, Dhahran, Saudi Arabia,
has under consideration the request of one of its faculty members,

Dr. , for promotion to the rank of Associate/Full Professor in [Department]. The candidate specializes in [specialization].

The University policy requires that external evaluations of the scholarly and professional contributions of each candidate for promotion be secured from recognized authorities outside the University in order to supplement the institutional record and provide reviewing authorities with an independent assessment. I shall appreciate your confirmation if you are willing to provide your evaluation of the candidate within four weeks of receipt of the material. It would greatly help the committee in expediting the process.

As per our university rules, an honorarium of US\$ 400.00 will be paid to you after receipt of your evaluation report. Please confirm your acceptance on our Fax No.(9663)860-2992 or e-mail (to be mentioned). On receipt of your confirmation, we will mail the documents, including the Faculty Promotion Guidelines of our University, Research Performance Evaluation Form, copies of Dr. (X's) complete list of publications and representative reprints selected by the candidate for your review.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

.....
Dr. Abdullah H. Al-Abdulgader
Vice Rector for Graduate Studies & Sc. Research

Appendix 'F2'

FORMAT OF LETTER FORWARDING THE REVIEW MATERIAL

[Address]

e-mail / Fax

[Date]

Dear Professor :

Thank you for your letter/fax/e-mail message dated
confirming your willingness to review the credentials of

Dr. who has applied for promotion to the rank of
Associate Professor/Full Professor in [Department].

I am glad to send herewith the Faculty Promotion Guidelines of our University,
Research Performance Evaluation Form, a copy of Dr. X's resume covering
the complete list of his publications, and some representative reprints selected
by Dr. for your review.

**The enclosed Research Performance Evaluation Form is to be completed
and returned within four weeks.**

The promotion evaluation process at KFUPM is confidential. Therefore, I would
appreciate keeping the matter as such and corresponding with my office if you
need further information. Please acknowledge receipt of the documents.

Thank you once again for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Appendix 'G1'

KING FAHD UNIVERSITY OF PETROLEUM & MINERALS Research Performance Evaluation Form For Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

Name of Applicant :

Department / Division :

Name of Reviewer :

Address :

To the reviewer: Please indicate how familiar you are with applicant's area of specialization by checking one of the following:

- ☐ I am actively engaged in research in the applicant's specific area.
- ☐ I have carried out research in the past in the applicant's specific area.
- ☐ My experience is in the general area but I have not worked in the applicant's specific area.
- ☐ Other.

Comments :

If you feel you cannot evaluate this material, please suggest names of other scholars who may be able to assist us:

Name :

Name :

Address:

Address:

.....

.....

.....

.....

Questions 1 through 8 deal with the Candidate's attributes concerning his research achievements through his publications. For each of these attributes, please provide rating and justification of that rating.

- 1- How would you rate the **productivity** of the Candidate's work in terms of publication frequency and quantity?

<input type="checkbox"/>	EXCELLENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	VERY GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	POOR
--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Justification for rating:

.....

.....

- 2- How would you rate the overall **quality of the journals** in which the applicant has published?

<input type="checkbox"/>	EXCELLENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	VERY GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	POOR
--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Justification for rating:

.....

.....

3- How would you rate the overall **quality of conferences**?

<input type="checkbox"/>	EXCELLENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	VERY GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	POOR
--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Justification for rating:

.....

.....

4- How would you rate the **originality** of the Candidate's publications?

<input type="checkbox"/>	EXCELLENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	VERY GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	POOR
--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Justification for rating:

.....

.....

5- How would you rate the **significance** of the Candidate's publications?

<input type="checkbox"/>	EXCELLENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	VERY GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	POOR
--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Justification for rating:

.....

.....

6- How would rate the Candidate's **independence** in research?

<input type="checkbox"/>	EXCELLENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	VERY GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	POOR
--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Justification for rating:

.....

.....

7- How would you rate the **citations** received by the Candidate's work?

<input type="checkbox"/>	EXCELLENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	VERY GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	POOR
--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Justification for rating:

.....

.....

8- To what degree you think the applicant has achieved **scholarly stature**?

<input type="checkbox"/>	EXCELLENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	VERY GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	POOR
--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Justification for rating:

.....

.....

- 9- If your institution were to adopt the same research criteria for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor as that of KFUPM (please refer to the attached criteria), what would be your assessment of the likelihood that the applicant will be promoted in your institution :

☐

Promotable

☐

Marginally Promotable

☐

Unpromotable

Justification for rating:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....
Signature of reviewer

.....
Date

Appendix 'G2'

KING FAHD UNIVERSITY OF PETROLEUM & MINERALS Research Performance Evaluation Form For Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

Name of Applicant :

Department / Division :

Name of Reviewer :

Address :

To the reviewer: Please indicate how familiar you are with applicant's area of specialization by checking one of the following:

- ☐ I am actively engaged in research in the applicant's specific area.
- ☐ I have carried out research in the past in the applicant's specific area.
- ☐ My experience is in the general area but I have not worked in the applicant's specific area.
- ☐ Other.

Comments :

If you feel you cannot evaluate this material, please suggest names of other scholars who may be able to assist us:

Name :

Name :

Address:

Address:

.....

.....

.....

.....

Questions 1 through 9 deal with the Candidate's attributes concerning his research achievements through his publications. For each of these attributes, please provide rating and justification of that rating.

- 1- How would you rate the **productivity** of the Candidate's work in terms of publication frequency and quantity?

<input type="checkbox"/>	EXCELLENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	VERY GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	POOR
--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Justification for rating:

.....

.....

- 2- How would you rate the overall **quality of the journals** in which the applicant has published?

<input type="checkbox"/>	EXCELLENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	VERY GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	POOR
--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Justification for rating:

.....

.....

3- How would you rate the overall **quality of conferences**?

<input type="checkbox"/>	EXCELLENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	VERY GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	POOR
--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Justification for rating:

.....

.....

4- How would you rate the **originality** of the Candidate's publications?

<input type="checkbox"/>	EXCELLENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	VERY GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	POOR
--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Justification for rating:

.....

.....

5- How would you rate the **significance** of the Candidate's publications?

<input type="checkbox"/>	EXCELLENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	VERY GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	POOR
--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Justification for rating:

.....

.....

6- How would rate the Candidate's **leadership** in research?

<input type="checkbox"/>	EXCELLENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	VERY GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	POOR
--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Justification for rating:

.....

.....

7- How would you rate the **impact** of the candidate's work in his field as evidenced by **citations, invitation(s) as keynote speaker**, etc?

<input type="checkbox"/>	EXCELLENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	VERY GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	POOR
--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Justification for rating:

.....

.....

8- To what degree you think the applicant has achieved **scholarly stature**?

<input type="checkbox"/>	EXCELLENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	VERY GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	POOR
--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Justification for rating:

.....

.....

- 9- If your institution were to adopt the same research criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor as that of KFUPM (please refer to the attached criteria), what would be your assessment of the likelihood that the applicant will be promoted in your institution:

☐

Promotable

☐

Marginally Promotable

☐

Unpromotable

Justification for rating:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....
Signature of reviewer

.....
Date

Appendix ‘H’

COMMITTEE MEMBER’S COMMITMENT STATEMENT

Confidential

TO :

DATE :

SUBJECT : Serving on Ad-Hoc Committee to consider the promotion
Request of Dr.

I would like to request your participation in the committee as its **Chairman**/as a **Member** that will consider the application of Dr. _____ for promotion from (rank) _____ to (rank) _____ in the Department of _____. Guidelines for promotion adopted by the University are enclosed for your information.

To provide an atmosphere which is conducive to a fair and comprehensive evaluation of each candidate based solely on professional considerations, the rules and regulations of the University require that the promotion committee members treat the deliberations, observations and recommendation of the committee as strictly confidential. According to these rules, you are expected to take every care not to divulge any information concerning any person, and to abstain from discussion of any aspect of the case outside the committee. In this connection, all communications on this case between committee members and anyone outside the committee shall be directed through the committee chairman.

I would appreciate it if you would indicate your willingness to work within the framework of these guidelines by signing this letter of commitment, and returning it to my office.

Thank you.

Dr. Abdullah H. Al-Abdulgader

Vice Rector for Graduate Studies & Sc. Research

I am willing to serve on this promotion committee and to honor the above regulations of confidentiality.

Further, I confirm that with respect to the candidate under consideration, I am able to act in a fair and unbiased manner and that no conflict of interest is involved.

Name :

Signature :

Date :

Appendix 'I'
**CANDIDATE COMMITMENT STATEMENT AND
CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

From : Dean of College of

To :

Subject : Application for promotion.

This is to acknowledge the receipt of your application for promotion, dated _____. According to the university regulations your suitability for a higher rank will be determined by an ad hoc committee which will be formed shortly.

In order to provide a fair chance to the candidate, all the members of the committee must be fair and unbiased. If you feel that any faculty member(s) in your Department or in any other Department (including the Research Institute) might be biased, you have the right to indicate who they are. If you wish to exercise this right you should tick the proper box on the enclosed sheet (App. J) and return it to this office. If you opted to exercise this right, you have to indicate the names of those faculty member(s) to the Dean of the College of _____ verbally (not in writing) when contacted, in due course, by the Dean.

Thank you.

.....
Dean, College of

Appendix ‘J’

DECLARATION FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST

From : Dr.

To : Dean, College of.....

Subject: Application for promotion

[] I want to exclude certain faculty member(s) from my promotion committee.

[] I do not want to exclude any faculty member from my promotion committee.

Thank you.

Dr.

Department:

Date:

Appendix ‘K’

POLICY ON MISCONDUCT IN RESEARCH

1. PREAMBLE

Professional integrity is at the very heart of any scholarly and educational enterprise. There are some well established, internationally recognized, norms governing conduct of research and other scholarly work. In broad terms these norms are :

- a.* Integrity of presentation, analysis and use of results in research.
- b.* Appropriate attribution and accurate acknowledgement of authorship.
- c.* Appropriate use of research funds.

Preservation of ethical standards as well as maintaining a high level of integrity in research is a shared responsibility of the University community as a whole. Deviations from established norms of conduct erode the public confidence in the quality of research enterprise and the University itself.

2. POLICY

It is the policy of the King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals (KFUPM) to :

- a.* Maintain high ethical standards in research and publications and to prevent misconduct whenever it arises.
- b.* Foster an environment that discourages misconduct in research and all other scholarly work.
- c.* Discover and censure instances of misconduct through proper disciplinary action.
- d.* Provide proper safeguards against frivolous, mischievous or malicious misrepresentation in alleging misconduct.

The Vice Rector for Graduate Studies and Scientific Research shall disseminate this policy and maintain records related to misconduct in research.

3. MISCONDUCT IN RESEARCH

Ethical conduct is commonly defined as “conforming to the standards of conduct of a given profession or group”. Misconduct in research means fabrication, falsifica-

tion, plagiarism, or other practices that deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the scientific community for proposing, conducting, or reporting research. Misconduct in research does not include honest errors or honest differences in interpretations or judgments of data.

3.1 Basic Rules for Proper Conduct

While “Common Sense” remains the cardinal rule to observe in guiding one’s conduct, there are specific rules that the faculty members at KFUPM are expected to fully adhere to. These rules are listed below under three sets, one set of these rules is related to research methods and data acquisition/analysis, the second set of rules is related to funded research.

3.1.1 Research Methods and Data Acquisition/Analysis:

- a. The researcher should exercise due care in the selection of the research methodology and in the analysis of data. Specifically the researcher should :
 - Employ only research tools and methods of analysis suited to the research problem under consideration.
 - Avoid selecting research tools and methods because of their special capacity to yield a desired conclusion.
 - Avoid interpreting research results in a way inconsistent with the data available.
 - Avoid implying that interpretations should be accorded greater confidence than the data actually warrants.
- b. The researcher should describe his method and analysis in an accurate and complete manner to allow for replication and verification.
- c. The researcher should exercise due care in gathering and processing data, taking all reasonable steps to assume the accuracy of results. The data must be presented in an organized fashion to allow for verification.
- d. All original data should be maintained for a reasonable length of time, e.g. 5 years from the date of publication.
- e. When research involves human respondents, e.g. in surveys, the researcher should not lie to the respondents or resort to any method which may abuse, coerce, or humiliate them. The researcher should protect the anonymity of the respondents unless they specifically waive it.

3.1.2 *Authorship:*

- a. Authorship attribution (publication credit) should be given to all persons who made significant intellectual contribution to the work and who share responsibility and accountability of results and to no others. Significant intellectual contribution may include formulating the problem or hypothesis, structuring the experimental design, organizing and conducting the statistical analysis, interpreting the results, or writing a major portion of the publication. This attribution of authorship is not affected by whether researchers were paid for their contributions or by their employment status. In a University environment such as KFUPM, special emphasis should be given to a student-professor collaboration. A student should be given due prominence on a list of co-authors of any multiple authored article that is based primarily on the student's work, including thesis or dissertation.
- b. An administrative relationship to the investigation does not constitute an attribution to authorship.
- c. Minor contributions to the work of a professional character or extensive clerical assistance do not constitute attribution to authorship. Such contribution should be acknowledged as footnotes or in the "acknowledgment" section in accordance to the practices of the discipline and the publisher.
- d. In co-authored work, the order of the names generally represents the relative significance of the authors' contributions.
- e. The principal or correspondence author has the duty of ascertaining the compliance of the above authorship rules. He is specifically responsible for :
 - Including, as co-authors, all persons who are entitled to co-authorship, and none who is inappropriate.
 - Sending each co-author a draft copy of the manuscript, and obtaining his consent, including the order of co-author's names.

3.1.3 *Funded Research:*

- a. All funding sources used in the conduct of research should be acknowledged in the resulting publications, except when otherwise requested by the sponsor.
- b. All information about the sponsor's general business affairs and about the findings of the research conducted for the sponsor should be kept confidential, except when the sponsor permits otherwise.
- c. All rules and guidelines issued by the sponsoring agency and those issued by KFUPM regarding funded research should be strictly adhered to especially on matters related to the management and disbursement of funds.

3.2 Forms of Misconduct

The following activities are among the most obvious forms of misconduct which represent serious offences :

3.2.1 *Integrity of Analysis and Use of Results in Research:*

- a. Fabrication or falsification of data and/or results.
- b. Improper experimental manipulation in an intentional way to obtain biased results.
- c. Selective reporting of data, including the omission of conflicting data, in order to sway the results in a particular direction.
- d. Deliberately omitting material fundamental to the understanding of the procedure that were followed and material that other researchers would need to replicate and validate published findings.
- e. Persistently conducting empirical observations without due care; intentionally failing to make reasonable efforts to distinguish artifacts from observed phenomena.

3.2.2 *Plagiarism and Related Practices:*

- a. Taking credit for an exact copy or the rewritten or rearranged published or unpublished work of another (Plagiarism).
- b. Republishing a significant amount of a research paper in another language. In case of translation of a paper, it should be identified as such.
- c. Republishing part(s) of a research paper without making a full, clear, and explicit reference to the original publication, except where standard professional practice permits it; such as reporting research findings to a conference prior to final journal publication.
- d. Insufficiently and/or knowingly not citing the work of others, including associates and students.
- e. Improper attribution of authorship to a person(s) who has (have) not made a significant contribution to the work.
- f. Abuse of confidentiality by improperly using information gained by privileged access.

3.2.3 *Inappropriate Use of Research Funds:*

Abusing resources or misusing funds assigned to funded research such as transferring part of the research fund to personal use.

3.2.4 Violation of Regulations:

Deliberate violation of regulations. For example, intentionally failing to comply with regulations concerning the health and safety of individuals and the environment.

4. ALLEGATION OF MISCONDUCT AND DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS

Allegation of misconduct in scholarly work may come from various sources within the University and/or from outside the University. An allegation of misconduct in scholarly work must be in writing and submitted to the Rector of the University. Investigations of allegations and disciplinary actions, if necessary, are carried out according to the prevailing regulations of the University.

5. PRECAUTIONS AND SAFEGUARDS

Due to the seriousness of this matter, it is the responsibility of the Rector of the University to :

- a.* Protect, to the maximum extent possible, the positions and reputations of those persons who, in good faith, make allegations of misconduct in research, and those against whom allegations of misconduct are not confirmed.
- b.* Make all efforts to restore the reputation of persons alleged to have engaged in misconduct in research, when allegations are not confirmed.
- c.* Take appropriate actions against anyone found to have mischievously or maliciously brought allegation of misconduct in research.

Appendix ‘L’

SUMMARY OF STEPS IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSORIAL RANKS AT KFUPM

CANDIDATE

1. Preparation of dossier by the candidate as given in Appendix ‘C’
2. Request for promotion initiated by the candidate addressed to the chairman of the department (or *Director of Center* at R.I.), forwarding his dossier together with a list of 8 possible external reviewers (Appendix E)

CHAIRMAN OF THE DEPARTMENT (Director of Center)

3. Presents the case to the Departmental Council.

DEPARTMENTAL COUNCIL (or whoever is delegated by the council)

4. Examines the case, establishes the eligibility of the candidate as given under section III and proposes a list of not less than eight referees in the candidate’s area of specialization (Appendix E may be considered), and forwards the application and findings to the Chairman of the Department.

CHAIRMAN OF THE DEPARTMENT (Director of Center)

5. Writes an evaluation letter (see Appendix C-Section 2) and forwards the case to the College Dean enclosing all relevant internal documents along with the dossier of the candidate. The complete file should be forwarded to the Dean of the College within three weeks of receipt of the application.

DEAN OF THE COLLEGE (Vice Rector for Applied Research)

6. Requests input from the Dean of Faculty & Personnel Affairs (see Appendix C-Section 3)
7. Forwards the case to the College Council.
8. Informs the candidate of the date his dossier was received and sends him a letter of “Conflict of Interest” – (Appendix I).
9. Nominates names of faculty members for the internal ad-hoc promotion committee for consideration by the Vice Rector for GS&SR through VRAA.

COLLEGE COUNCIL (or whoever is delegated by the Council)

10. Examines the case, selects a list of not less than 8 referees and forwards the complete file to the Vice Rector for GS& SR through the Dean of the College within three weeks.

VICE RECTOR FOR GS&SR

11. Presents the case to the Scientific Council for examination and selection of 5 external referees.
12. Selects names of five faculty members for the internal ad-hoc promotion committee.
13. Sends research performance evaluation forms (Appendices F and G) and relevant material to first three external reviewers and additional reviewers, if necessary.
14. Requests commitment statement (Appendix H) from faculty members selected to serve on the internal ad-hoc promotion committee.
15. Sends evaluations and recommendations from the external reviewers, to the promotion committee as soon as they become available.

INTERNAL AD-HOC PROMOTION COMMITTEE

16. Inspection of candidate's dossier, chairman evaluation and all other documents by all committee members. The committee chairman should ascertain that all internal documents are in order before calling for a meeting of the internal ad-hoc promotion committee.
17. Meeting of ad-hoc Committee to be called by the committee chairman
18. Committee chairman should clarify all aspects concerning "confidentiality" and "conflict of interest" before deliberation of the committee. Sections II, III and IV, and the external reviewers evaluations and recommendations, shall form the basis of all deliberations.
19. The committee report to be compiled by the committee chairman after conclusion of the deliberations. The report must include recommendations for or against promotion based on assignment of points for research (maximum 60) for teaching (maximum 25) and for University, Departmental and Public Service (maximum 15). The report must also consider the evaluations and recommendations from the external reviewers (Sect. IV - 2.7 and 3.9). The report should be signed by all members and shall be submitted within six months to the Vice Rector for GS&SR.

VICE RECTOR FOR GS&SR

20. Presents the case again to the Scientific Council for comprehensive examination.

SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

21. Reviews the case and decides whether the candidate be promoted or not.

VICE RECTOR FOR GS&SR

22. Forwards the decision of the Scientific Council to the Rector for approval. If the Rector does not approve within two weeks, the Council's decision is accepted. In case the Rector does not approve the Council's decision, he returns the decision to the Council for further consideration. If the Council insists, then the decision is taken to the University Board and the Board's decision is final.
23. Informs the Dean of Faculty & Personnel Affairs the result of the application for promotion (if it is favorable) and the Dean of the College (if it is unfavorable) to be conveyed to the applicant.

DEAN OF THE COLLEGE (Vice Rector for Applied Research)

24. Informs applicant the result of the application for promotion (if unfavorable). The Dean shall advise the applicant about the reasons and shall inform him of future requirements for his promotion. Academic promotion is effective from the date of the decision of the Scientific Council.