



**جامعة السلطان قابوس**  
**Sultan Qaboos University**

# **ACADEMIC PROMOTION REGULATIONS**

Revised Edition 2017

## ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Actual Name
AC	Academic Council
APAC	Academic Promotion Appeals Committee
CAPC	College Academic Promotion Committee
DAPC	Department Academic Promotion Committee
HoD	Head of Department
SQU	Sultan Qaboos University
UAPC	University Academic Promotion Committee
VC	Vice-Chancellor

# CONTENT

<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 PREFACE	1
1.2 DEFINITIONS	1
1.3 PRINCIPLES	1
<b>2 REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMOTION APPLICATION</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 GUIDANCE FOR APPLICANTS	2
2.2 ELIGIBILITY FOR PROMOTION	2
2.3 APPLICATION	2
2.4 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION	2
<b>3 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1 PREFACE	3
3.2 COMPETENCIES	3
3.3 EVIDENCE	3
3.4 DESCRIPTION AND EVALUATION OF AREAS	4
3.4.1 <i>University Teaching and Learning</i>	4
3.4.2 <i>Scholarship</i>	5
3.4.3 <i>Clinical Service</i>	6
3.4.4 <i>University and Community Service</i>	7
3.5 MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION	8
3.5.1 <i>Rubrics for acceptability of evidence for performance within an area</i>	8
3.5.2 <i>Rubrics for evaluation of performance within an area</i>	8
3.5.3 <i>Minimum Criteria for Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor</i>	8
3.5.4 <i>Minimum Criteria for Promotion to the rank of Professor</i>	9
<b>4 ACADEMIC PROMOTION COMMITTEES AND ACADEMIC COUNCIL</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1 DEPARTMENT ACADEMIC PROMOTION COMMITTEE (DAPC)	10
4.1.1 <i>Status and membership</i>	10
4.1.2 <i>The DAPC's responsibilities:</i>	10
4.2 COLLEGE ACADEMIC PROMOTION COMMITTEE (CAPC)	10
4.2.1 <i>Status and membership</i>	10
4.2.2 <i>The CAPC's responsibilities:</i>	11
4.3 UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PROMOTION COMMITTEE (UAPC)	11
4.3.1 <i>Status and membership</i>	11
4.3.2 <i>The UAPC's responsibilities</i>	12
4.4 ACADEMIC PROMOTION APPEALS COMMITTEE (APAC)	12
4.4.1 <i>Status and membership</i>	12
4.4.2 <i>The APAC's responsibilities</i>	12
4.5 ACADEMIC COUNCIL (AC)	12
<b>5 OFFICERS AND DUTIES</b>	<b>13</b>
5.1 HEAD OF DEPARTMENT (HOD)	13
5.2 DEAN	13
5.3 CHAIR OF THE UAPC	13
5.4 CHAIR OF THE APAC	13
5.5 RAPORTEURS OF COMMITTEES	13
5.6 VICE-CHANCELLOR (VC)	13
<b>6 PROCEDURE FOR PROMOTION</b>	<b>14</b>

6.1 PREFACE	14
6.2 SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION	14
6.3 DEPARTMENT ACADEMIC PROMOTION COMMITTEE (DAPC) EVALUATION	15
6.4 COLLEGE ACADEMIC PROMOTION COMMITTEE (CAPC) STAGE ONE EVALUATION	15
6.5 COLLEGE ACADEMIC PROMOTION COMMITTEE (CAPC) STAGE TWO EVALUATION	16
6.5.1 Refereeing	16
6.5.2 Evaluation	16
6.6 UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PROMOTION COMMITTEE (UAPC) EVALUATION	17
6.7 APPEALS	18
6.7.1 Appeals against the DAPCs and the CAPCs	18
6.7.2 Appeals against UAPC	18
6.8 ACADEMIC COUNCIL (AC)	18
6.9 VICE CHANCELLOR (VC)	18
<b>APPENDIX A. APPLICATION LETTER</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>APPENDIX B. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT PORTFOLIO</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>APPENDIX C. CURRICULUM VITAE</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>APPENDIX D. SUMMARY OF COURSE AND TEACHING EVALUATIONS (OVER THE PAST THREE YEARS)</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>APPENDIX E. EVALUATION OF CLINICAL SERVICE</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>APPENDIX F. APPLICATION DOSSIER</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>APPENDIX G. EVALUATION FORM 1</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>APPENDIX H. LETTERS TO REFEREES</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>APPENDIX I. REFEREE EVALUATION</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>APPENDIX J. EVALUATION FORM 2-A</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>APPENDIX K. EVALUATION FORM 2-B</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>APPENDIX L. COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>APPENDIX M. LETTER TO SUCCESSFUL APPLICANT</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>APPENDIX N - 1. LETTER TO UNSUCCESSFUL APPLICANT</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>APPENDIX N-2. LETTER TO UNSUCCESSFUL APPLICANT</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>APPENDIX O-1. LETTER TO UNSUCCESSFUL APPELLANT</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>APPENDIX O-2. LETTER TO UNSUCCESSFUL APPELLANT</b>	<b>52</b>

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Preface

Sultan Qaboos University promotes its faculty to recognize and reward them for their achievements in teaching and learning, scholarship, clinical service, and university and community service. This document details the criteria and procedures for promotion to the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor.

## 1.2 Definitions

- (a) **Promotion Committees:** committees of peers. They are constituted from senior academic staff, experienced in a broad range of academic work.
- (b) **Career as a whole:** overall academic performance and achievements and breadth of the totality of the applicant's work.
- (c) **Diverse academic activities:** various activities within university teaching and learning, scholarship, clinical service, and university and community service.
- (d) **Leadership:** prominent academic roles and responsibilities within the relevant area.
- (e) **Peers** in academic promotion: qualified experienced senior academics who are entrusted with the evaluation of the promotion application.
- (f) **Recognition:** acknowledgment and acceptance of achievements.
- (g) **Senior academic staff:** associate professors and professors.
- (h) **Sustained achievement:** quality achievement that is maintained and extended over a period of time. The level of achievement will be commensurate with the expectations of performance at the academic rank to which promotion is sought.
- (i) **Area:** university teaching and learning, scholarship, clinical service, or university and community service.

## 1.3 Principles

- (a) Sultan Qaboos University considers academic promotion to be important for the fulfilment of its mission and objectives and for its development.
- (b) Subject to the Regulations, any faculty member may apply for academic promotion.
- (c) Academic promotion is designed to recognize and reward sustained quality achievement in academic activities.
- (d) The University aims to ensure equity, transparency and fairness in all aspects of the academic promotion process.
- (e) Promotion decisions/recommendations are based on evaluation by peers of an applicant's career as a whole with emphasis on achievement at SQU.
- (f) Promotion decisions/recommendations are based on evidence of the quality and impact of achievement, professional development, recognition and leadership roles.
- (g) Promotion committees' decisions and recommendations are arrived at by majority vote (more than 50%). In case of a voting deadlock, the Chair will have the casting vote.
- (h) Referee reports, which are part of the formal process, will assist the committees in evaluating the application.
- (i) Confidentiality will be observed throughout the evaluation process.
- (j) Applicants may appeal against committee decisions, but not against appeal rulings.
- (k) Applications may be rejected based on ethical grounds as per the University regulations and by-laws.

## 2 REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMOTION APPLICATION

### 2.1 Guidance for Applicants

Potential applicants can get guidance on achievements of promoted and non-promoted cases from the statistics provided in the annual reports of the UAPC and APAC (e.g. the number of publications and other scholarly works of recommended and not recommended cases).

### 2.2 Eligibility for Promotion

Eligibility for promotion is defined in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Eligibility for promotion

Promotion to Associate Professor	Promotion to Professor
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To be eligible to apply for promotion, the applicant must spend a minimum of four years after the Ph.D. or equivalent in an academic institution, of which at least two years must be at SQU.</li> <li>▪ To effect promotion, the applicant must complete five years after the Ph.D.</li> <li>▪ To apply on the basis of clinical service, the applicant must hold a position of a consultant in a tertiary hospital in Oman.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To be eligible to apply for promotion, the applicant must spend a minimum of nine years after the Ph.D. or equivalent in an academic institution, of which four years must be as an Associate Professor at SQU.</li> <li>▪ To effect promotion, the applicant must complete ten years after the Ph.D.</li> <li>▪ To apply on the basis of clinical service, the applicant must hold a position of a senior consultant in a tertiary hospital in Oman.</li> </ul>

### 2.3 Application

The applicant should follow the procedure prescribed in Chapter 6.

### 2.4 Criteria for Promotion

The minimum criteria for promotion are detailed in Chapter 3.

## 3 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

### 3.1 Preface

Academic promotion at Sultan Qaboos University is based on achievements in university teaching and learning, scholarship, clinical service, and university and community service. The applicant should provide evidence to help evaluate quality of productivity, professional development, recognition, leadership and achievement impact in relevant areas.

### 3.2 Competencies

The evaluation of the specified area assesses evidence submitted to show that competencies of Associate Professor or Professor have been demonstrated.

**Associate Professor Competencies:** *These comprise quality productivity, professional development, and university/national recognition in the relevant area.*

**Professor Competencies:** *These comprise the sustained activities of an Associate Professor together with regional/international recognition, leadership roles and impact in the area.*

### 3.3 Evidence

- (a) The applicant is required to provide evidence to show that all relevant competencies have been demonstrated.
- (b) It is understood that the evidence submitted to demonstrate a competency, which reflects activities and achievements, may for various reasons differ in quality, and therefore assessment by committee members before requesting referee reports will determine the acceptability of evidence to demonstrate the performance in the area as a whole (Acceptable/Unacceptable) and assessment after receiving referee reports will determine the level of performance as a whole (Excellent/Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory).
- (c) The examples of evidence for each competency given below are offered only as guidelines and other evidence may be submitted. It is also recognized that evidence may be used to demonstrate more than one competency in the same area; but the same evidence cannot be used for more than one area.
- (d) Substantial quality evidence for competencies will strengthen the application.
- (e) For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, additional evidence (of Professor competencies) will strengthen the application.
- (f) The applicant should identify and cite clearly in the Academic Achievement Portfolio (Appendix B(4), List of Documented Achievement Evidence for Competencies) all evidence provided for the competencies.
- (g) The applicant should limit the amount of data to upload for evidences e.g.:
  - i. A Maximum of 5 full manuscripts to be uploaded. For the rest of the manuscripts only a copy of the front page which has the required details is uploaded.
  - ii. The full titles and references of the rest of the published manuscripts should be in the Curriculum Vitae – together with the contribution of the Applicant in case of multi-author manuscripts
  - iii. For books, only the title page and a maximum of 10 pages of the book are uploaded. Also it should mention the type of book and for whom is the book meant e.g. student textbook. Also indicate the total number of pages in the book and appropriate referencing.
  - iv. Limit number of Certificates of Appreciation, etc. – maximum of 10 certificates.
  - v. Qarars for committees' membership are not required.
  - vi. If evidence is used more than once in the same area, cross referencing is used rather than re-uploading of the evidence.

### 3.4 Description and Evaluation of Areas

#### 3.4.1 University Teaching and Learning

**Note:** All Applicants for Professor must fill both areas; Associate Professor and Professor Competencies, but evidences do not have to be repeated or re-uploaded. These may just be cross-referenced.

**i. Associate Professor Competencies**

*The applicant should provide evidence of proven achievements to demonstrate quality productivity, professional development and university/national recognition in university teaching and learning.*

Competency	Examples of Evidence
1. Contributes to and delivers quality university teaching and learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Excellent evaluations from learners (See <a href="#">Appendix D</a>)</li> <li>▪ Excellent peer evaluations</li> <li>▪ Teaching and learning awards</li> <li>▪ Graduation project titles and students' names</li> <li>▪ Contribution to laboratory teaching and management of teaching processes, including coordination of courses, timetabling, etc., as certified by the HoD.</li> <li>▪ Academic Advising</li> </ul>
2. Participates actively in developing/reviewing programs and university teaching and learning processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Level of contribution to programs, curricula, courses, showcases developed/reviewed at various university levels</li> <li>▪ Innovative approaches to improve independent/collaborative learning processes</li> <li>▪ Instruments of program evaluation</li> <li>▪ Developed instructional materials such as:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Manuals/guides</li> <li>– Lab workbooks</li> <li>– Audiovisual media</li> <li>– Textbooks</li> <li>– Software</li> <li>– E-learning resources</li> <li>– Intelligent tutoring systems</li> <li>– Protocols</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
3. Demonstrates the quality of developed/reviewed academic programs and other university teaching and learning processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Technical and audit reports</li> <li>▪ Awards for university teaching and learning</li> <li>▪ Impact factors of journals</li> <li>▪ Citations</li> </ul>
4. Subscribes to university teaching and learning professional societies and attends professional meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Membership of university teaching and learning professional societies</li> <li>▪ Oral and poster presentations within university teaching and learning at scientific/professional events.</li> </ul>
5. Gains university/national recognition in the university teaching and learning in the field of specialization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Invitations to review papers/theses/reports in university teaching and learning</li> <li>▪ Membership of university teaching and learning committees</li> <li>▪ University/national awards</li> </ul>

**ii. Professor Competencies:** *The applicant should provide evidence to demonstrate*

**a)** *the sustained competencies of an Associate Professor and*

**b)** *regional/international recognition, leadership roles and impact in university teaching and learning.*

Competency	Examples of Evidence
1. Sustains focused university teaching and learning activities and achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sustained focused university teaching and learning activities and achievements as listed in the Personal Statement (Appendix B)</li> </ul>
2. Leads scholarly work in university teaching and learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Research published on university teaching and learning</li> <li>▪ Position papers delivered on university teaching and learning</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Books, chapters in books, and technical reports on university teaching and learning</li> <li>▪ Names of postgraduates supervised</li> <li>▪ Training programs coached and mentored</li> <li>▪ Leading roles in the organization of conferences, workshops and symposia.</li> </ul>
3. Demonstrates leadership, has an active role and impact in developing university teaching and learning in the field of specialization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Officer in professional societies</li> <li>▪ Invitations as expert (consultant, external examiner, assessor, referee, reviewer, auditor)</li> <li>▪ Keynote speaker</li> <li>▪ Leader in review panels and specialized committees</li> <li>▪ Chair national/regional university teaching and learning professional committees</li> <li>▪ Participated in shaping university teaching and learning policies that have been implemented in the field of specialization.</li> <li>▪ Participated in developing innovative educational principles that have been adopted by specialized bodies</li> </ul>
4. Gains regional/international recognition in university teaching and learning in the field of specialization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Member of editorial boards</li> <li>▪ Membership of university teaching and learning committees</li> <li>▪ Awards received</li> </ul>

### 3.4.2 Scholarship

**Note:** All Applicants for Professor must fill both areas; Associate Professor and Professor Competencies, but evidences do not have to be repeated or re-uploaded. These may just be cross-referenced.

*i. Associate Professor Competencies: The applicant should provide evidence of proven achievements to demonstrate quality productivity, professional development and university/national recognition in scholarship.*

Competency	Examples of Evidence
1. Produces peer reviewed scholarly work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Single author published research and co-authored papers with specified level of contribution.</li> <li>▪ Books/book chapters</li> <li>▪ Refereed published conference proceedings</li> <li>▪ Invitations to speak at professional meetings</li> <li>▪ Patents</li> <li>▪ Architectural designs and technical drawings</li> <li>▪ Visual, theatrical art and music production</li> <li>▪ Internal research grants awards</li> </ul>
2. Demonstrates quality scholarly achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citations, impact factor, h-index</li> <li>▪ Ranking of journals/conferences</li> <li>▪ Include a Reference to your Scopus Profile and Google Scholar Profile and if available any of the scholastic Profile of Arabic Literature (e.g. Edusearch, AraBase, ARADO, HumanIndex, EcoLink &amp; ResearchGate.)</li> <li>▪ Awards for scholarly achievements</li> <li>▪ Statement certifying successful completion of research/consultancy work</li> </ul>
3. Subscribes to professional societies and attends professional meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Member of professional societies</li> <li>▪ Oral and poster presentations at scientific/professional events</li> </ul>
4. Gains university/national recognition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invitations to review papers/theses/reports</li> <li>• Chair of specialized panel discussions</li> <li>• Membership of scholarship committees</li> <li>• Awards received</li> </ul>

- ii. **Professor Competencies:** *The applicant should provide evidence to demonstrate*
- a) *the sustained competencies of an Associate Professor and*
  - b) *regional/international recognition, leadership roles and impact in scholarship.*

Competency	Examples of Evidence
1. Sustains focused scholarly work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sustained focused scholarly activities and achievements as listed in the Personal Statement (Appendix B)</li> </ul>
2. Leads scholarly work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Papers as single, first or corresponding author in peer-reviewed specialized journals</li> <li>▪ Principal investigator (PI) or Co-PI of collaborative/strategic/external research consultancy projects</li> <li>▪ Leader of a research team</li> <li>▪ Supervision of master/doctoral students with names of students and project titles</li> <li>▪ Junior staff mentored with names</li> </ul>
3. Demonstrates leadership, has an active role and impact in developing scholarly work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officer in university professional societies</li> <li>• Invitations as expert (consultant, external examiner, assessor, referee, reviewer)</li> <li>• Keynote speaker</li> <li>• Leader on review panels and in specialized committees.</li> <li>• Chair national/regional committees on scholarly work</li> <li>• Participated in shaping policies on scholarly work that have been implemented</li> <li>• Participated in developing innovative principles on scholarly work that have been adopted by specialized bodies</li> </ul>
4. Gains regional/international recognition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Membership of editorial boards</li> <li>• Membership of scholarship committees</li> <li>• Awards received</li> </ul>

### 3.4.3 Clinical Service

*(Doctors applying for promotion and are not heavily involved in Clinical Service may opt out of Clinical Service and need not provide any evidences for this area.)*

**Note:** All Applicants for Professor must fill both areas; Associate Professor and Professor Competencies, but evidences do not have to be repeated or re-uploaded. These may just be cross-referenced.

**i. Associate Professor Competencies:** *The applicant should provide evidence of proven achievements to demonstrate quality productivity, professional development and university/national recognition in clinical service.*

Competency	Examples of Evidence
1. Contributes to and delivers quality clinical service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Excellent clinical activity record (Appendix E, E-1 or E-2, E-3A &amp; E-3B)</li> <li>▪ Excellent evaluations as clinician from clinicians and students.</li> <li>▪ Awards for clinical work</li> </ul>
2. Participates actively and successfully in developing/reviewing clinical programs and service processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ List of protocols, technical reports, clinical care models, practice guidelines, explaining the level of contribution</li> <li>▪ Instruments of evaluation for programs/protocols</li> <li>▪ Innovative approaches to improve independent/collaborative clinical processes</li> </ul>

3. Demonstrates quality in developing/reviewing clinical programs and service processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Technical reports, case audits and intervention processes</li> <li>▪ Awards received</li> <li>▪ Impact factors of journals</li> <li>▪ Citations</li> </ul>
4. Subscribes to professional societies and attends professional meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Membership of professional societies</li> <li>▪ Oral and/or poster presentations at scientific/professional events</li> </ul>
5. Gains university/national recognition in the profession	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Membership of clinical service committees</li> <li>▪ Awards received</li> <li>▪ Review of papers/theses/reports</li> </ul>
6. Contributes to clinical training programs/skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Clinical training programs</li> <li>▪ Names and designation of those mentored and type of mentoring given</li> </ul>

ii. **Professor Competencies:** The applicant should provide evidence to demonstrate

a) the sustained competencies of an Associate Professor and

b) regional/international recognition, leadership roles and impact in clinical service.

Competency	Examples of Evidence
1. Sustains focused clinical service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sustained focused clinical service and achievements as listed in the Personal Statement (Appendix B)</li> </ul>
2. Leads scholarly work in clinical service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Papers as single, first or corresponding author in peer-reviewed specialized journals</li> <li>• Principal investigator (PI) or Co-PI of collaborative/strategic/external research and consultancy projects</li> <li>• Leader of a research team</li> <li>• Supervision of master/doctoral students with names of students and project titles</li> <li>• Junior staff mentored with names</li> </ul>
3. Demonstrates leadership, has an active role and impact in developing clinical service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Officer position in professional societies</li> <li>▪ Invitations as expert (consultant, external examiner, assessor, referee, reviewer)</li> <li>▪ Keynote speaker</li> <li>▪ Leadership on review panels or in specialized committees</li> <li>▪ Chair national and/or regional professional committees</li> <li>▪ Chair of plenary sessions at conferences</li> <li>▪ Participated in shaping policies on clinical service that have been implemented</li> <li>▪ Participated in developing innovative principles on clinical service that have been adopted by specialized bodies</li> </ul>
4. Gain regional/international recognition in the profession	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Membership of editorial boards</li> <li>▪ Membership of clinical service committees</li> <li>▪ Awards received</li> </ul>

#### 3.4.4 University and Community Service

a) The Applicant should provide evidences to demonstrate acceptable performance, quality productivity and professional development in University and Community Service as required in Competencies 1 & 2 in the table below – To achieve “Satisfactory”.

b) The Applicant should provide evidences to demonstrate sustained high performance, quality productivity and professional development in University / National Recognition & impact in Community Service as required in Competencies 3 & 4 in the table below - To achieve “Excellent”.

Competency	Example of Evidence
1. Participates actively in university and community service activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Departmental/college/university committees</li> <li>▪ Outreach committees</li> <li>▪ Organization of workshops, conferences, etc.</li> </ul>
2. Participates actively in areas other than those directly related to research, university teaching and learning and clinical activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Certificate/letter</li> </ul>
3. Serves in an administrative position and/or chairs committee, if any.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Administrative positions certified by the applicant's superior</li> <li>▪ Chair of university and/or outreach committees certified by the applicant's superior</li> <li>▪ Initiatives/contributions within university/outreach committees</li> <li>▪ Supervision of fieldwork or extension services</li> </ul>
4. Popularizes, disseminates, simplifies knowledge, as applicable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Publication of scholarly contributions in related service</li> <li>▪ Public lectures</li> <li>▪ Short courses</li> <li>▪ Media talks and interviews</li> <li>▪ Non-peer-refereed publications</li> <li>▪ Newspaper articles</li> </ul>

### 3.5 Minimum Criteria for Promotion

#### 3.5.1 Rubrics for acceptability of evidence for performance within an area

The committees should evaluate the acceptability of the **performance** within an **area** using the following rubrics:

- (a) **Acceptable:** The evidence submitted satisfies the minimum performance within an area.
- (b) **Unacceptable:** The evidence submitted does not satisfy the minimum performance within an area.

#### 3.5.2 Rubrics for evaluation of performance within an area

The committees will evaluate performance within an area using the following rubrics:

- (a) **Excellent:** Peer evaluation of evidence concludes sustained high performance within an area
- (b) **Satisfactory** Peer evaluation of evidence concludes acceptable performance within an area
- (c) **Unsatisfactory** Peer evaluation of evidence concludes unacceptable performance within an area

#### 3.5.3 Minimum Criteria for Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will be recommended if the applicant satisfies one of the following two options:

**Option 1:**

- **Excellent** in the Associate Professor competencies in Scholarship, AND
- **Satisfactory** in the other two areas (University Teaching and Learning, and University and Community Service).

**Option 2:**

- **Excellent** in the Associate Professor competencies in University Teaching and Learning, and University and Community Service, AND
- **Satisfactory** in Scholarship

OR, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will be recommended if an applicant working in clinical service area satisfies one of the following two options:

**Option 1:**

- **Excellent** in the Associate Professor competencies in Scholarship, AND
- **Satisfactory** in the other two areas (Clinical Service and University Teaching and Learning).

**Option 2:**

- **Excellent** in the Associate Professor competencies in Clinical Service and University Teaching and Learning, AND
- **Satisfactory** in Scholarship.

### 3.5.4 Minimum Criteria for Promotion to the rank of Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor will be recommended if the applicant satisfies the following criteria:

**Option 1:**

- **Excellent** in the Professor competencies in Scholarship, AND
- **Satisfactory** in the other two areas (University Teaching and Learning, and University and Community Service)

And for those applicants who opt to be evaluated in their Clinical Service, they have a choice of the following criteria:

**Option 2:**

- **Excellent** in the Professor competencies in Scholarship, AND.
- **Satisfactory** in the other two areas (Clinical Service and University Teaching and Learning).

## 4 ACADEMIC PROMOTION COMMITTEES AND ACADEMIC COUNCIL

### 4.1 Department Academic Promotion Committee (DAPC)

#### 4.1.1 Status and membership

- (a) The DAPC is a standing committee appointed by the Department Board for the duration of one year at the beginning of each year.
- (b) The DAPC consists of the HoD as Chair and four senior faculty members appointed by the Department Board, including one appointed rapporteur. The board will appoint members from outside the department if the required number is not available. In the case of the College of Medicine and Health Sciences, at least three members are senior faculty and the fourth can be a senior consultant.
- (c) Applicants cannot be a member of, and cannot Chair DAPC.
- (d) There should be no conflict of interest, such as a member being a close relative (within 4 degrees) or graduate supervisor.
- (e) The Chair will request members to declare that they have "No Conflict of Interest" at the beginning of discussion of every case. Members should not attend cases in which they may have conflict of interest. If the chair of the DAPC declares a conflict of interest, the remaining members shall elect a temporary Chair.
- (f) All members contribute to the discussion of all cases but only Professors and the Chair can vote on the applications for promotion to the rank of Professor.
- (g) The meetings of the DAPC are quorate if at least 4 members are present. If the Chair is absent, the committee shall elect a temporary Chair for the meeting.
- (h) Voting is by secret ballot and voting by abstention or proxy is not permitted.
- (i) Members should observe strict confidentiality concerning the proceedings of the committee.
- (j) Faculty Members who are from Independent Units, and are Academic Staff but do not belong to a department, must submit their applications to the Dean of the relevant College, who will form a Special Committee that will act as DAPC, for evaluation of their applications. The Dean may chair this Committee or appoint a delegate to chair it.

#### 4.1.2 The DAPC's responsibilities:

- (a) Follows the procedures stated in these regulations.
- (b) Ensures eligibility of the application and absence of overlapping evidences between different areas.
- (c) Submits a report on each recommended case.
- (d) Forwards the dossiers of recommended cases to the CAPC.
- (e) Submits an annual report to the CAPC.
- (f) Keeps minutes and documents of its meetings for two years.
- (g) Reports the outcome of applications to the Department Board without submitting minutes.

### 4.2 College Academic Promotion Committee (CAPC)

#### 4.2.1 Status and membership

- (a) The CAPC is a standing committee appointed by the College Board for the duration of one year at the beginning of each academic year.
- (b) A maximum of 2 members from any one DAPC can be members of CAPC. A member of the CAPC cannot be a member of the UAPC or APAC in the same year.

- (c) The CAPC consists of the Dean as Chair and six senior faculty members, with one appointed rapporteur. At least four members of the committee are Professors. The College Board shall appoint additional Professors from other colleges if the required number is not available.
- (d) Applicants cannot be a member of, and cannot Chair CAPC.
- (e) There should be no conflict of interest, such as a member being a close relative (within 4 degrees) or graduate supervisor.
- (f) The Chair shall request members to declare that they have "No Conflict of Interest" at the beginning of discussion of every case. Members should not attend cases in which they may have conflict of interest. If the Chair of the CAPC declares a conflict of interest, the remaining members shall elect a temporary Chair.
- (g) All members contribute to the discussion of all cases, but only Professors and the Chair can vote on the applications for promotion to the rank of Professor.
- (h) The meetings of the CAPC are quorate if at least six members are present. If the Chair is absent, the committee shall elect a temporary Chair for the meeting.
- (i) Voting is by secret ballot and voting by abstention or proxy is not permitted.
- (j) Members should observe strict confidentiality concerning the proceedings of the committee.

#### **4.2.2 The CAPC's responsibilities:**

- (a) Follows the procedures stated in this regulations.
- (b) Submits a report on each recommended case.
- (c) Decides on all appeals against the DAPC.
- (d) Forwards the dossiers of recommended cases to the UAPC.
- (e) Submits an annual report to the UAPC.
- (f) Keeps minutes and documents of its meetings for two years.
- (g) Reports the outcome of applications to the College Board without submitting minutes.

### **4.3 University Academic Promotion Committee (UAPC)**

#### **4.3.1 Status and membership**

- (a) The UAPC is a standing committee of the Academic Council and has the discretionary power to issue decisions/recommendations on all applications and appeals submitted to it.
- (b) The UAPC membership consists of one senior academic member from each college as appointed by the Vice Chancellor from the list of nominees approved by the College Boards, and endorsed by the Academic Council.
- (c) The Vice Chancellor will also appoint the Chairman in addition to the members who are representing Colleges.
- (d) The majority of the members should be Professors.
- (e) Committee members serve two-year terms with possible renewal and membership is staggered to allow for continuity. A member of the UAPC cannot be a member of the CAPC or the APAC in the same academic year.
- (f) Applicants cannot be a member of, and cannot Chair UAPC.
- (g) There should be no conflict of interest, such as a member being a close relative (within 4 degrees) or graduate supervisor.
- (h) The chair shall request members to declare that they have "No Conflict of Interest" at the beginning of discussion of every case. Members should not attend cases in which they may have conflict of interest. If the Chair of the UAPC declares a conflict of interest, the remaining members shall elect a temporary Chair.
- (i) All members contribute to the discussion and vote on all cases.

- (j) The meetings of the UAPC are quorate if at least eighty percent (80%) of the members (including chairman) are present. If the Chair is absent, the committee shall elect a temporary Chair for the meeting.
- (k) Voting is by secret ballot and voting by abstention or proxy is not permitted.
- (l) Members should observe strict confidentiality concerning the proceedings of the committee.

#### **4.3.2 The UAPC's responsibilities**

- (a) Organizes two workshops on the Academic Promotion system every year; one in May for faculty members and another in September for members of DAPCs and CAPCs.
- (b) Follows the procedures stated in these regulations.
- (c) Decides on all appeals against decisions of the CAPC submitted to it.
- (d) Submits an annual report to the Academic Council, with the names of applicants recommended for promotion.
- (e) Keeps minutes and documents of its meetings for two years.

### **4.4 Academic Promotion Appeals Committee (APAC)**

#### **4.4.1 Status and membership**

- (a) The APAC is a standing committee of the Academic Council and has the discretionary power to make decisions and recommendations on all appeals submitted to it.
- (b) The APAC is composed of one senior academic member from each college as appointed by the Vice Chancellor from the list of nominees approved by the College Boards, and endorsed by the Academic Council, preferably with experience working on promotion committees at SQU.
- (c) The Vice Chancellor will also appoint the Chairman in addition to the members who are representing Colleges.
- (d) Committee members will serve two-year terms with possible renewal and membership is staggered to allow for continuity. A member of this committee cannot be a member of the CAPC or the UAPC in the same academic year.
- (e) Applicants cannot be a member of, and cannot Chair APAC.
- (f) There should be no conflict of interest such as a member being a close relative (within 4 degrees) or graduate supervisor.
- (g) The Chair shall request members to declare that they have "No Conflict of Interest" at the beginning of discussion of every case. Members should not attend cases in which they may have a conflict of interest. If the Chair of the APAC declares a conflict of interest, the remaining members shall elect a temporary Chair.
- (h) All members contribute to the discussion and vote on all cases.
- (i) The meetings of the APAC are quorate if at least eighty percent (80%) of the members (including chairman) are present. If the Chair is absent, the committee shall elect a temporary Chair for the meeting.
- (j) Voting is by secret ballot and voting by abstention or proxy is not permitted.
- (k) Members should observe strict confidentiality concerning the proceedings of the committee.

#### **4.4.2 The APAC's responsibilities**

- (a) Follows procedures stated in these regulations.
- (b) Submits an annual report to the Academic Council with the names of appellants recommended for promotion.
- (c) Keeps minutes and documents of its meetings.

### **4.5 Academic Council (AC)**

- (a) Endorses the nominations of college boards for membership of the UAPC and APAC and forwards them to the Vice Chancellor.
- (b) Discusses the reports of the UAPC and the APAC and submits the recommended cases to the VC.



## 5 OFFICERS AND DUTIES

### 5.1 Head of Department (HoD)

- (a) Convenes, chairs and manages the meetings of the DAPC
- (b) Forwards the dossiers of recommended cases to the CAPC.
- (c) Notifies, in writing, applicants not recommended for promotion stating the reasons.
- (d) Forwards the DAPC's annual report to the CAPC.
- (e) Reports the outcome of applications to the Department Board without submitting minutes.
- (f) Keeps the committee minutes and documents for two years in the HoD's office.

### 5.2 Dean

- (a) Convenes, chairs and manages the meetings of the CAPC.
- (b) Ensures that the CAPC has identified 9 referees for each applicant supported after Stage One Evaluation.
- (c) Obtains three valid referee reports for each applicant supported after Stage One Evaluation.
- (d) Forwards the dossiers of recommended applicants to the UAPC.
- (e) Notifies, in writing through the HoD, applicants not recommended for promotion after Stage One Evaluation and after Stage Two Evaluation, stating the reasons.
- (f) Forwards the CAPC's annual report to the UAPC.
- (g) Reports the outcome of applications to the College Board without submitting minutes.
- (h) Keeps the committee minutes and documents for two years in the Dean's office.

### 5.3 Chair of the UAPC

- (a) Convenes, chairs and manages the meetings of the UAPC.
- (b) Obtains three valid referee reports for each appellant against CAPCs, if needed.
- (c) Submits the UAPC's annual report to the Academic Council with the names of applicants recommended for promotion.
- (d) Notifies, in writing through the Deans, applicants/appellants not recommended for promotion stating the reasons.
- (e) Keeps the committee minutes and documents for two years in the committee's office.

### 5.4 Chair of the APAC

- (f) Convenes, chairs and manages the meetings of the APAC.
- (g) Submits the APAC's annual report to the Academic Council with the names of appellants recommended for promotion.
- (h) Informs, in writing through the college Deans, those appellants whose appeals have been rejected.
- (i) Keeps the committee minutes and documents for two years in the committee's office.

### 5.5 Rapporteurs of Committees

- (j) Write minutes of the committee.
- (k) Upload the committees' reports to the academic promotion system.

### 5.6 Vice-Chancellor (VC)

- (l) Appoints the UAPC and APAC.
- (m) Endorses recommendations of the Academic Council on academic promotions.
- (n) Issues qarars on promoted cases.
- (o) Sends letters to promoted applicants (Appendix M).

## 6 PROCEDURE FOR PROMOTION

### 6.1 Preface

- (a) An application follows three phases:
- DAPC evaluation
  - CAPC evaluation (Stage One Evaluation and Stage Two Evaluation)
  - UAPC evaluation
- (b) There is provision for appeal against the decisions of committees as per the regulations. Appellants against UAPC decisions may submit new applications while their appeals are being considered. In case of a successful appeal, the new application will be withdrawn.

### 6.2 Submission of Application

Table 6.1 shows the deadlines for the various steps in the promotion process.

Table 6.1: Academic Promotion Deadlines

Responsible	Action	Deadline Dates*
<b>Applicant</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits application to the HoD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sept. (1-15)</li> </ul>
<b>DAPC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits dossiers of recommended cases + the DAPC's annual report to the CAPC</li> <li>• Informs applicants not recommended</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sept. 30</li> <li>• Oct. 7</li> </ul>
<b>CAPC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Receives appeals against the DAPC</li> <li>• Informs applicants/appellants not recommended after CAPC - Stage One Evaluation</li> <li>• Submits dossiers of recommended applicants/appellants + the CAPC's annual report to the UAPC</li> <li>• Informs applicants/appellants not recommended after the CAPC Stage Two Evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nov. 7</li> <li>• Nov. 30</li> <li>• Feb. 28</li> <li>• Feb. 28</li> </ul>
<b>UAPC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Receives appeals against decisions after CAPC Stage One Evaluation</li> <li>• Receives appeals against decisions after CAPC Stage Two Evaluation</li> <li>• Submits recommended applicants/appellants + the UAPC's annual report to the Academic Council</li> <li>• Informs non-recommended applicants/appellants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dec. 30</li> <li>• March 30</li> <li>• May 15</li> <li>• May 22</li> </ul>
<b>APAC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Receives appeals against the UAPC</li> <li>• Submits recommended appellants + the APAC's annual report to the AC</li> <li>• Informs non-recommended appellants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• June 22</li> <li>• Oct. 15</li> <li>• Oct. 22</li> </ul>
<b>AC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Takes action on the report and recommendations of the UAPC.</li> <li>• Takes action on the report and recommendations of the APAC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May 15</li> <li>• Oct. 15</li> </ul>
<b>VC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues qarars on promoted cases</li> <li>• Issues qarars on promoted cases after appeals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• June 1</li> <li>• Nov. 1</li> </ul>

\*If the deadline date falls on a weekend or official holiday, then the deadline will be on the following working day to the end of the day. If the meeting of the AC is postponed, non-recommended applicants/appellants will be notified one week after the meeting.

- (a) Applications are submitted on-line to the HoD.
- (b) Heads of departments who are applicants for promotion submit their applications to the Dean, who will assume the role and responsibilities of the Chair of the DAPC.
- (c) Deans who are applicants for promotion should submit their applications to the relevant Heads of the Department, who will forward the application to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Community Service (DVCAACS), if recommended. The DVCAACS will assume the role and responsibilities of the Chair of the CAPC in all matters related to the Dean's application. But, the Chair for CAPC in deliberations of other applicants, (when the Dean is an applicant), will be appointed by the DVCAACS.
- (d) Faculty members who have been seconded to administrative positions outside their departments/colleges should submit their applications to the head of their department.

- (e) The application consists of the Application Letter (Appendix A) and the Academic Achievement Portfolio (Appendix B). The Academic Achievement Portfolio consists of
- Applicant's Statement (Appendix B)
  - Curriculum Vitae (Appendix C)
  - Summary of Course and Teaching Evaluation (Appendix D)
  - Evaluation of Clinical Service for medical doctors, if applicable (Appendix E, E-1 or E-2, E-3A & E-3B.)
  - List of Documented Evidence for Competencies (Appendix B)
  - Attachments and enclosures, which consist of reprints of journal publications, books or chapters of books, conference presentations, technical reports, letters, certificates, and other documents on university teaching and learning, scholarship, clinical service or university and community service
- (f) The Application Dossier (Appendix F) includes the following components as per the stage:
- Application Letter (Appendix A)
  - Academic Achievement Portfolio (Appendix B)
  - Department Evaluation (Appendix G) and DAPC's report with recommendations
  - List of names and addresses of referees (9 or more)
  - The Referee Evaluation Forms (Appendix I)
  - College Evaluation (Appendix J) and CAPC's report with recommendations
  - UAPC Evaluation (Appendix K).
- (g) An applicant must sign the Declaration in the Application Letter (Appendix A) that the contents of the application are true.
- (h) It is the responsibility of the applicant to prepare his/her CV and the rest of Academic Achievement Portfolio in the format as prescribed above and detailed in Appendices B, C, D and E.
- (i) It is the responsibility of the DAPC to confirm that applicant documents are in the right format.
- (j) Applications that are not in the right format shall not be processed by DAPC and the application shall be rejected.

### **6.3 Department Academic Promotion Committee (DAPC) Evaluation**

- (a) The DAPC will consider all submitted applications.
- (b) Before the meeting, members of the DAPC may use the Evaluation Form 1 (Appendix G) for initial assessment of each application.
- (c) The DAPC will attest the eligibility of applicants; check the completeness of the documents and ascertain that there are no procedural irregularities.
- (d) If the applicant is not eligible, or if there are procedural irregularities, the case will be rejected.
- (e) The committee will check whether the applicant has provided evidence to demonstrate each competency and vote whether the performance of the applicant within the area is Acceptable or Unacceptable using the Evaluation Form 1 (Appendix G).
- If more than 50% (majority) of the vote produces a decision of Unacceptable for any relevant area, the applicant will not be recommended. The Chair will then summarize the justification for the outcome. The Chair will inform the applicant why the DAPC could not recommend the case for further consideration (Appendix N-1).
  - If more than 50% (majority) of the vote produces a decision of Acceptable for all relevant areas, then the applicant will be recommended to the CAPC for consideration. The committee will submit a report and recommendation after summarizing the outcome.
  - In case of 50% vote, the Chair will have a casting vote.
- (f) Prepare the annual report (Appendix L) and submit it to the CAPC.
- (g) A record of the proceedings with attachments should be kept for two years.
- (h) Department Board should be informed in general of the outcome of promotion applications, without submitting names or minutes.

### **6.4 College Academic Promotion Committee (CAPC) Stage One Evaluation**

- (a) The CAPC will consider all submitted applications by the DAPC and appeals against the DAPC.

- (b) Before the meeting, members of the CAPC will use the Evaluation Form 1 (Appendix G) for initial assessment of each application.
- (c) The CAPC will attest the eligibility of applicants, check the completeness of the documents and ascertain that there are no procedural irregularities.
- (d) If the applicant is not eligible, or if there are procedural irregularities, the case will be rejected.
- (e) For medical doctors applying on the basis of clinical service:
  - The committee will solicit 3 evaluation reports from the 6 suggested peers who fulfill the requirements as stated in Appendix E.
- (f) The committee will check whether the applicant has provided evidence to demonstrate each competency and vote whether the performance of the Applicant within the area is Acceptable or Unacceptable using the Evaluation Form 1 (Appendix G).
  - If more than 50% (majority) of the vote produces a decision of Unacceptable for any relevant area, the applicant will not be recommended. The Chair will then summarize the justification for the outcome. The Chair will inform the applicant why the CAPC could not recommend the case for further consideration (Appendix N-2).
  - If more than 50% (majority) of the vote produces a decision of Acceptable for all relevant areas, then the case will move to Stage Two Evaluation.
  - In case of 50% vote, the Chair will have a casting vote.

## **6.5 College Academic Promotion Committee (CAPC) Stage Two Evaluation**

### **6.5.1 Refereeing**

- (a) The CAPC will prepare the names and addresses of at least 9 referees for each applicant voted Acceptable. Referees will be selected from a variety of reputable higher education institutions across the world. The referees must be at the same or higher rank than the rank being applied for.
- (b) Referees should have no current or previous relationship with the applicant which might suggest a conflict of interest, e.g., close relative (within 4 degrees), supervisor, collaborator or competitor.
- (c) The Referee Letter (Appendix H) will be used for correspondence with referees, taking into consideration the need for referees to be selected from different countries.
- (d) The Chair of the CAPC should allow referees on-line access to the applicant's Academic Achievement Portfolio and Referee Evaluation Form (Appendix I).
- (e) Referees should use the Referee Evaluation Form (Appendix I) for reporting. A clear and substantiated referee evaluation will assist committee members in evaluating the application.
- (f) Three referee reports will be sought for each applicant voted Acceptable.

### **6.5.2 Evaluation**

- (a) Referee reports, which are part of the formal process, will assist the committees in reaching their evaluation of the promotion cases.
- (b) If an applicant resigns before contacting the referees, the application will be stopped. Also, once external referees are contacted, the applicant is not allowed to correct or add any material to the application.
- (c) Applicants may correct their Dossier, but not add new material to their Dossier, prior to submission to the Referees. This has to be done through the Chair of the CAPC. Direct access to his/her Electronic application must not be given to the Applicant.
- (d) After receiving 3 referee reports, the CAPC will meet to evaluate the application (Appendix J).
- (e) The committee discusses the performance within the areas and votes on the performance as follows:
  - If more than 50% (majority) of the vote produces a decision of Excellent, then the performance within the area is Excellent
  - If more than 50% (majority) of the vote produces a combination of Excellent and Satisfactory, then the performance within the area is Satisfactory

- If more than 50% (majority) of the vote produces a decision of Satisfactory, then the performance within the area is Satisfactory.
  - If more than 50% (majority) of the vote produces a decision of Unsatisfactory, then the performance within the area is Unsatisfactory
  - In case of 50% vote, the Chair will have a casting vote.
- (f) The committee will use the minimum criteria for promotion (sections 3.5.3/3.5.4) to decide whether the applicant is promotable.
- (g) The Chair will inform the applicants not recommended for promotion through the HoD, providing a detailed justification for why the CAPC could not recommend the case (Appendix N-2).
- (h) The Chair will inform the appellants not recommended for promotion through the HoD, providing a detailed justification as to why the CAPC rejected the appeal case (Appendix O-1).
- (i) The committee will submit a report on each recommended applicant with a recommendation to the UAPC.
- (j) The Chair will forward the dossiers of recommended applicants to the UAPC.
- (k) An annual report (Appendix L) will be submitted to the UAPC. The report will also summarize the DAPCs' annual reports.
- (l) All documents related to promotion should be returned by committee members to the Chair for shredding and the Chair will instruct members to delete the electronic version of the documents.
- (m) The Dean should report to the College Board in general terms without submitting names or minutes.
- (n) A record of the proceedings with attachments should be kept for two years.

## 6.6 University Academic Promotion Committee (UAPC) Evaluation

- (a) The UAPC will consider all applications submitted by the CAPC and appeals against the CAPC.
- (b) The committee evaluates the appeals against college committees after stage 1 as per section 6.4.
- (c) Prima Facie Appellants may not correct or add documents once the Dossier reaches the UAPC.
- (d) UAPC should judge an appellant based on the same dossier as was used by the CAPC – the only addition should be the Letter of Appeal.
- (e) For prima facie Appellant: If UAPC decides to proceed to Referees, the appellant may correct his/her dossier but not add new material, to the Dossier. The corrections can be done only through the UAPC Chair before it is sent out to external referees.
- (f) The UAPC will discuss the performance within the areas one at a time for those recommended for promotion and vote whether Agree or Disagree with the CAPC's evaluation using Evaluation Form 2-B (Appendix K) as follows:
- If more than 50% (majority) of the vote produces decision to Agree, then the CAPC's vote on the performance within the area will remain.
  - If more than 50% (majority) of the vote produces a decision to Disagree, the performance within the area will be re-evaluated by the UAPC. The committee will then vote Excellent, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory on the performance within the area as specified in 6.5.2 (d) above. The committee will use the minimum criteria for promotion (sections 3.5.3/3.5.4) to decide whether the candidate is to be recommended for promotion.
  - In case of 50% vote, the Chair will have casting vote.
- (g) The Chair will inform the relevant Dean if an applicant is not recommended for promotion, providing a detailed justification for why the UAPC could not recommend the case (Appendix N-2).
- (h) The Chair will inform the relevant Dean if an appellant is not recommended for promotion, providing a detailed justification as to why the UAPC rejected the appeal case (Appendix O-2).
- (i) An annual report (Appendix L) will be prepared and submitted to the Academic Council with a list of candidates recommended for promotion.
- (j) All documents related to promotion should be returned by committee members to the Chair for shredding and the Chair will instruct members to delete the electronic version of the documents from their computers.
- (k) A record of proceedings with attachments should be kept for two years in the UAPC office.

## 6.7 Appeals

### 6.7.1 Appeals against the DAPCs and the CAPCs

- (a) Appeals against DAPC to the CAPC, which will repeat the procedure applied by the DAPC in its consideration of the case (6.3). Such an applicant cannot appeal against the ruling of the CAPC.
- (b) An application rejected by the CAPC can be the subject of an appeal at the UAPC, which will repeat the procedure applied by the CAPC in its consideration of the case (6.4 or 6.5), which may require the UAPC to select the referees.

### 6.7.2 Appeals against UAPC

- (a) An applicant who is referred to UAPC by CAPC and is rejected by UAPC, may appeal against UAPC. However, an appellant who has reached the UAPC by appealing against CAPC and is rejected by UAPC, cannot appeal against the ruling of the UAPC, as this constitutes appeal against an appeal. The APAC will consider all appeals against the UAPC.
- (b) The appeal should be based on the reasons stated for the decision of the UAPC and applicants will not be permitted to submit additional documents.
- (c) The committee will consider the reasons for the appeal and review the appellant's dossier.
- (d) The APAC has the right to request the minutes and relevant documents from the UAPC.
- (e) The APAC will discuss the area performances one at a time and vote whether Agree or Disagree with the UAPC's evaluation using Evaluation Form 2-B (Appendix K) as follows:
  - If more than 50% (majority) of the vote produces a decision to Agree, then the UAPC's vote on the performance within the area will be confirmed.
  - If more than 50% (majority) of the vote produces a decision to Disagree, the performance within the area will be evaluated by the APAC. The committee will then vote Excellent, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory on the performance within the area as specified in 6.5.2 (d) above. The committee will then use the minimum criteria for promotion (sections 3.5.3/3.5.4) to decide whether the candidate is to be recommended for promotion.
  - In case of 50% vote, the Chair will have a casting vote.
- (f) The Chair will inform all appellants whose appeals have been rejected (Appendix O-2).
- (g) The committee will submit an annual report with the names of recommended appellants to the Academic Council (Appendix L).
- (h) The appeal documents should be returned by committee members to the Chair for shredding and the Chair will instruct the members to delete the electronic version of the documents.
- (i) A record of proceedings and the minutes of the meetings with documents should be kept in the committee's office.

## 6.8 Academic Council (AC)

- (a) Discusses the annual reports of the UAPC and APAC and takes the necessary action.
- (b) Forwards to the VC the names of applicants/appellants to be promoted.

## 6.9 Vice Chancellor (VC)

- (a) Endorses the recommendations of the AC
- (b) Issues Qarars on promoted candidates and sends letters to them (Appendix M).

# Appendices

## Appendix A. Application Letter

Dear Dr/Prof .....

Head, Department of .....

Please find attached my Academic Achievement Portfolio for consideration for promotion from the rank of .....(current academic rank) to the rank of .....(next academic rank). I was appointed at SQU on .....and was last promoted (if relevant) on.....:

I would like to declare that the contents of my application are true and accurate.

Signature of Applicant:

Date:

Name of Applicant:

SQU ID#:

College:

Department:

Email:



## Appendix B. Academic Achievement Portfolio

### Content of the Academic Achievement Portfolio

1. Applicant's Statement
2. Curriculum Vitae
3. Attached evidence
4. List of documented achievement to demonstrate evidence of competencies

#### 1. APPLICANT STATEMENT

The Applicants should explain in the statement the personal values that are important to them and the goals they have been trying to attain and how they are aligned with SQU's vision, mission, and objectives. Using the provided evidence, the Applicants should explain how these values, goals and objectives are reflected in their achievements by demonstrating productivity, professional development, recognition, leadership and impact within the areas of University teaching and learning, scholarship, clinical service, and University and community service. Finally, the applicants should explain how they measured their own success and that of beneficiaries relative to the goals that they have set for each area. The statement should not exceed 3 pages. Text should be typed single-spaced with 12pt Time New Roman font type. Margins on all 4 sides must be 0.8".

#### 2. CURRICULUM VITAE

See Appendix C.

#### 3. ATTACHED EVIDENCE

Copies of publications, letters, certificates, etc.

## 4. LIST OF DOCUMENTED ACHIEVEMENT TO DEMONSTRATE EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCIES

Evidence for each competency cited in the CV and/or given as an attachment (see examples below).

**Associate Professor competencies**

Area	Competency	Evidence cited as shown in the examples below
University Teaching and Learning	1. Contributes to and delivers quality university teaching and learning.	Attachment Appendix D
	2. Participates actively in developing/reviewing programs and teaching and learning processes.	CV ( 3(a))
	3. Demonstrates the quality of developed/reviewed academic programs and other university teaching and learning processes.	Attachment A1
	4. Subscribes to university teaching and learning professional societies and attends professional meetings.	Attachment A2
	5. Gains university/national recognition in university teaching and learning in the field of specialization.	
Scholarship	1. Produces peer reviewed scholarly work	
	2. Demonstrates quality scholarly achievements	
	3. Subscribes to professional societies and attends professional meetings	
	4. Gains University/national recognition	
Clinical Service	1. Contributes to and delivers quality clinical service	
	2. Participates actively and successfully in developing/reviewing clinical programs and service processes	
	3. Demonstrates quality in developing/reviewing clinical programs and service processes	
	4. Subscribes to professional societies and attends professional meetings	
	5. Gains University/National recognition in the profession	
	6. Contributes to clinical training programs/skills	
University and Community Service	1. Evidence needed to fulfill requirement 1 and 2 to achieve "Satisfactory"	
	2. Evidence needed to fulfill requirement 1 and 2 to achieve "Satisfactory"	
	3. Evidence needed to fulfill requirement 1, 2, 3 & 4 to achieve "Excellent"	
	4. Evidence needed to fulfill requirement 1, 2, 3 & 4 to achieve "Excellent"	

**Professor competencies**

(In addition to listing the evidence for sustained Associate Professor competencies above, the list below consists of evidence for each competency cited in the CV and/or given as an attachment).

Area	Competency	Evidence cited as shown in the examples below
University Teaching and Learning	1. Sustains focused University teaching and learning activities and achievements	
	2. Leads scholarly work in university teaching and learning	
	3. Demonstrates leadership, has an active role and impact in developing university teaching and learning in the specialization	
	4. Gains regional/international recognition in university teaching and learning in the field of specialization	
Scholarship	1. Sustains focused scholarly work	

	2. Leads scholarly work	
	3. Demonstrates leadership, has an active role and impact in developing scholarly work	
	4. Gains regional/international recognition	
Clinical Service	1. Sustains focused clinical service activities	
	2. Leads scholarly works in clinical service	
	3. Demonstrates leadership, has an active role and impact in developing clinical service	
	4. Gains regional/international recognition in the profession	
University and Community Service	1. Evidence needed to fulfill requirement 1 and 2 to achieve "Satisfactory"	
	2. Evidence needed to fulfill requirement 1 and 2 to achieve "Satisfactory"	
	3. Evidence needed to fulfill requirement 1, 2, 3 & 4 to achieve "Excellent"	
	4. Evidence needed to fulfill requirement 1, 2, 3 & 4 to achieve "Excellent"	

## Appendix C. Curriculum Vitae

The Curriculum Vitae (CV) should show the career of the applicant as a whole, while highlighting activities at SQU. The following formatting is guided by the list of documented evidence for competencies and attached supported materials.

### 1. Personal Information

### 2. Education and Employment Information

The year, major field of study and degree obtained from each institution should be included, stating the title of the doctoral thesis. This is followed by the year and institution for each position held, commencing with the first employment.

### 3. Teaching and Learning

- (a) Active participation in university teaching & learning
- (b) Student/trainee advising and supervision
- (c) Participation in curriculum development /review and teaching management
- (d) Personal professional development in university teaching and learning
- (e) Scholarship in university teaching and learning
- (f) Recognition in university teaching and learning
- (g) Leadership in university teaching and learning
- (h) Impact in university teaching and learning
- (i) Other information

### 4. Scholarship

- (a) Scholarly work (specify contributions during graduate studies and while holding the rank of Assistant Professor and Associate Professor)
- (b) Student/trainee advising and supervision in scholarship
- (c) Personal professional development in scholarship
- (d) Recognition in scholarship
- (e) Leadership in scholarship
- (f) Impact in scholarship
- (g) Other information

### 5. Clinical Service (applicable to health professionals only)

- (a) Active participation in clinical, diagnostic, procedural or other medical professional work/programs
- (b) Mentoring of junior doctors and supporting medical staff
- (c) Professional development in clinical service
- (d) Scholarship in clinical service
- (e) Recognition in clinical service
- (f) Leadership in clinical service
- (g) Impact in clinical service
- (h) Other information

### 6. University & Community Service

- (a) Participation in university and community service activities
- (b) Participation in areas other than those directly related to research and teaching and learning activities
- (c) Scholarship in university and community service
- (d) Popularization, dissemination and simplification of knowledge
- (e) Serving in administrative positions and committee membership/chairmanship
- (f) Other information



## Appendix E. Evaluation of Clinical Service

### Procedure

- (a) The Head of Department evaluates the clinical performance of the candidate using the special forms (Appendix E-3A & E-3B).
- (b) The candidate will suggest the names of 3 peers to the HoD as part of his application, and the DAPC suggests another 3.
- (c) The CAPC solicits peer evaluation from three clinicians out of the 6 suggested peers – these 3 reviewers should come from the candidate's department and from a closely allied Department, or from an outside institution that frequently refer patients to the candidate.
- (d) The candidate must declare that he has not contacted or solicited support from the peers he proposes.
- (e) Peers must declare that they have not been contacted or solicited for support by the candidate and that they have no conflict of interest with him/her (Appendix E-1 or E-2).

## Appendix E-1. Clinical Performance (Evaluation by Peers)

Name of Candidate:.....Department.....

Title:.....

Assistant Professor

PERFORMANCE		Excellent 3	Satisfactory 2	Unsatisfactory 1	Uncertain
1	Attitude to staff: Respects and values contribution of other members on the team	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Attitude to Patients: Respects the rights, choices, beliefs and confidentiality of patients	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Reliability and Punctuality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Communication skills: Communicates effectively with colleagues, patients and families	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Team Player skills: Supportive and accepts appropriate responsibilities; Approachable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Contributes to and delivers quality clinical service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Provides medical, professional and consultation work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Professional development: committed to improving quality of service, keeps up-to-date with knowledge and skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Accepts referrals and internal consultations locally and countrywide	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Participate actively in clinical or professional programs such as auditing and drafting of practice guidelines/protocols	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Recognized and respected institutionally for clinical work and professionalism	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL PERFORMANCE		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:					

Declaration by Peer:

1. I have not been contacted or solicited for support by the candidate.
2. I have no conflict of interest with the candidate such as being a relative or a shareholder in business.
3. I am not competing with the candidate or involved in a dispute with him/her.

Assessors Name:.....  
Signature:..... Date:.....

Title and Designation of Assessor:.....



## Appendix E-2. Clinical Performance (Evaluation by Peers)

Name of Candidate:.....Department.....

Title:.....

Associate Professor

PERFORMANCE		Excellent 3	Satisfactory 2	Unsatisfactory 1	Uncertain
1	Attitude to staff: Respects and values contribution of other members on the team	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Attitude to Patients: Respects the rights, choices, beliefs and confidentiality of patients	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Reliability and Punctuality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Communication skills: Communicates effectively with colleagues, patients and families	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Team Player skills: Supportive and accepts appropriate responsibilities, Approachable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Leadership skills: Takes responsibility of own actions and actions of the team	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Contributes to and deliver quality clinical service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Provides medical, professional and consultation work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Professional development: committed to improving quality of service, keeps up-to-date with knowledge and skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Accepts referrals at the local, regional and/or international levels.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Participates and leads in developing or reviewing and improving clinical or professional programs such as morbidity/mortality reviews, auditing etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12	Raises funds in support of clinical services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13	Contributes to the delivering of quality clinical practice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14	Recognized and respected for clinical professionalism both nationally and internationally	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL PERFORMANCE		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:					

Declaration by Peer:

1. I have not been contacted or solicited for support by the candidate.
2. I have no conflict of interest with the candidate such as being a relative or a shareholder in business.
3. I am not competing with the candidate or involved in a dispute with him/her.

Assessor Name:.....  
Signature:..... Date:.....

Title and Designation of Assessor:.....

### Appendix E-3A. Clinical Workload (By the Candidate)

Activity	Number per Week	Duration per week	Comments
OPD Clinics			
Day Clinics			
Ward Rounds			
Surgical Sessions			
On-Call			
Reporting Sessions (Radiology/Lab)			
Other Activities			

### Appendix E-3B. HOD Verification & Evaluation of Clinical Service

Evaluated and approved by the Head of Department

Overall Appraisal

(Includes clinical competence, professionalism and commitment)

Name of HoD ..... Signature.....

## Appendix F. Application Dossier

The dossier is prepared by the rapporteurs of each committee as per the stage in the following order:

### 1. First page

Details of Applicant

Full Name:

ID#:

College:

Department:

Current academic rank:

Applying for the rank of:

Date of appointment at SQU:

Date of last promotion (if relevant):

2. Application Letter (See Appendix A)
3. Academic Achievement Portfolio (See Appendix B)
4. DAPC Evaluation Form 1 (Appendix G), and DAPC Recommendation Letter
5. CAPC Evaluation Form 1 (Appendix G)
6. Names and Addresses of Referees
7. Referee Evaluation Form (Appendix I)
8. CAPC Evaluation Form 2-A (Appendix J) and CAPC Recommendation Letter
9. UAPC Evaluation Form 2-B (Appendix K)

## Appendix G. Evaluation Form 1

This Stage One Evaluation Form is filled in by the DAPC, the CAPC, and the UAPC for Appeal cases

### Applicant's Personal Details

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ SQU ID#: \_\_\_\_\_  
 College: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Email: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date of appointment: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of last promotion (if relevant): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Current Academic rank: \_\_\_\_\_ Academic rank applied for: \_\_\_\_\_

### Eligibility, Completeness of Documents, Procedural Processes

*The eligibility of the applicant and procedural processes will be reviewed*

	Yes	No
1. The applicant is eligible for consideration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The documents are complete	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. There are no other issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Justification** (if the applicant is not eligible, if the documents are not complete, or if there are procedural irregularities, the committee has discretionary power not to proceed with the case)

### Stage One Evaluation of Performance within the Area

The committee will review the evidence submitted for every competency and vote on the acceptability of performance within the area.

#### 1. University Teaching and Learning

**Associate Professor Competencies:** *The applicant should provide evidence of proven achievement to demonstrate the competencies of quality productivity, professional development and university/national recognition in university teaching and learning.*

Competencies	Evidence	
	Acceptable	Unacceptable
1. Contributes to and delivers quality university teaching and learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Participates actively in developing/reviewing programs and university teaching and learning processes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Demonstrates the quality of developed/reviewed academic programs and other university teaching and learning processes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Subscribes to university teaching and learning professional societies and attends professional meetings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Gains university/national recognition in university teaching and learning in the field of specialization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Vote on stage one evaluation of performance within the area</b>	<b>Acceptable</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Unacceptable</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b>		

**Professor Competencies:** The applicant should provide evidence to demonstrate

- the sustained activities of an Associate Professor; and
- the competencies of impact, regional/international recognition and leadership roles in university teaching and learning.

Competencies	Evidence	
	Acceptable	Unacceptable
1. Sustains focused University teaching and learning activities and achievements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Leads scholarly work in university teaching and learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Demonstrates leadership, has an active role and impact in developing university teaching and learning in the specialization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Gains regional/international recognition in the university teaching and learning in the field of specialization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Vote on stage one evaluation of performance within the area</b>	<b>Acceptable</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Unacceptable</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b>		

## 2. Scholarship

**Associate Professor Competencies:** The applicant should provide evidence of proven achievements to demonstrate competencies of quality productivity, professional development and university/national recognition in scholarship.

Competencies	Evidence	
	Acceptable	Unacceptable
1. Produces peer reviewed scholarly work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Shows quality scholarly achievements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Subscribes to professional societies and attends professional meetings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Gains university/national recognition	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Vote on stage one evaluation of performance within the area</b>	<b>Acceptable</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Unacceptable</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b>		

**Professor Competencies:** The applicant should provide evidence to demonstrate

- the sustained activities of an Associate Professor; and
- the competencies of impact, regional/international recognition and leadership roles in scholarship.

Competencies	Evidence	
	Acceptable	Unacceptable
1. Sustains focused scholarly work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Leads scholarly work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Demonstrates leadership and has an active role in developing scholarly work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Gains regional/international recognition	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Vote on stage one evaluation of performance within the area</b>	<b>Acceptable</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Unacceptable</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b>		

### 3. Clinical Service

**Associate Professor Competencies:** The applicant should provide evidence of proven achievements to demonstrate the competencies of quality productivity, professional development and University/national recognition in clinical service.

Competencies	Evidence	
	Acceptable	Unacceptable
1. Contributes to and delivers quality clinical service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Participates actively and successfully in developing/reviewing clinical programs and service processes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Demonstrates the quality of developing/reviewing clinical programs and service processes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Subscribes to professional societies and attends professional meetings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Gains University/National recognition within the profession	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Contributes to clinical training programs/skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Vote on stage one evaluation of performance within the area</b>	<b>Acceptable</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Unacceptable</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b>		

**Professor Competencies:** The applicant should provide evidence to demonstrate

- a) the sustained activities of an Associate Professor; and,
- b) the competencies of impact, regional/international recognition and leadership roles in clinical service.

Competencies	Evidence	
	Acceptable	Unacceptable
1. Sustains focused clinical service activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Leads scholarly work in clinical service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Demonstrates leadership, has an active role and impact in developing clinical service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Gains regional/international recognition within the profession	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Vote on stage one evaluation of performance within the area</b>	<b>Acceptable</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Unacceptable</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b>		

#### 4. University & Community Service

a) The Applicant should provide evidences to demonstrate quality productivity and professional development in University and Community Service for Competencies 1 & 2 below.

b) To achieve "Excellent" in University and Community Service, Applicants need to provide acceptable evidences for competencies of University / National Recognition & impact in Community Service - provide the required evidences for Competencies 3 & 4 below.

Competencies	Evidence	
	Acceptable	Unacceptable
1. Participates in service activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Participates in areas other than those directly related to research and Teaching and Learning activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Serves in an administrative position and/or chair a committee, if any	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Popularizes, disseminates and simplifies knowledge, as applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Vote on stage one evaluation of performance within the area</b>	<b>Acceptable</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Unacceptable</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b>		

<b>Decision to proceed to referees (CAPC, and UAPC for Appeal cases)</b>	<b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b>		

Name of Chair of Committee

Signature

Date



## Appendix H. Letters to Referees

### 1. Referee availability letter

Name & Address

Date

Fax:

Dear Dr./Prof. ....

Your name has been proposed as a possible reviewer for the promotion of Dr. ...., who has applied for promotion to the rank of .....Professor. Dr. .... specializes in .....

SQU's Academic Promotion Regulations require that external evaluations of the application for promotion be secured from referees in the same specialization from outside the University in order to provide the promotion committee with an independent assessment of the applicant's achievement in relevant areas (*Teaching and Learning, Scholarly Achievements, University and Community Service, Clinical Service – if applicable*). Three anonymous referees are required to assess the application confidentially and declare that they do not have any conflict of interest with the applicant.

The University requires the external referee to submit a frank and objective assessment of the applicant's achievements on a preformatted form and provides an honorarium of about US\$..... for this.

If you are available to provide the assessment report within four weeks of accessing the applicant's Academic Achievement Portfolio, please let me know by email at .....@squ.edu.om. Please also provide your email/postal address and telephone number.

Thank you for considering this request.

Yours sincerely,

Chair of the Committee

P.S.: If you feel you cannot evaluate this application, please suggest the names of other scholars who may be able to do so.

**2. Letter to referee after agreeing to evaluate the application**

Name & Address

Date

Dear Dr./Prof.....

Thank you for agreeing to act as a referee for Dr. ....from our Department of ....., who is being considered for promotion from the rank of ..... Professor to the rank of ..... Professor.

SQU adopts the following three categories for academic positions: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor (equivalent to senior lecturer in the UK), and Professor.

Please access the SQU Academic Promotions System at

[http://www.squ.edu.om/.....](http://www.squ.edu.om/)

and enter the username and password as follows:

username:

password:

You will find the SQU Academic Promotion Regulations, the applicant's Academic Achievement Portfolio and a Referee Evaluation form (Appendix I). Please read these regulations and complete the form to evaluate the applicant's performance.

I would appreciate receiving your frank evaluation within four weeks from the date you receive this message, preferably by submitting it through the above link or as an attachment by e-mail to <.....@squ.edu.om>. The promotion evaluation process at SQU is strictly confidential.

I thank you in anticipation of a timely response and please do not hesitate to contact me if you need any further information.

Yours sincerely

Chair of the Committee

PS Please acknowledge receipt of this letter.

**3. Reminder letter to referee**

Name & Address

Date

Fax:

Dear Dr./Prof.....

Reference: Your Report on .....

We recently gave you access to SQU's Academic Promotion System to evaluate the Academic Achievement Portfolio of Dr. ....

If you have finalized the evaluation, I would appreciate your submitting the report as soon as possible.

Again, we sincerely thank you for your willingness to assist in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Chair of the Committee

## Appendix I. Referee Evaluation

**Name of Referee:**

Academic Rank:

Specialization:

Research Specialization

Current Administrative Position (if relevant):

Address:

Department:

College:

Institution:

Postal Code:

Town:

Country:

Email:

Telephone:

**Applicant's Personal Details**

Name:

College:

Department:

Academic rank applied for:

**General Instructions**

Please:

1. Read and follow SQU's Academic Promotion Regulations
2. Evaluate competencies as per section 3.4 (Description and Evaluation of Areas)
3. Grade the performance within the area as Excellent, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory
4. Comment on the performance within the area of the applicant after evaluation of the competencies
5. Provide general comments on the activities and achievements of the applicant.

**1. University Teaching and Learning**

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
<b>Performance within the Area</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b>			

**2. Scholarship**

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
<b>Performance within the Area</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b>			

**3. Clinical Service**

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
<b>Performance within the Area</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b>			

**4. University and Community Service**

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
<b>Performance within the Area</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b>			

**General Comments**

--

Name of Referee

Signature

Date

## Appendix J. Evaluation Form 2-A

This Stage Two Evaluation Form is filled in by the CAPC and UAPC in case of appeal.

### Applicant's Personal Details

Name:

SQU ID#:

College:

Department:

Email:

Date of appointment:

Date of last promotion (if relevant):

Academic rank applied for:

### Evaluation of Area

The committee should review the evidence submitted for the competencies within the area together with the referee evaluations, make Stage Two Evaluation of each area by voting on the performance within the area, and provide justification.

**1. University Teaching and Learning**

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
<b>Vote on performance within the Area</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b>			

**2. Scholarship**

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
<b>Vote on performance within the Area</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b>			

**3. Clinical Service**

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
<b>Vote on performance within the Area</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b>			

**4. University and Community Service**

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
<b>Vote on performance within the Area</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b>			

	Recommended	Not Recommended
<b>Final Recommendation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Name of Chair of Committee

Signature

Date

## Appendix K. Evaluation Form 2-B

This Stage Two Evaluation Form is filled in by the UAPC, and by the APAC.

### Applicant's Personal Details

Name:

SQU ID#:

College:

Department:

Email:

Date of appointment:

Date of last promotion (if relevant):

Current Academic Rank:

Academic rank applied for:

### Evaluation of Area

The UAPC/APAC should review the evidence and referee evaluations and make their decision on the case by voting to either agree with the CAPC/UAPC or disagree and provide justification. This form will also be used by the APAC for Appeal cases.



**1. University Teaching and Learning**

		Agree	Disagree
<b>Agreement with the CAPC/UAPC</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>If Disagreeing with the CAPC/UAPC</b>			
<b>Vote on performance within the area (section 6.5.2(d))</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b> (if disagreeing with the CAPC/UAPC):			

**2. Scholarship**

		Agree	Disagree
<b>Agreement with the CAPC/UAPC</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>If Disagreeing with the CAPC/UAPC</b>			
<b>Vote on performance within the area (section 6.5.2(d))</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b> (if disagreeing with the CAPC/UAPC):			

**3. Clinical Service**

		Agree	Disagree
<b>Agreement with the CAPC/UAPC</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>If Disagreeing with the CAPC/UAPC</b>			
<b>Vote on performance within the area (section 6.5.2(d))</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b> (if disagreeing with the CAPC/UAPC):			

**4. University and Community Service**

		Agree	Disagree
<b>Agreement with the CAPC/UAPC</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>If Disagreeing with the CAPC/UAPC</b>			
<b>Vote on performance within the area (section 6.5.2(d))</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b> (if disagreeing with the CAPC/UAPC):			

		Recommended	Not Recommended
<b>Final Recommendation</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Name of Chair of the Committee

Signature

Date

## Appendix L. Committee Annual Report

### Purpose of Report

The annual report, which is part of the quality assurance process, is submitted by all committees. Each committee addresses the relevant sections and submits the report to the next higher committee. The UAPC and APAC submit their reports to the Academic Council, which makes them available to SQU faculty. The overall objective is to show how far the University has progressed and succeeded in fulfilling its mission by providing data on academic promotion achievements. The report should cover the following.

#### 1. Summary of the Outcome of Applications/Appeals

This will include the number of applications and the number of recommended cases.

#### 2. Summary of Reasons for Not Recommending Cases

The committee should summarize the reasons for not recommending cases. The names of unsuccessful applicants should not be mentioned, but the summary should specify whether the deficiencies lie within the quality of productivity, recognition, professional development, leadership or impact in the areas of teaching and learning, scholarship, clinical service and university & community service.

#### 3. Refereeing

The committee should list the institutions from which referees were selected. Also it should summarize the referee's evaluations.

#### 4. Recommendation of the UAPC/APAC

The UAPC/APAC may submit recommendations to the AC to improve the process.

#### 5. Names of applicants/appellants recommended for promotion

#### 6. Indicators of Academic Promotion in Fulfillment of University Mission

The report of the UAPC/APAC should provide statistics on the achievements of recommended and not-recommended cases, such as the range and number of publications and other scholarly work. In addition, the report should analyze and compare the progress over the last few years in terms of the number of applicants, the quality of their productivity, their recognition, professional development and capabilities, leadership roles, and their impact in the areas of teaching and learning, scholarship, clinical service and university and community service.

#### 7. Any Other Comments

### Name and Signature of the Chair of the committee

Name:

Signature:

Date:

## Appendix M. Letter to Successful Applicant

Dear Dr/Prof. ....

I am pleased to congratulate you on your promotion to the rank of Associate Professor/Professor in .....  
(subject/subspecialty) as per the Qarar (No:....., Dated:.....).

I hope you will continue to develop your career through further achievements.

Best wishes

Vice-Chancellor

Date

## Appendix N - 1. Letter to Unsuccessful Applicant

(For DAPC use)

Dear Dr. ....

The DAPC regrets to inform you that it did not recommend your promotion to the rank of Associate Professor/Professor in ..... (subject/subspecialty).

The reasons for this are given below. The committee hopes that its comments will help you in your future application and wishes you success next time. You are welcome to discuss these points with the HoD.

Reasons for not Recommending Promotion
Areas for Improvement

Best wishes

Chair of the DAPC

Date:

## Appendix N-2. Letter to Unsuccessful Applicant (For UAPC and CAPC use)

Dr./Prof. ....  
Dean of College / HOD of .....  
Sultan Qaboos University

Dear Dr./Prof. ....,

**Re: Promotion Application Dr. .... (ID# ....)**

The UAPC/CAPC discussed the application of Dr. .... seeking promotion to Associate/Full Professor at its meeting on .....(date)..... I regret to inform you that the UAPC / CAPC has decided not to recommend Dr. .... to the Academic Council /UAPC for promotion to Associate/Full Professor, based on the following.

After extensively reviewing the Dossier and CAPC/DAPC evaluation of the candidate in each of the 3/4 areas, UAPC/CAPC has reached the following conclusions:

**Teaching & Learning: Excellent / Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory** (Type here one of the 3 choices)

Justification: (Copy here exactly what is in the minutes, as approved by the UAPC/CAPC members and that should not be changed at this stage)

- .....
- .....

**Scholarship: Excellent / Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory** (Type here one of the 3 choices)

Justification: (Copy here exactly what is in the minutes, as approved by the UAPC/CAPC members and that should not be changed at this stage)

- .....
- .....

**University and Community Service: Excellent / Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory** (Type here one of the 3 choices)

Justification: (Copy here exactly what is in the minutes, as approved by the UAPC/CAPC members and that should not be changed at this stage)

- .....
- .....

**Final Decision:**

- 1) UAPC/CAPC disagreed with the CAPC/DAPC in recommending the candidate for promotion.
- 2) UAPC/CAPC deliberations of the Dossier and of CAPC/DAPC evaluations, have led to the above conclusions.
- 3) UAPC/CAPC has decided not to recommend Dr. .... for promotion to Associate Professor/Full Professor.

The UAPC/CAPC would very much appreciate if you could kindly inform Dr..... of the above decision.

Yours sincerely,

Dr./Prof.....  
Chairman UAPC/CAPC, .....(Academic Year).....

**Appendix O-1. Letter to Unsuccessful Appellant**  
**(For CAPC use)**

Dr./Prof. ....  
HoD .....(Dept.).....  
Sultan Qaboos University

Dear Dr./Prof. ....

**Re: Promotion Application (Appeal) of Dr. .... (ID# ....)**

The CAPC discussed the appeal of **Dr. ....** against the DAPC on .....(date)..... Dr. .... is seeking promotion to Associate/Full Professor. The CAPC extensively discussed the Dossier of the Appellant, as well as the Letter of Appeal, and the DAPC evaluation of the application.

I regret to inform you that after extensive deliberations, the CAPC decided not to proceed further with the application based on the following reasons:

**Teaching & Learning: Acceptable or Unacceptable.** (Type here one of the 2 choices)

Justification: (Copy here exactly what is in the minutes, as approved by the CAPC members and that should not be changed at this stage)

- .....
- .....
- .....

**Scholarship: Acceptable or Unacceptable.** (Type here one of the 2 choices)

Justification: (Copy here exactly what is in the minutes, as approved by the CAPC members and that should not be changed at this stage)

- .....
- .....

**University and Community Service: Acceptable or Unacceptable** (type here one of the 2 choices)

Justification: (Copy here exactly what is in the minutes, as approved by the CAPC members and that should not be changed at this stage)

- .....
- .....

**Final Decision:**

- 1) CAPC agrees with the DAPC decision.
- 2) CAPC deliberations of the Dossier and the Appellant’s Appeal Letter came to the above-stated conclusions and justifications. CAPC has decided not to proceed further with the application and not to seek the opinion of External Referees.
- 3) Dr..... is not recommended for promotion to Associate/Full Professor.

The CAPC would very much appreciate if you could kindly inform **Dr. ....** of the CAPC decision.

Yours sincerely,

Dr./Prof.....  
Chairman CAPC, .....Academic Year.....

## Appendix O-2. Letter to Unsuccessful Appellant (For UAPC and APAC use)

Dr./Prof. ....  
Dean, College of .....  
Sultan Qaboos University

Dear Dr./Prof. ....

**Re: Promotion Application (Appeal) of Dr. .... (ID# ....)**

The UAPC/APAC discussed the appeal of **Dr. ....** against the CAPC/UAPC on .....(date)..... **Dr. ....** is seeking promotion to Associate/Full Professor. The UAPC/APAC extensively discussed the Dossier of the Appellant, as well as the Letter of Appeal, and the CAPC/UAPC evaluation of the application.

I regret to inform you that after extensive deliberations, the UAPC/APAC decided not to proceed further with the application based on the following reasons:

**Teaching & Learning: Acceptable or Unacceptable.** (Type here one of the 2 choices)

Justification: (Copy here exactly what is in the minutes, as approved by the UAPC/APAC members and that should not be changed at this stage)

- .....
- .....
- .....

**Scholarship: Acceptable or Unacceptable.** (Type here one of the 2 choices)

Justification: (Copy here exactly what is in the minutes, as approved by the UAPC/APAC members and that should not be changed at this stage)

- .....
- .....

**University and Community Service: Acceptable or Unacceptable** (type here one of the 2 choices)

Justification: (Copy here exactly what is in the minutes, as approved by the UAPC/APAC members and that should not be changed at this stage)

- .....
- .....

**Final Decision:**

- 1) UAPC/APAC agrees with the CAPC/UAPC decision.
- 2) UAPC/APAC deliberations of the Dossier and the Appellant’s Appeal Letter came to the above-stated conclusions and justifications. UAPC/APAC has decided not to proceed further with the application and not to seek the opinion of External Referees.
- 3) Dr..... is not recommended for promotion to Associate/Full Professor.

The UAPC/APAC would very much appreciate if you could kindly inform **Dr. ....** of the UAPC/APAC decision.

Yours sincerely,

Dr./Prof.....  
Chairman UAPC/APAC, .....Academic Year.....