

**King Fahd University of Petroleum &
Minerals
Dhahran - Saudi Arabia**



**Faculty Promotion Regulations
and
Guidelines**

*Office of the Vice Rector for Research
Revised November, 2014*

1. PREAMBLE

All universities have a well-structured process for the promotion of their faculty to higher academic ranks in recognition of their academic accomplishments and achievements. King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals (KFUPM) also has one, which is built on transparency and fairness to deal with all requests for academic promotion in strict compliance with the university's regulations without any exception. This document sets out the guidelines and the regulatory procedures for promotion.

The promotion process aims to advise the university on the promotability of a candidate and provide feedback to the candidate through the appropriate dean of his performance in research, teaching and public and university service, which are the three principal activities considered in promotion. The university uses the promotion process to encourage academic excellence and to rectify mediocrity and marginal contributions in a fair and constructive manner.

While approving these regulations and guidelines, the Scientific Council asserts that these regulations and guidelines are in accordance with the 'Unified Bylaws for Faculty' that were adopted by the Higher Education Council of Saudi Arabia in 1996 (1417H). This revised version of 'Faculty Promotion Regulations and Guidelines', dated November 2014, replaces all previous versions and shall be considered valid until it is in turn amended.

This booklet contains Appendices A-K as integral parts of this document. They cover in detail the roles and functions of various committees and administrative processes related to promotion regulations and guidelines. Whenever and wherever necessary, attention has been drawn to the relevant Appendix for more details.

2. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

Faculty members applying for promotion will be evaluated on the basis of their performance and achievement in the following three core areas of their activities:

- Teaching and Learning
- Research and Scientific Contributions
- University, Departmental and Public Service

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

2.1 Teaching and Learning

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

- a. Demonstration of competence in the subject matter in the classroom and public presentations (e.g. colloquia, seminars, symposia, short courses, conferences, etc.).
- b. Effectiveness in the development and use of technology-based innovative teaching methods.
- c. Guidance and leadership in student activities.
- d. Initiation and participation in curriculum development (e.g. new courses, new programs, etc.).
- e. Effective engagement in the development and use of Instructional Laboratories.
- f. Level of participation and effectiveness in graduate programs (if applicable) and in continuing education programs.
- g. Book authoring.
- h. Effectiveness in supervising senior projects, Summer Training and Coop Programs (if applicable).
- i. Teaching Load.
- j. Effective engagement in student advising and counseling.

Information regarding the above-mentioned aspects of the candidate's teaching and teaching-related performance can be sought from his chairman, peers, students (preferably senior), alumni and course files. It is noted that student evaluations should not be accepted without qualification. They may serve, however, as indicators of competence but are not to be used as absolute and final measures of the teaching performance. Every faculty member is expected to maintain course files that include the syllabi, outlines of materials covered, homework, lab assignments, exams, and other pertinent information. Such files should be made available to the committee on request. In the case of multiple-section courses where a number of instructors are involved, the input from the course coordinator may also be sought through the Chairman of the Department.

In judging the effectiveness of the candidate's teaching, the internal promotion committee (Appendix A) shall consider the candidate's command of his subject; the professional advancement in his field; his ability to organize and present his materials with clarity and vigor; his capacity to make students aware of the inter-deciplinery relationship of his subject; the spirit and enthusiasm which energize his learning and teaching; his ability to infuse intellectual curiosity in students and to stimulate discussions; his personal attributes as they affect his teaching, his students, and his colleagues; and the extent and skill of his participation in the general guidance and counseling of students.

2.2 Research and Scientific Contributions

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

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

In published scholarly work, a key ingredient is significance rather than volume. A judgement can be made by examining the quality of the journals in which the publications appeared, the use which other researchers make of an individual's publications, or by requesting testimony from other distinguished workers in the field. Since the task of choosing reviewers is rather critical, extra care is needed in the selection of peers who should be asked to evaluate a candidate's research accomplishments. Contributions in the area of coordination of knowledge such as survey articles and books are evidence of effective scholarship. Other evidence in this area includes supervision of master and doctoral theses. Moreover, articles, textbooks, reports, and similar publications normally considered as contributions to the professional literature or the advancement of professional practice or of professional education, should be judged as evidence of

effective scholarship especially, when they present new ideas or incorporate scholarly research. Evidence of scholarly stature may include service on the editorial boards of scholarly journals; invitations to give keynote addresses in conferences or symposia; membership in technical committees of international national conferences; acting as a reviewer for scholarly journals, conferences, symposia, books, and technical reports; prizes and awards received; and high level consulting work. Confidential and secret reports, software or prototypes may be evaluated by an ad-hoc committee of cleared university personnel of higher rank than the candidate. This committee shall report its findings to the internal promotion committee.

2.2.1 Journal Publications Recognized for Promotion

Effective January 1, 2014, the University has adopted the following policy on journal publications to promote and ensure quality of research. For promotion, only research publications published in the following categories of journals, specified for each college/department, will be considered, without any exception:

(a) *College of Sciences and Engineering Sciences*

Only ISI listed journals shall be considered for promotion.

(b) *College of Industrial Management*

All ISI listed journals, in addition to those rated not less than 3 in the evaluation rating of Association of Business School, UK (ABS).

(c) *College of Environmental Design*

All ISI listed journals plus those approved by the Scientific Council.

(d) *Department of Arabic and Islamic Studies*

All ISI listed journals plus those approved by the Scientific Council.

2.3 Departmental, University and Public Service

The faculty plays an important role in administration within the University and in the formulation of its policies. Recognition shall therefore be given to faculty members who prove themselves to be able administrators and developers of their respective departments and who participate effectively and creatively in Departmental, College, and University committees. Service rendered by the faculty members to local and outside communities at large, both in their special capacities as scholars, and in areas beyond these special capacities when the services rendered are of high level and quality, shall likewise be recognized for promotion. These may include organizing short courses, national/international conferences, seminars, workshops, technical projects, authoring articles for the general public, translations, etc. Contributions might also include identifying industry needs and developing training programs, as well as establishing effective links for technical cooperation between KFUPM and other institutions or industries. Noteworthy contributions to the students' welfare and development will also be recognized and considered.

3. MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS FOR PROMOTION

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

For journal papers, only those published in the journals specified in Section 2.2.1 shall be considered for promotion.

It should be understood that the minimum qualifications are necessary but may not be sufficient for promotion unless they fully satisfy the evaluation criteria for promotion.

3.1 Degree Requirement

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

3.2 Assistant Professor

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

3.3 Associate Professor

Four (4) or more years of successful teaching and research at a recognized university, subsequent to attaining the requisite degree, are required, of which at least one year of service in a Saudi University is needed. For candidates with an industrial or professional background, the time requirement of combined university teaching and pertinent experience after the completion of the doctorate or equivalent degree is given in section 3.5 below. An Associate Professor should demonstrate mature and independent scholarship. Research and other scholarly activities should indicate creativity, significance and effectiveness. The candidate for promotion must satisfy the following minimum requirements in Research and Scientific Contributions:

Four published and/or accepted-for-publication units; at least two of which must be *single-authored* (exceptions to single-authorship in some fields will be determined by the University Board). In determining the minimum number of units, the following categories and rules should be considered:

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

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

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

3.4 Professor

Eight (8) or more years of successful teaching and research work at a recognized university subsequent to attaining the requisite degree are required. For candidates with an industrial or professional background, the time requirement of combined university teaching and pertinent experience after the completion of the doctorate or equivalent degree, with at least four years of teaching is given in Section 5 below. Candidates applying for promotion to this rank must have at least four years of service at the Associate Professor rank, of which at least one year of service in a Saudi university is required. Bestowal of this rank indicates a recognized scholar of authoritative reputation who has demonstrated substantial scholarly achievement, and whose work in a given discipline is widely known and respected. For promotion to this rank, contributions in teaching and service are important; however, the main emphasis is on research and scholarly achievements, without which a candidate cannot be promoted to the rank of Professor regardless of his contributions in teaching and services. Thus, all candidates to this rank must demonstrate that their research achievements have had a recognized impact on the advancement of knowledge in their subject area. The candidates for promotion to this rank must satisfy the following minimum requirement in Research and Scientific Contributions:

Six (6) published and/or accepted-for-publication units; three (3) of these units, at least, shall be single-authored (exceptions to single-authorship in some fields will be determined by the University Board).

In determining the minimum number of units for promotion to the rank of Professor, the same nine categories of scholarly activities listed in Section 3.3 (items 1 - 9) and the unit maxima for each category are applicable. However, for consideration for promotion to this rank, a *minimum of two units* in category "1" (refereed journal papers) is required.

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

Furthermore, it shall be ascertained that materials submitted for consideration must have been published or accepted for publication in more than one publication channel (i.e. different journals and different university and scientific establishments). It shall also be ascertained that materials submitted for consideration are not exactly extracted from the candidate's MS thesis, PhD dissertation, or previous publications.

3.5 Special Cases

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

- (i) The *full* period should be counted if the loan or assignment was to a scientific organization and the work was in his field of specialty.
- (ii) The *half* period should be counted, if the loan or assignment was to a non-scientific organization or the work was industrial, provided that the work was carried out in his field of specialty.
- (iii) No part of the period should be counted if the work done during the loan or assignment was not in his field of specialty.

4. PROMOTION TO PROFESSORIAL RANKS

The evaluation of a candidate's application for promotion is carried out by a well-established process described in Section 5 and in Appendix J. The evaluation process ascertains two basic requirements: (a) eligibility of the candidate's request for promotion and (b) a satisfactory level of performance and achievement in the three core areas of activities: teaching, research and service. The minimum qualifications stated in Section 3 must be satisfied for all ranks without any exception.

4.1 Assistant Professor

The Minimum Qualifications in Section 3 are sufficient for promotion to this rank.

4.2 Associate Professor

4.2.1 The candidate should satisfy the teaching and research requirements as listed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the Criteria for Promotion. Also, he should have demonstrated teaching effectiveness at various levels of the undergraduate and, where applicable, graduate programs.

4.2.1 Normally, the candidate for promotion shall have a record of successful research achievements, which demonstrates his capability to conduct independent and original research. This would be evidenced by scholarly publications in refereed journals, in the refereed proceedings of international conferences (Section 2.2). While numerical standards might vary from one discipline to another, a normal requirement would be the publication, during the period preceding the application, of several scholarly articles in refereed journals of good repute, with the candidate being the sole or the principal author of some of them. The quality and significance of the Research and Scientific Contributions shall be the primary criteria in assessing the candidate's application. The number of publications alone may not be sufficient in meeting the research criterion for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

4.2.3. In the case of multi-authored publications, the numerical expectations would correspondingly be higher. However, in making such judgments, attention should be given to certain special disciplines where research is necessarily collaborative. Conversely, in cases of publications documented to have had major impacts on their fields, the numerical requirements may be lowered. The internal promotion committee may request the candidate to elaborate on his specific contributions in joint publications.

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

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

For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the following two conditions shall be satisfied:

- (i) The total number of points credited to the candidate is not less than sixty (60) points, of which at least thirty-five (35) points must come from Research and Scientific Contributions, and
- (ii) at least two of the three selected external reviewers have recommended the promotion of the candidate.

4.3 Professor

- 4.3.1. Throughout his service as Associate Professor, the candidate must have served at a level of effectiveness and accomplishment consistent with the criteria for advancement to the rank of Professor.
- 4.3.2. The candidate should be a recognized scholar within his discipline, and have a record of successful research achievements. He should be well recognized for the extent and significance of his contributions to the discipline. His work should have demonstrated originality and significance as manifested by citations by others in the literature.
- 4.3.3. While numerical standards might vary from one discipline to another, it is expected that, during the period preceding his application, the candidate should have maintained an active involvement in research as shown by his record of publications in refereed journals or by significant professional accomplishments in fields where publications are limited. These requirements are qualified by statements made in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the requirements for promotion to Associate Professor. The number of publications alone may not be sufficient in meeting the research criterion for promotion to the rank of Professor.
- 4.3.4. The candidate's contributions must indicate a consistent commitment to improving the department's and his own role in training undergraduate and graduate students.
- 4.3.5. When opportunities exist, the candidate is expected to have taught a number of graduate-level courses and supervised a number of MS and PhD theses.
- 4.3.6. The candidate must have demonstrated ability as an educator, proven by his participation and leadership in the development of undergraduate and graduate programs.
- 4.3.7. During his tenure as Associate Professor, the candidate must have played an effective part in the service activities of his Department, University and Community.
- 4.3.8. The candidate's application will be evaluated on a 100-point scale, which is composed of:
 - Sixty (60) points for Research and Scientific Contributions.
 - Twenty-five (25) points for Teaching.
 - Fifteen (15) points for University, Departmental and Public Service.

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

For promotion to the rank of Professor the following two conditions shall be satisfied:

- (i) the total number of points secured by the candidate is not less than sixty (60) points, of which at least forty (40) points must be from Research and Scientific Contributions, and
- (ii) all three selected external reviewers have recommended the promotion of the candidate. In the case where two of the three external reviewers recommend promotion and one does not recommend promotion of the candidate, a fourth external reviewer shall be asked to evaluate the candidate's achievements in Research and Scientific Contributions, and his opinion shall be considered as the final one.

5. UNIVERSITY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY PROMOTION

While the policies and procedures for promotion are described here, the sequential steps of the promotion process are covered in detail in Appendix J with a flow chart.

5.1 Policies

- 5.1.1 The principal criteria for evaluation of academic promotion of faculty are: (i) Teaching, (ii) Research and Scientific Contributions and (iii) University, Departmental and Public Service.
- 5.1.2 The promotion request of a faculty member shall be evaluated by a five-member ad-hoc Internal Promotion Committee (IPC) formed by the Vice Rector for Research (VRR). The membership of this committee shall include distinguished faculty and researchers holding a higher rank than that of the applicant. The VRR may seek nominations of the faculty members from the Dean of the respective college.
- 5.1.3 The IPC shall comprise:
 - (a) At least two faculty members from the college or the Research Institute in the same or a closely related field of specialization as that of the applicant for promotion. Exception to this rule may apply at the discretion of the VRR in those cases where this condition cannot reasonably be fulfilled due to non-availability of qualified faculty members from the colleges or the Research Institute.
 - (b) A minimum of two and a maximum of three members in fields of specialization related to that of the candidate.
 - (c) The VRR shall appoint the chairman of the committee.
 - (d) The membership of the committee shall not include the present chairman of the academic department of the candidate.
- 5.1.4 If the candidate is the Department Chairman, the Dean of the College concerned should chair the meeting of the Departmental Council concerning his promotion application.

- 5.1.5 If the candidate is the Dean, the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs should chair the meeting of the College Council concerning his promotion application.
- 5.1.6 The Scientific Council shall select, from reputable universities, three primary external reviewers (with a sufficient number of back-up reviewers), who are recognized scholars and have demonstrated expertise in the same field(s) of research as that of the candidate to evaluate the research accomplishments of the candidate. While the Scientific Council normally considers the list of potential external reviewers submitted by the College, the department and the applicant, it may reject all names, if warranted and justified, and select instead reviewers through its own independent search.
- 5.1.7 In its evaluation, the IPC may seek, if needed, additional information about the candidate's credentials and activities from the concerned departments and the candidate only through the office of the VRR, which will be the sole communication channel for the IPC to secure further input related to a promotion case.
- 5.1.8 In all cases, the IPC shall submit a report to the VRR on the promotion request of the candidate by detailing their findings about the candidate and his qualifications with an in-depth analysis of all relevant information and requirements pertinent to the rank applied for. The IPC is required to take into due consideration the opinion of the external reviewers on the promotability of the candidate. This is a mandatory requirement of the process for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and Professor.
- 5.1.9 The Scientific Council shall make its decision on the candidate's promotability after evaluating the promotion report submitted by the IPC in conjunction with the reports of the external reviewers.
- 5.1.10 The Scientific Council may request the IPC, the department concerned, or the candidate to submit supplementary details or information which may assist the Council in making its final decision regarding the promotion.
- 5.1.11 The Scientific Council may reject the recommendation of the IPC if it finds irregularities and unsubstantiated conclusions when all reports and facts are taken into consideration.
- 5.1.12 The VRR shall submit the Scientific Council's recommendation to HE the Rector.

- 5.1.13 At all stages of evaluation, confidentiality shall be strictly maintained by all involved in the promotion process. The IPC and the Scientific Council shall keep all discussions, deliberations and the reports confidential.
- 5.1.14 If the candidate applying for promotion is a member of the Department, College or Scientific Council, he will be barred from attending the meetings of the relevant councils or knowing of their proceedings when his case is reviewed. He may not see any report or decision relevant to the evaluation of his performance, except that communicated to him by the VRR.

5.2. Procedure

- 5.2.1 The University has adopted an online system for the submission of all promotion materials and progress tracking. The key steps in the progress of a promotion evaluation case are updated online and can only be accessed by authorized individuals.
- 5.2.2 A request for promotion may be initiated by the candidate six months before fulfilling the minimum time requirements. The request should be addressed to the chairman of the department and all supporting documents as outlined in “Guide to the Preparation of a Dossier” (Appendix B) shall be submitted online. It is the responsibility of the candidate to ensure that the complete dossier with all required materials is correctly uploaded to the system.
- 5.2.3 Upon receiving the application, the ad-hoc departmental committee formed by the department chairman or by the Department Council, if the chairman is not delegated the authority by the Council, examines the case, ascertains the candidate's eligibility (according to the regulations stated in Section 3), and proposes a list of at least 10 external reviewers in the candidate's area of specialization. For an eligible case, the department chairman shall expeditiously notify the College Dean of the candidate's request. The notification shall be accompanied by a letter of evaluation providing details of eligibility, together with the list of suggested external reviewers. This letter shall be forwarded to the Dean as soon as possible but not later than three weeks after the receipt of the application. The candidate should be informed in writing that his case has been forwarded to the Dean.

- 5.2.4 Following the receipt of the application, the College Dean seeks a conflict-of-interest statement from the candidate for the selection of faculty names who can serve as members of the internal promotion committee. The College Council examines the case, and proposes a list of at least 10 external reviewers in the candidate's area of specialization. This list can include reviewers other than the ones nominated by the Departmental Council. Within three weeks, the Dean notifies the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs of the College Council's recommendation along with the list of external reviewers and the names of possible promotion committee members. The Vice Rector for Academic Affairs shall forward the case to the Chairman of the Scientific Council (the Vice Rector for Research), for an evaluation of promotability by the Scientific Council.
- 5.2.5 The VRR presents the application to the Scientific Council for further examination and selection of 6-10 short-listed external reviewers, in a prioritized descending order to evaluate the candidate's research and scientific contributions. The short-listed reviewers can be from the lists provided by the College Council, the department and the candidate. The external reviewers must be internationally well-known researchers with a significant contribution in the area of specialization of the candidate. They must hold the rank of full professors or equivalent. In the case of promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, one of the external reviewers could be an Associate Professor. The selection of the external reviewers should not include anyone who knows the candidate or has a personal association with the candidate.
- 5.2.6 The office of the VRR seeks the willingness of the external reviewers to serve as reviewers through correspondance, starting with the three primary reviewers from the selected list (sample letter shown in Appendix E). If one or more express their unwillingness, the next reviewer(s) from the priority order is contacted until three confirmed reviewers are secured. The Scientific Council (or whoever it delegates) requests the selected three reviewers to forward their evaluations online (sample letter given in Appendix E). The evaluation forms are available online, the format of which is shown in Appendix F.
- 5.2.7 The VRR forms the five-member Internal Promotion Committee (IPC). He may choose some or none from the list of possible faculty members suggested by the College Dean. The IPC carries out a thorough evaluation taking stock of all submitted documents and the independent evaluations of the three external reviewers.

- 5.2.8 In the event of an unfavorable recommendation, the IPC, before finalizing its recommendation, can ask the applicant (through the office of the VRR) to comment on specific negative aspects and provide additional information. These comments shall be taken into consideration by the committee and presented to the Scientific Council along with the committee's final report and any additional new information submitted by the applicant.
- 5.2.9 The IPC submits its final report to the VRR. The report contains the committee's deliberations, observations, conclusions, and a clear recommendation for promotion, which is either 'for promotion' or 'against promotion'.
- 5.2.10 The VRR submits the IPC's report to the Scientific Council for discussion and review. The Scientific Council may seek the opinion of a fourth external reviewer, if necessary, for further clarification and takes the final decision on the case through a secret ballot. The VRR forwards the Council's decision to the Rector for his approval.
- 5.2.11 In exceptional cases, the Rector may, upon his review, send back the case to the Scientific Council for further elucidation.
- 5.2.12 The final decision on promotion, following the Rector's approval, is communicated to the candidate. If the promotion is approved, the Dean of Faculty and Personnel Affairs informs the candidate of his promotion. If the promotion is denied, the College Dean conveys the decision to the applicant.

5.3 Promotability

- 5.3.1 The IPC's recommendation with regard to a promotion case will be decided on the basis of the criteria specified in item 7 under Section 4.2 for Associate Professor and in item 9 under Section 4.3 for Professor.
- 5.3.2 The Scientific Council shall carefully study the reports of the external reviewers and the internal ad-hoc promotion committee, and take a decision to promote or not to promote the applicant.
- 5.3.3 If the Scientific Council decides not to promote the candidate for any weakness in the applicant's Research and Scientific contributions, a candidate can re-apply for promotion after six (6) months from the receipt of the decision of his previous application for promotion. For future re-application, the minimum requirements shall include at least one (1) new research unit in the case of application to the rank of Associate Professor and two (2) new research units for application to the rank of Professor.
- 5.3.4 If the Scientific Council finds that the candidate has claimed some of the submitted publications in support of his promotion which are duplications of the candidate's work in his MS thesis, his PhD dissertation, or his previous published work, the candidate will be denied consideration for promotion for one year, effective from the date of the Scientific Council's decision.

5.4 Withdrawal of Promotion Request

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

5.5 Action by the Scientific Council

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

5.6 Notification to Candidate

The VRR shall submit the decision of the Scientific Council on the candidate's application for promotion to the Rector for his approval. If the decision is favourable, it shall be communicated to the candidate by the Dean of Faculty and Personnel Affairs. In the case of an unfavorable decision, the concerned College Dean shall communicate to the faculty member the detailed evaluation of his performance with any recommendations for improvement. Feedback will also be provided to the candidate about his performance and further improvements.

5.7 Reapplication for Promotion

In the event of an unfavorable decision of the Scientific Council, the candidate may reapply for promotion after six months from the date of the decision. The reapplication shall be acted upon only if new evidence has been presented to justify its reconsideration as explained in item 5.3.3 of this Section.

Appendix A

GUIDELINES FOR AD-HOC INTERNAL PROMOTION COMMITTEES

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

A.1 Purpose and Responsibility of the Internal Promotion Committees (IPC)

The primary role of the IPC is to ensure that the candidate fulfils all the requirements for promotion set out by the University in these guidelines. The committees are entrusted with the implied role of building and maintaining a faculty of high quality through in-depth evaluations of all required credentials of the applicants and to ensure, in that process of evaluation, that fairness has prevailed without any bias or prejudice of any kind. By supporting or denying promotion, the committees should aim to uphold academic excellence and reject mediocrity and marginal contributions in a fair and constructive manner.

A.2 Maintenance of the Committee's Effectiveness

- A.2.1 The membership, deliberations, and report of the IPC are to be kept strictly confidential. The Chairman of the committee should remind its members of the confidential nature of their assignment. This should be kept in mind in the transaction of all written and oral communications. When the final recommendations and supporting documents are forwarded, it is the responsibility of the Chairman of the committee to destroy all copies and preliminary drafts.
- A.2.2 The Chairman of the committee has the responsibility of ascertaining that each member of the committee has read and understood the regulations, guidelines and instructions in this document.
- A.2.3 It is expected that the IPC will deal with a promotion case expeditiously by holding meetings as often as necessary, promptly collecting any other supportive materials deemed necessary for review and concluding the case within the expected timeframe by adhering to all relevant University regulations.

A.3 IPC's Report

A.3.1 The report of the IPC forms the basis for further review by the Scientific Council. The report shall include a thorough evaluation of all significant evidence for promotion, both favorable and unfavorable. It should be specific and factually sound, and adequately documented by reference to supporting materials.

A.3.2 The IPC's report should contain:

- (i) A thorough independent evaluation of the applicant's credentials in the three core components of evaluation, and
- (ii) A commentary on the external reviewers' observations and comments on the applicant's research output, taking into consideration the University's promotion standards as stipulated in these Promotion Guidelines.

A.3.3 The IPC's report shall contain four sections with a summary, and shall be structured in the following format:

Summary

1. Introduction

A general introduction shall be provided.

2. Evaluation

2.1 Teaching

- ***Input***

A sequential statement of all teaching and major teaching-related activities shall be provided.

- ***Evaluation of Teaching***

In this section, the IPC's assessment and evaluation of the candidate's teaching and teaching-related activities is covered with supporting data and information. The IPC shall make an effort to collect as much information as necessary in order to make their its evaluation complete. The committee may accord an overall rating for teaching using the five-step index of *excellent, very good, good, fair* and *poor*.

2.2 Research

- *Input*

A statement of all research-related activities and output shall be provided. A table should be included to show the total number of publications considered for the rank, dividing them into journals and conferences published as the sole author, first author and co-author for multi-authored publications. The table should indicate if the journals are ISI-ranked or non-ISI. An impact factor for the ISI journals shall also be provided.

- *Evaluation of Research*

- (a) *IPC's Evaluation*

In this section, the IPC presents its own independent assessment and evaluation of research outputs based on the following: (i) research output, (ii) quality of journals, (iii) quality of conferences, (iv) citations, (v) research independence, (vi) scholarly stature, and (vii) research leadership. The IPC should use a five-step quality scale of: *excellent, very good, good, fair and poor* for each evaluation component.

- (b) *Comment on External Reviewers' Assessment*

This is a mandatory requirement of the IPC's promotion report. The IPC includes in this section its collective opinion of the external reviewers' comments, evaluation and ratings on each and every item of the evaluation of research. This opinion—either concurrence, full or partial, or total disagreement—should be justified in a commentary. Where the IPC's opinion is at odd with those of the external reviewers, being either positive or negative, the IPC must provide a convincing, evidence-based argument. The IPCs have the burden of convincing the Scientific Council that their assessment and evaluation is fair, unbiased and impartial.

2.3 University and Public Service

- ***Input***

A statement of all services claimed by the candidate shall be provided.

- ***Evaluation of Services***

The IPC's assessment and evaluation of all services shall be covered. A rating for services should be given using the five-step quality scale of *excellent, very good, good, fair* and *poor*.

3. Promotability

In this section of the report, the IPC shall discuss the core issue of promotability by referring to all the requirements of promotion, namely the IPC's points table, the external reviewers' recommendations and the minimum point requirements (Section A.3.4). It shall also address any significant gap that may exist in points allocated by the individual members.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

In writing conclusions, the strengths and weaknesses, if any, should be included. Even if the candidate is recommended for promotion, there may be some suggestions with regard to improvement in some areas of teaching and learning, research and services which can be brought to the attention of the candidate.

The recommendation will be either "for promotion" or "against promotion". If the IPC members remain split on their recommendation, this should be mentioned with the count of votes in favor or against promotion.

A.3.4 The internal ad-hoc promotion committee has the responsibility of making a clear recommendation based on the average of points assigned by each of the committee members in each category. The points shall be solicited by secret ballot and the name of the members must not be disclosed. The report shall include a table of points as follows:

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

Note: Names of members must not be disclosed.

Total Points (out of 100)	
Rating (Excellent – Poor)	

The average of points in each category and the total points shall also be qualified using a *five-step scale* as follows:

- (i) **Excellent** : equivalent to a score of $\geq 90\%$ of the maximum number of points in a category.
- (ii) **Very Good**: equivalent to a score between 75 and 89% of the maximum number of points in a category.
- (iii) **Good** : equivalent to a score between 60 and 74% of the maximum number of points in a category.
- (iv) **Fair** : equivalent to a score between 50 and 59% of the maximum number of points in a category.
- (v) **Poor** : equivalent to a score $< 50\%$ of the maximum number points in a category.

A.3.5 All members of the internal ad-hoc promotion committee shall sign the report which, with all supporting documents, shall be submitted online by the Chairman of the committee to the VRR.

A.3.6 The committee should aim to complete its task within a maximum period of six (6) months from the formation of the committee.

A. 4 Dissolution and Reformation of IPC

The VRR has the authority to dissolve an Internal Promotion Committee in the event of serious reported or observed violations of the promotion regulations and guidelines and replace it with a new committee.

Appendix B

GUIDE TO THE PREPARATION OF THE DOSSIER

In order to initiate and complete the review process, the candidate and his department should provide all documentation necessary for the Internal Promotion Committee's deliberations and recommendations. The documentation assembled in one package is referred to as the candidate's promotion file or dossier. The following shall be included in a well-prepared dossier.

B.1 Input from the Candidate

B.1.1 Résumé

The candidate should prepare a well-structured résumé with a brief account of his career and qualifications. It should include basic personal data, a record of academic accomplishments, employment history, and other information such as recognitions, awards, professional certifications, membership in societies, etc.

B.1.2 Teaching

- a. A list of courses taught in each semester at KFUPM and other educational institutions, including student evaluations.
- b. Course coordination assignments.
- c. Course and lab development responsibilities.
- d. Participation in short courses.
- e. Supervision and advising of senior project students, summer training, coop students.
- f. Supervision of, and/or participation in, MS and Ph.D. student theses as committee chairman or member.

B.1.3 Research

- a. List of Publications

A list of publications, which shall be arranged in chronological order, separating them into two groups: (a) publications before the attainment of the current rank, and (b) publications under the current rank.

Furthermore, the list should be subdivided to include the following categories:

- Papers published or accepted for publication in ISI and other approved refereed journals.
- Papers in refereed proceedings in international conferences and symposia.
- Refereed technical reports, published or accepted for publication from specialized university research centers.
- Refereed textbooks and reference books.
- Refereed authentication reviews of rare books.
- Refereed translations of specialized scientific books.
- Refereed books and research reports published by scientific societies/authorities approved by the Scientific Council.
- Inventions and innovations with patents from recognized patent agencies approved by the Scientific Council.
- Distinguished creative activities according to a basis recommended by the Scientific Council and approved by the University Board.
- Public lectures, seminars, symposia, invited lectures, keynote addresses, etc.

It is essential that the candidate submits copies of all published or accepted-for-publication works which are claimed in support of his promotion. For accepted-for-publication works, copies of the acceptance letters should be enclosed to provide concrete evidence. In listing publications, the recommended format given in Appendix D shall be followed.

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

B.1.4 Professional Activities

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

(i) conference/workshop organization; (ii) honors and awards; (iii) editorial services; (iv) consulting; (v) services to professional societies.

B.1.5 University, Departmental and Public Service

a. Administrative positions and appointments held, with a clear indication of their duration.

b. Committee work.

In addition to tabulation of all committees, which include standing and ad-hoc committees, the candidate should indicate his role i.e. as chairman or member, specifying dates and committee level (University, College or Department). It is helpful to point out which of the committee assignments have been more important and had more impact.

B.1.6 Sample Résumé

The outline of a sample résumé is available online in the Promotion System.

B.1.7 Submission of Dossier

The candidate submits his dossier online with all required materials.

B.2 Input from the Department

The chairman of the concerned department shall provide the department's input on the candidate's performance in the three core areas of evaluation by expressing qualitative opinions that should be considered in the overall evaluation by the IPC.

B.2.1 Teaching

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

B.2.2 Research

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

B.2.3 University, Departmental and Public Service

The department chairman shall provide all available information on the effectiveness with which the candidate has discharged his committee assignments, and the degree of his involvement and leadership in other departmental and university affairs. The candidate's service to the community and his profession, if any, should also be described and documented.

B.3 Input From Faculty and Personnel

The Faculty and Personnel department shall provide the annual performance evaluation reports of the candidate for the last five years or the period since the candidate's appointment or last promotion, whichever is applicable.

B.4 Names of Potential External Reviewers

The candidate, the concerned department and the college dean shall submit separately and confidentially the names of at least ten (10) external reviewers from reputable universities who are recognized scholars and researchers in the fields or closely related fields of the candidate.

Appendix C

FORMAT FOR LISTING OF PUBLICATIONS

The candidate shall comply with the following recommended format in listing all of his publications.

C.1 Papers in Refereed Journals

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

C.2 Conference Papers

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

C.3 Technical Notes

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

C.4 Reports

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

C.5 Books and Book Chapters

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

C.6 Invited Lectures

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

C.7 Seminars

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

Appendix D

SELECTION OF EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR EVALUATION

D.1 Names of Potential Reviewers

For a promotion case, the candidate, the concerned department and the College Dean shall confidentially submit separate lists of names of potential reviewers, who can serve as experts to evaluate the research output of the candidate. The nominated reviewers must be from reputable universities, holding professor rank or its equivalent in their institutions, and having expertise and a significant contribution in areas (or closely related areas) of the candidate's specialization. Each list must contain at least ten (10) names as potential reviewers with their complete contact details including email and mailing address.

The candidate is barred from listing reviewers who are known to him or who have a personal association with him.

D.2 Selection of the Reviewers

The Scientific Council short-lists 6-10 potential reviewers in descending order of priority from the three lists of reviewers submitted separately by the candidate, the department and the college, after due review of the reviewers' scientific and research contributions as evidenced by the number of journal publications, H-index and citations.

The office of the VRR sends a letter to the primary selected reviewers soliciting their willingness to evaluate the research output of the candidate (Appendix E). If a reviewer declines, others on the approved list are approached, in order of priority, until three reviewers confirm their willingness to carry out the evaluation.

Appendix E

FORMAT OF LETTERS SENT TO EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

The office of the VRR contacts the selected reviewers in two stages: (i) first seeking their willingness to serve as external reviewers, and (ii) requesting the three selected reviewers to evaluate the research work of the candidate and to submit their evaluation. The following format of the letter is used in each communication.

E.1: Seeking the Willingness of the Reviewers

Dear Prof. _____,
The College of _____ at King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals, Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, has under consideration the request of one of its faculty members, Dr. _____, for promotion to the rank of Associate/Full Professor in [Department]. The candidate specializes in [specialization].

University policy requires that the scholarly and scientific contributions of a candidate for promotion be evaluated by recognized authorities outside the University in order to provide the decision-making authorities of the University with a supplementary independent assessment. In view of your research expertise, accomplishments and scholarly stature, the University would like to request you to kindly serve as an external reviewer for the candidate's research.

If you are willing, you will be given online access to view the candidate's résumé, our promotion guidelines, research evaluation form, and all published research work including a short list of research papers considered by the candidate as his most significant research contribution.

Your evaluation report is expected within *four weeks* from the receipt of the materials.

As an acknowledgement and appreciation of your professional services, the University will pay an honorarium of \$US ----- after receipt of your evaluation report. Please confirm your acceptance by pressing the ACCEPT button on the following URL:

<http://www3.kfupm.edu.sa/FacultyPromotionSystem/ExtForms/ShowWillingnessExtReviewer.aspx?refreeID=>

On receipt of your confirmation, you will be provided with a username and password through which you can logon to the online Faculty Promotion System and provide your evaluation. The Faculty Promotion Guidelines of our University, Research Performance Evaluation Form , copies of

Dr. _____'s complete list of publications and representative reprints selected by the candidate will be provided to you in due course.

We very much look forward to your positive response.

Sincerely yours,

Vice Rector for Research

E.2: Requesting Evaluation from the External Reviewers

Dear Prof. _____,

Thank you for your letter/fax/e-mail message dated confirming your willingness to evaluate the credentials of Dr....., for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor/Full Professor in the Department of _____.

I am pleased to inform you that you can access all information related to this promotion case which has now been uploaded to our website (www.kfupm.edu.sa/facultypromotionsystem). You can view the candidate's résumé, the complete list of his publications, prints of his selected papers, the Faculty Promotion Guidelines of our University, and the Research Performance Evaluation Form.

Please complete the Research Performance Evaluation Form online within four weeks. For access to our website, your user ID and password are as follows:

User ID: -----

Password: -----

As the promotion evaluation process at KFUPM is confidential, I would appreciate your treating the matter as such, and communicate only with my office if you need any further information or clarification.

We greatly appreciate your service and thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Vice Rector for Research

Appendix F

RESEARCH PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Name of Applicant: _____

Name of Reviewer: _____

Mailing Address: _____

IBAN No.: _____

Swift Code: _____

To the Reviewer:

One of the most important requirements for promotion is the research contribution of the applicant. You are requested to evaluate the promotability of the applicant based on the *research component only*, excluding teaching and services. In evaluating research, please examine the impact, significance and depth of scholarship of the applicant's research work, and ascertain if they are sufficient for promotion to the rank applied for.

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

I am actively engaged in research in the applicant's specific area.

I have carried out research in the past in the applicant's specific area.

My experience is in the general area but I have not worked in the applicant's specific area.

Other Comments: _____

Questions 1 through 8 deal with the candidate's research achievements. For each of the following components, please provide a rating and your justification of that rating:

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

Excellent

Very Good

Good

Fair

Poor

Justification: _____

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

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Justification: _____

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

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Justification: _____

4. How would you rate the **originality** of the candidate's publications?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Justification: _____

5. How would you rate the **significance** of the candidate's publications?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Justification: _____

6. How would you rate the candidate's **independence** in research?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Justification: _____

7. How would you rate the **citations** received by the candidate's work?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Justification: _____

8. What level of **scholarly stature** is indicated by the research?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Justification: _____

9. Please indicate your assessment of the applicant's **promotability**.

- Promotable
- Unpromotable

Justification: _____

Comments: _____

Appendix G

COMMITTEE MEMBER'S COMMITMENT STATEMENT

Confidential

To: _____

Subject : **Serving on the Ad-Hoc Internal Promotion Committee to consider the promotion request of Dr.** _____

I would like to request your participation in the committee as its **Chairman**/as a **Member** that will consider the application of Dr. _____ for promotion from _____ (rank) to _____ (rank) in the Department of _____. The "Faculty Promotion Regulations and Guidelines" adopted by the University are available at <http://www3.kfupm.edu.sa/FacultyPromotionSystem>.

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

I would appreciate it if you would indicate your willingness to work within the framework of these guidelines by clicking the link below:

<http://www3.kfupm.edu.sa/FacultyPromotionSystem/ExtForms/ShowWillingnessPC.aspx?pcID>

Thank you.

Vice Rector for Research

Nominated Committee Member's Reply

We would be pleased, if you kindly express your willingness for working as Member in the promotion committee for the promotion of

Dr. _____ by selecting one of the following options.

- Accept
- Decline

Comments: _____

Submit

Appendix H

DECLARATION FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST

In accordance with the University's promotion regulations, your application will be evaluated by an ad-hoc Internal Promotion Committee, to be formed shortly. For an impartial and unbiased evaluation, the members of the promotion committee are carefully selected to avoid those who may have a conflict of interest or personal enmity.

If you feel that any faculty member(s) in your department or in any other department (including the Research Institute) might be biased, you have the right to express your wish to exclude them. If you have opted for exclusion of any faculty members from the IPC, you will be contacted by the Office of VRR and asked to disclose the names of such faculty member(s) verbally (*not in writing*).

Candidate's wish to exclude or not to exclude any person from the Adhoc promotion committee.

- Yes**, I intend to exclude some names
- No**, I have nobody to exclude

Appendix I

POLICY ON MISCONDUCT IN RESEARCH

I.1 Preamble

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

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

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

I.2 Policy

It is the policy of KFUPM to:

- a) Maintain high ethical standards in research and publications and to prevent misconduct from occurring.
- b) Foster an environment that discourages misconduct in research and all other scholarly work.
- c) Censure instances of misconduct, when discovered, through proper disciplinary action.
- d) Provide proper safeguards against frivolous, mischievous or malicious misrepresentation in alleging misconduct.

The Vice Rector for Research shall disseminate this policy to all faculty members and researchers, and maintain records related to cases of misconduct in research.

I.3 Misconduct in Research

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

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

I.3.1 Basic Rules of Proper Conduct

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

I.3.1.1 Research Methods and Data Acquisition/Analysis

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

- f) The researcher should protect the anonymity of the respondents unless they specifically waive it.

I.3.1.2 Authorship

- a) Authorship attribution (publication credit) should only be given to those persons who made a significant intellectual contribution to the work and who shared responsibility and accountability of results. Significant intellectual contribution may include formulating the problem or hypothesis, structuring the experimental design, organizing and conducting the statistical analysis, interpreting the results, or writing a major portion of the publication. This attribution of authorship is not affected by whether researchers were paid for their contributions or by their employment status. In a University environment like the one at KFUPM, special emphasis should be given to student-professor collaboration. The student should be given due prominence on the list of co-authors of any multi-authored article based primarily on the student's work, including his thesis or dissertation.
- b) An administrative relationship to the research work or project does not constitute an attribution to authorship.
- c) Insignificant contributions to the work of a professional nature or clerical assistance, even if extensive, do not constitute attribution to authorship. Such contribution should however be acknowledged as footnotes or in the 'acknowledgment' section as appropriate in accordance to the practices of the discipline and the publisher.
- d) In a co-authored work, the order of the names represents the relative significance of the authors' contributions.
- e) The principal or correspondence author has the duty of ascertaining the compliance of the above authorship rules. He is specifically responsible for:
- Including, as co-authors, all persons who are entitled to co-authorship, and none who is inappropriate.
 - Sending each co-author a draft copy of the manuscript, and obtaining his consent, including the order of co-author's names.

I.3.1.3 Funded Research

- a) All funding sources used in the conduct of research should be acknowledged in the resulting publications, except when the sponsor (s) has expressed objection to such disclosure.
- b) All information about the sponsor's general business affairs and the findings of the research conducted for the sponsor should be kept confidential. The research work and the findings can only be published if permitted by the sponsor.
- c) All rules and guidelines issued by the sponsoring agency and those issued by KFUPM regarding funded research should be strictly adhered to including the management and disbursement of funds. All expenses under a funded project should be justified with prior approvals or receipt or invoices.

I.3.2 Forms of Misconduct

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

I.3.2.1 *Integrity of Analysis and Use of Results in Research*

- a) Fabrication or falsification of data and/or results.
- b) Intentional manipulation of experimental data to obtain biased results or to support a conclusion.
- c) Selective reporting of data, including the omission of conflicting data, in order to sway the results in a particular direction.
- d) Deliberately omitting material fundamental to the understanding of the procedure that were followed and material that other researchers would need to replicate and validate published findings.
- e) Making empirical observations without in-depth analysis and review; intentionally failing to make efforts to distinguish artifacts from observed phenomena.

I.3.2.2 Plagiarism and Related Practices

- a) Taking credit for a copied, rewritten or rearranged published or unpublished work of others (Plagiarism).
- b) Republishing a significant amount of a research paper in another language without acknowledging the author and the source. In the case of a translated paper, the original author and the source must be disclosed.

- c) Republishing part(s) of a research paper without making a full, clear, and explicit reference to the original publication, except where standard professional practice permits it (such as reporting research findings to a conference prior to final journal publication).
- d) Insufficiently and/or knowingly not citing the work of others, including associates and students.
- e) Improper attribution of authorship to anyone who has not made a significant contribution to the work.
- f) Abuse of confidentiality by improperly using information gained by privileged access.

I.3.2.3 Inappropriate Use of Research Funds

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

I.3.2.4 Violation of Regulations

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

I.4 Allegation of Misconduct and Disciplinary Actions

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

I.5 Precautions and Safeguards against Misconduct

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

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

Appendix J

SEQUENTIAL STEPS OF PROMOTION PROCESS FOR PROFESSORIAL RANKS AT KFUPM

In this Appendix, the promotion steps are stated in sequence. In Fig. 1 a flow chart of the various procedural steps involved in a promotion case are presented.

Candidate

1. Preparation of a dossier by the candidate as specified in Appendix B
2. Request for promotion initiated by the candidate is addressed to the *chairman of the department* forwarding his dossier together with a list of 10 possible external reviewers (Appendix D). The candidate submits his résumé and all materials online.

Chairman of the Department

3. Forms a departmental ad-hoc committee to examine the eligibility of the candidate for promotion in accordance with Section 3. The committee also proposes a list of ten (10) reviewers in the candidate's area of specialization (Appendix D).
4. Requests input from the Dean of Faculty & Personnel Affairs (Appendix B, Section B.3)
5. Presents the case to the Department Council for approval.
6. Writes an evaluation letter (Appendix B, Section B.2) and forwards the case to the College Dean enclosing all relevant internal documents. The complete file is forwarded to the Dean of the College within three weeks of receipt of the application.

Dean of the College

7. Suggests names of faculty members for the Internal Promotion Committee for consideration by the Vice Rector for Research.
8. The Dean of the college presents the case to the College Council for approval. The Council examines the case and selects a list of at least 10 reviewers. The Dean forwards the case to the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs within three weeks from the receipt of the file from the Department Chairman.

Vice Rector for Academic Affairs

9. The Vice Rector for Academic Affairs, upon approval, forwards the case to the Vice Rector for Research for further processing by the Scientific Council.

Vice Rector for Research

10. Assigns the Council's sub-committee to carry out a final examination of the eligibility of the candidate to seek promotion and suggest a sequence for potential external reviewers.
11. Presents the case to the Scientific Council for further verification and selection of 6-10 prioritized external reviewers on the basis of their research publication profiles.
12. Solicits willingness by forwarding a letter (Appendix E1) from the three primary external reviewers, and from back-up reviewers if one or more of the primary reviewers declines, till three reviewers confirm their willingness to evaluate the application.
13. Requests the three willing reviewers to carry out an evaluation of research (Appendix E2) and to submit their evaluation online by completing the evaluation forms (Appendix F).
14. Requests a commitment statement (Appendix G) from the faculty members selected to serve on the internal ad-hoc promotion committee.
15. Forms the five-member Internal Promotion Committee for the candidate.

Internal Promotion Committee (IPC)

16. The IPC studies the candidate's dossier, chairman's input and comments and all other documents submitted by the candidate in support of his promotion. The committee chairman ascertains that all internal documents are in order before calling for a meeting of the IPC.
17. The committee chairman should clarify all aspects concerning "confidentiality" before the deliberation of the committee. Sections 2, 3 and 4, and the external reviewers' evaluations and recommendations, form the basis of all deliberations.
18. The committee submits a report (Appendix A, Section A.3.3) on the promotion case to the Vice Rector for Research, with a recommendation for or against promotion based on the promotion criteria (Section A.3.3).

Scientific Council

19. Following the receipt of the IPC's report, the Vice Rector for Research presents the case to the Scientific Council for its review, deliberation and conclusion.
20. The Scientific Council decides whether the candidate is promoted or not through a secret vote. It may also decide to seek the opinion of an additional external reviewer, if necessary.

Vice Rector for Research

21. Forwards the decision of the Scientific Council to the Rector for approval. If the Rector does not approve the Council's decision within two weeks, the decision is treated as accepted. In case the Rector does not approve the Council's decision, he returns it to the Council for further clarification or consideration. If the matter is not finally resolved, the case may be referred to the University Board and the Board's decision will be final.
22. Informs the Dean of the College of the result of the application for promotion.
23. Provides Feedback to the candidate about his performance and further improvement.

Dean of the College

24. In the case of promotion being denied, the Dean shall advise the applicant about the reasons and shall inform him of any future requirements for his promotion. For an approved promotion case, the VRR informs the Dean of Faculty and Personnel Affairs of the University's approval for promotion. The Dean of Faculty and Personnel Affairs notifies the candidate of his promotion to the new rank.

PROMOTION PROCESS FLOW CHART



