

**King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals**

**Dhahran - Saudi Arabia**



## **Faculty Promotion**

## **Regulations and Guidelines**

*Office of the Vice President of Research and Innovation(VPRI)  
Revised March, 2024*

## Table of Contents

<b>1.</b>	<b>PREAMBLE</b>	<b>Page 3</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION</b>	
2.1	Teaching	Page 4
2.2	Research and Scientific Contributions	Page 5
2.3	Departmental, University, and Public Service	Page 6
<b>3.</b>	<b>MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS FOR PROMOTION</b>	
3.1	Degree Requirement	Page 6
3.2	Assistant Professor Appointment	Page 7
3.3	Associate Professor	Page 7
3.4	Professor	Page 8
3.5	Special Cases	Page 9
<b>4.</b>	<b>PROMOTION TO PROFESSORIAL RANKS</b>	
4.1	Common Requirements	Page 10
<b>5.</b>	<b>UNIVERSITY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY PROMOTION</b>	
5.1	Policies	Page 12
5.2.	Procedure	Page 14
5.3.	Promotability	Page 16
5.4	Withdrawal of Promotion Request	Page 17
5.5	Action by the Scientific Council	Page 17
5.6	Notification to Candidate	Page 17
5.7	Reapplication for Promotion	Page 17
<b>Appendix A:</b>	<b>Guidelines for Ad-Hoc Internal Promotion Committees</b>	
A.1	Purpose and Responsibility of the IPC	Page 18
A.2	The IPC's Effectiveness	Page 18
A.3	The IPC's Tasks	Page 18
A.4	The IPC's Report	Page 19
A.5	Dissolution and Reformation of the IPC	Page 23
<b>Appendix B:</b>	<b>Guide to the Preparation of the Promotion Dossier</b>	
B.1	Input from the Candidate	Page 24
B.2	The Department Chairman's Input	Page 26
B.3	The Faculty and Personnel Input	Page 26
B.4	Names of Potential External Reviewers	Page 26
<b>Appendix C:</b>	<b>Format for Listing of Publications</b>	
C.1	Papers in Refereed Journals	Page 27
C.2	Conference Papers	Page 27
C.3	Technical Notes	Page 27
C.4	Reports	Page 27
C.5	Books and Book Chapters	Page 27
C.6	Invited Lectures	Page 27
C.7	Seminars	Page 27
<b>Appendix D:</b>	<b>Selection of External Reviewers for Evaluation</b>	
D.1	Information of External Reviewers	Page 28
D.2	Selection of the External Reviewers	Page 28
<b>Appendix E:</b>	<b>Requesting Evaluation from the External Reviewers</b>	Page 29
<b>Appendix F:</b>	<b>Research Performance Evaluation Form (For External Reviewers)</b>	Page 30
<b>Appendix G:</b>	<b>Committee Member's Commitment Statement</b>	Page 32
<b>Appendix H:</b>	<b>Declaration for Conflict of Interest</b>	Page 34
<b>Appendix I:</b>	<b>Policy on Misconduct in Research</b>	Page 35
<b>Appendix J:</b>	<b>Sequential Steps of Promotion Process for Professorial Rank at KFUPM</b>	Page 40
	<b>Flow Chart of Promotion Process</b>	Page 43

## 1. PREAMBLE

Reputed universities have established procedures for promoting their faculty to higher academic ranks in recognition of their accomplishments. King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals (KFUPM) is no exception, and its promotion process is designed to ensure transparency and fairness, with strict adherence to university regulations. This document outlines the guidelines and procedures for promotion. The purpose of the promotion process is twofold: to assess a candidate's suitability for promotion and to provide feedback on their performance in research, teaching, and service to both the university and the public. These three areas are the primary criteria considered during the promotion evaluation. By implementing the promotion process, the university aims to foster academic excellence while addressing any issues of mediocrity or marginal contributions in a fair and constructive manner. It is important to note that the regulations and guidelines outlined in this document have been approved by the Scientific Council and are in accordance with the 'Unified Bylaws for Faculty' established by the Higher Education Council of Saudi Arabia in 1996 (1417H). This updated Faculty Promotion Regulations and Guidelines version supersedes all previous versions and remains valid until further revisions are made.

In addition to the main content, this booklet includes Appendices A-K, which provide detailed information on the roles and responsibilities of various committees and administrative processes related to the promotion regulations and guidelines. Relevant appendices are referenced when more specific details are required.

### Acronyms

- VPAA** : Vice President for Academic Affairs
- VPRI** : Vice President for Research and Innovation
- IPC** : Internal Promotion Committee

## **2. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION**

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

- Teaching
- 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 indispensable qualifications for promotion to higher professorial ranks.

### **2.1 Teaching**

Since teaching is one of the primary functions of all KFUPM faculty, a candidate for promotion must demonstrate his/her ability to participate and contribute effectively to teaching-related activities in addition to his/her other responsibilities. The evaluation of the teaching performance will be based on the candidate's involvement in the following teaching-related activities:

- a. Demonstration of competence in the subject matter in the classroom and participation in teaching-related public presentations (e.g., colloquia, seminars, symposia, short courses, conferences, etc.).
- b. Initiation and participation in curriculum development (e.g., new courses, new programs, etc.).
- c. Development of new labs and effective engagement in developing and using Instructional Laboratories.
- d. Engagement in the development and use of technology-based innovative teaching methods.
- e. Guidance of student activities and effectiveness in supervising Senior Projects, Summer Training, and Coop Programs (if applicable).
- f. Effective participation in graduate programs (if applicable) and in continuing education programs.
- g. Authoring of textbooks.
- h. Teaching load and participation in various undergraduate and graduate courses.
- i. Effective engagement in student advising and counseling.
- j. Contribution and role in committees for course development or other teaching activities.
- k. Demonstration of competence in teaching via students' evaluation.

To evaluate a candidate's teaching performance, information can be gathered from various sources such as the candidate's department chair, colleagues, students (particularly senior undergraduate and graduate students), alumni, and course materials. However, it is important to note that these sources should be viewed as indicators of competence rather than absolute measures of teaching performance. Faculty members are expected to maintain comprehensive course files that include syllabi, material outlines, homework assignments, lab work, exams, and other relevant information. These files should be made available to the promotion committee upon request. In cases where multiple instructors are involved in teaching a course, the input of the course coordinator may be obtained through the department chair.

## **2.2 Research and Scientific Contributions**

The quality of a university's teaching and graduate programs depends on its faculty's research and scholarship. That's why the university only promotes faculty members who are actively involved in high-quality research and creative scholarships. Evaluating scholarship and the effectiveness of a candidate can be challenging, but the goal is to fairly assess the depth of their scholarship. This is directly linked to their research's creativity, significance, and scholarly reputation. Candidates' published research in reputable journals, conference proceedings, monographs, technical reports, or original professional work like architectural designs or computer software can provide evidence of their creative research.

When evaluating published scholarly work, its significance is more important than the quantity. The quality of the journals where publications appear, or feedback from respected individuals in the field can help assess their significance. Contributions such as survey articles, books, and supervision of master's theses and Ph.D. dissertations also indicate effective scholarship. In addition, publications like articles, textbooks, reports, and similar works that contribute to professional literature, or the advancement of professional practice or education should be considered evidence of effective scholarship, especially if they present new ideas or incorporate scholarly research. Evidence of scholarly stature can include serving on editorial boards, giving keynote addresses at conferences, serving on technical committees, acting as a reviewer, receiving awards, and engaging in high-level consulting work.

A candidate's scholarly and creative contributions to their discipline should be of high quality and recognized nationally or internationally. They should have management skills, experience in supervising graduate students and supporting their publication efforts, and the ability to lead and manage teams or projects. Collaboration with colleagues to enhance the university's reputation, adherence to professional ethics, and maintaining university values in behavior and interactions with colleagues are also important factors.

### **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 will be considered without any exception:

- **College of Engineering and Physics**  
**College of Computing and Mathematics**  
**College of Petroleum Engineering and Geosciences**  
**College of Chemicals and Material**  
**College of Design and Built Environment**  
Only ISI-listed journals shall be considered for promotion.
- **KFUPM Business School**  
All ISI-listed journals, in addition to those rated not less than 3 in the evaluation rating of the Association of Business School, UK (ABS).
- **College of General 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 formulating its policies. Recognition shall, therefore, be given to faculty members who prove themselves to be capable of being 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, developing training programs, and establishing effective links for technical cooperation between KFUPM and other institutions or industries. Noteworthy contributions to the student's 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 based on 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 would 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 a "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.
- Journal publications with unauthorized multiple affiliations emanating from the research work conducted by a faculty member during his/her employment with KFUPM will not be considered for points calculations for promotion to a higher professorial rank.
- It should be understood that the minimum qualifications are necessary for the application for promotion but may not be sufficient for granting 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, exceptions can be made in certain fields of study and in special cases (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 Appointment

KFUPM affiliates who acquired their Ph.D. abroad via official scholarship can be appointed assistant professors upon completing their Ph.D. A candidate for this rank must show promise of successful research performance. Publications resulting from his/her 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

The candidate should have four (4) or more years of successful teaching and research at a recognized university after attaining his Ph.D. 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 completing the doctorate or equivalent degree is given in *section 3.5*. An Associate Professor should demonstrate mature and independent scholarship. Research and other scholarly activities should indicate creativity, significance, and impact. 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 with patents from recognized patent agencies approved by the University and commercialized products; a maximum of one unit is accepted.
9. Any other 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.

### 3.4 Professor

The candidate should have eight (8) or more years of successful teaching and research work at a recognized university after attaining his Ph.D. degree are required. For candidates with an industrial or professional background, the time requirement of combined university teaching and pertinent experience after completing the doctorate or equivalent degree, with at least four years of teaching. 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 to teaching and service are important. However, the main emphasis is on research and scholarly achievements. Thus, all candidates to this rank must demonstrate that their research achievements have had a recognized impact on the advancement of knowledge in their subject area. The candidates for promotion to this rank must satisfy the following minimum requirements in Research and Scientific Contributions:

- Six (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 needed 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.

#### **Important Notes:**

In determining the minimum number of units for promotion to either the rank of *Associate Professor* or to the rank of *Professor*, it shall be ascertained that the candidate's research and scientific contributions were published or accepted for publication while the candidate was at his current rank of Assistant Professor (in case of promotion to Associate Professor) or current rank of Associate Professor (in case of promotion to 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 universities and scientific establishments). It shall also be ascertained that materials submitted for consideration are not exactly extracted from the candidate's MS thesis, Ph.D. 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/her field of specialty.
- (ii) *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/her 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/her 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 Common Requirements

- 4.1.1 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/she should have demonstrated teaching effectiveness at various levels of the undergraduate and, where applicable, graduate programs.
- 4.1.2 The candidate for promotion shall have a record of successful research achievements, demonstrating his/her capability to conduct independent and original research. He should be a recognized scholar 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.
- 4.1.3 While *quantitative* standards might vary from one discipline to another, a 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.
- 4.1.4. In the case of multi-authored publications, 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.
- 4.1.5 Papers presented at reputable international conferences, refereed and published in full in the proceedings thereof, will be accepted.
- 4.1.6 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 publication requirement.
- 4.1.7 The candidate's contributions must indicate a consistent commitment to improving the department's and his own role in training undergraduate and graduate students.
- 4.1.8 When opportunities exist, the candidate is expected to have taught several graduate-level courses and supervised several MS and PhD theses.

- 4.1.9 The candidate must have demonstrated ability as an educator, proven by his participation and leadership in developing undergraduate and graduate programs.
- 4.1.10 The candidate is expected to share the service responsibilities of his/her Department, College, and University and provide professional service to his/her discipline and the community. While service cannot be considered equivalent to teaching or research, the candidate's service activities enhance his/her qualifications for advancement. A record of such services should be compiled and documented by the candidate. Comments on the quality of service activities from the department chairman and others may be requested.
- 4.1.11 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 are 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 candidate's promotion.

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 candidate's promotion. If two of the three external reviewers recommend promotion and one does not recommend the promotion of the candidate, a fourth external reviewer shall be asked to evaluate the candidate's achievements in Research and Scientific Contributions, and his/her 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 presented in the flow chart 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 President for Research and Innovation (**VPRI**). The membership of this committee shall include distinguished faculty and researchers holding a higher rank than the candidate's. The **VPRI** 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 (RI) in the same or a closely related field of specialization as that of the candidate for promotion. The exception to this rule may apply at the discretion of the **VPRI** in those cases where this condition cannot reasonably be fulfilled due to the non-availability of qualified faculty members from the colleges or the Research Institute.
  - (b) Two to three members in fields of specialization related to that of the candidate.
  - (c) The **VPRI** shall appoint the chairman and the committee members.
  - (d) The committee membership shall not include the present chairman of the candidate's academic department.
- 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/her promotion application.

- 5.1.5 If the candidate is the Dean, the **VPAA** should chair the meeting of the College Council concerning his/her promotion application.
- 5.1.6 The Scientific Council shall select, from reputable universities, three primary external reviewers who are recognized scholars and have demonstrated expertise in the same field(s) of research as that of the candidate to evaluate the candidate's research accomplishments. While the Scientific Council normally considers the list of potential external reviewers submitted by the college, the department and the candidate, it may discard suggested 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 **VPRI**, 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 **VPRI** 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 consider 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 decide on the candidate's promotability after evaluating the promotion report submitted by the **IPC** in conjunction with the external reviewers' reports.
- 5.1.10 The Scientific Council may request the **IPC**, the department concerned, or the candidate to submit supplementary details or information that may assist the Council in making its final decision regarding the promotion.
- 5.1.11 The Scientific Council may decline the recommendation of the **IPC** if it finds irregularities and unsubstantiated conclusions in the **IPC** report.
- 5.1.12 The **VPRI** shall submit the Scientific Council's recommendation to HE, the President.

- 5.1.13 At all evaluation stages, confidentiality shall be strictly maintained by all members/persons involved in the promotion process. All discussions, deliberations, and reports shall be kept confidential at all evaluation stages.
- 5.1.14 If the candidate applying for promotion is a Department, College, or Scientific Council member, the candidate should not attend meetings where his promotion case is discussed. He or she may not see any report or decision relevant to evaluating his/her performance except that communicated to him by the **VPRI**.

## **5.2. Procedure**

- 5.2.1 The University has adopted an online system for submitting all promotional materials and tracking progress. 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 The candidate may initiate a promotion request six months before fulfilling the minimum time requirements. The request should be addressed to the department's chairman, and all supporting documents, as outlined in “Guide to the Preparation of the *Promotion Dossier*” (*Appendix B*), shall be submitted online. The candidate is responsible for ensuring that the complete dossier with all required materials is correctly uploaded to the online 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 and ascertains the candidate's eligibility (according to the regulations stated in Section 3). The department committee proposes a list of at least **20** 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 supported by details of his eligibility and the list of suggested external reviewers. The candidate should be informed that his/her 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 to select faculty names who can serve as members of the 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 those the Departmental Council nominated. Within three weeks, the Dean notifies the **VPAA** of the College Council's recommendation, the list of external reviewers, and the names of possible promotion committee members. The **VPAA** shall forward the case to the Chairman of the Scientific Council (**VPRI**) for an evaluation of promotability by the Scientific Council.
- 5.2.5 The **VPRI** presents the application to the Scientific Council for further examination and selection of 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 professor 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 **VPRI** office seeks the external reviewers' willingness to serve as reviewers through correspondence, 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 **VPRI** forms the five-member Adhoc **Internal Promotion Committee (IPC)**. He may choose some or none from the list of possible faculty members suggested by the College Dean. The **IPC** performs 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 candidate (through the office of the **VPRI**) to comment on specific negative aspects and provide additional information. These comments shall be considered by the committee and presented to the Scientific Council along with the committee's final report and any additional new information submitted by the candidate.
- 5.2.9 The **IPC** submits its final report to the **VPRI**. The report contains the committee's deliberations, observations, conclusions, and a clear decision on promotion, which is either 'for promotion' or 'against promotion'.
- 5.2.10 The **VPRI** 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 take the final decision on the case through a secret ballot. The **VPRI** forwards the Council's decision to the President for his approval.
- 5.2.11 In exceptional cases, the President 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 President's approval, is communicated to the candidate. If the promotion is approved, the Dean of Faculty and Personnel Affairs informs the candidate of his/her promotion. If the promotion is denied, the College Dean conveys the decision to the candidate.

### **5.3 Promotability**

- 5.3.1 The **IPC**'s recommendation about a promotion case will be decided based on the criteria specified in item 7 under Section 4.1 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 **IPC** and decide whether to promote or not to promote the candidate.
- 5.3.3 If the Scientific Council decides not to promote the candidate for any weakness in the candidate's Research and Scientific contributions, a candidate can re-apply for promotion after six (6) months from receiving the decision of his/her previous application for promotion. For future re-application, the minimum requirements shall include at least one (1) new research unit for 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/her promotion, which are duplications of the candidate's work in his/her MS thesis, his/her Ph.D. dissertation, or his/her 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 candidate for promotion has the right to withdraw his/her application at any stage. Such cases will not be presented to the Scientific Council. However, these candidates will be eligible to reapply for promotion based on the production of new evidence after 12 months from the withdrawal date of the promotion request.

## **5.5 Action by the Scientific Council**

The **IPC** report shall be presented to the Scientific Council. The Scientific Council then conducts a comprehensive review and decides for or against the candidate's promotion.

## **5.6 Notification to Candidate**

The **VPRI** shall submit the decision of the Scientific Council on the candidate's application for promotion to the President for his approval. If the decision is favorable, the Dean of Faculty and Personnel Affairs shall communicate it to the candidate. In the case of an unfavorable decision, the concerned College Dean shall communicate to the faculty member the detailed evaluation of his/her performance with any recommendations for improvement. Feedback will also be provided to the candidate about his/her 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 six months after the decision date. 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 (**IPCs**) shall be guided by the regulations and procedures set out in this document. Unless otherwise stated, the same regulations and guidelines are used for faculty members assigned to the Research Institute.

#### **A.1 Purpose and Responsibility of the IPC**

The primary role of the **IPC** is to ensure that the candidate fulfills 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 high-quality faculty through in-depth evaluations of all required credentials of the candidates and to ensure, in that evaluation process, 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 disregard mediocrity and marginal contributions in a fair and constructive manner.

#### **A.2 The IPC's Effectiveness**

**A.2.1** The IPC's membership, deliberations, and reports must be kept strictly confidential. The committee chairman should remind its members of the confidential nature of their assignment. This should be kept in mind in all written and oral communication transactions. When the final recommendations and supporting documents are forwarded, the committee's Chairman is responsible for destroying all copies and preliminary drafts. It is highly emphasized that the IPC and scientific council members are strictly forbidden from leaking out any proceedings to the candidate or any other external parties. Such actions are deemed highly unethical and unprofessional.

**A.2.2** The committee's Chairman is responsible for ascertaining that each committee member has read and understood the regulations, guidelines, and instructions in this document.

**A.2.3** The IPC is expected to deal with the 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 The IPC's Tasks**

In judging the effectiveness of the candidate's teaching, the Internal Promotion Committee, **IPC** (*Appendix A*) shall consider the candidate's command of his/her subject, professional advancement in his/her field, ability to organize and present

his/her materials with clarity and vigor; capacity to make students aware of the interdisciplinary relationship of subject; the spirit and enthusiasm which energize learning and teaching; ability to infuse intellectual curiosity in students and to stimulate discussions; personal attributes as they affect teaching, students, and colleagues; and the extent and skill of participation in the general guidance and counseling of students.

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 **IPC**. The final report by the **IPC** should include all the above-mentioned facts and scholarly achievements of the candidate in detail and then cast their vote based on the quality and quantity (his/her publications data should be limited to ISI ranking) of his/her research accomplishments.

The committee should ensure that the CV is prepared as per the latest Promotion-Dossier-Template in all aspects as approved by the Scientific Council and made available on the KFUPM Homepage.

- a. Ensure that the candidate's *Promotion Dossier* contains all necessary information as per the provided Dossier-Template and return the incomplete ones.
  - Complete Promotion-Dossier
  - Upload the journal publications to the promotion online system
  - Describe the quantitative contributions of all co-authored papers.
- b. Study the external reviewers' list and ensure that their specialties align with the candidate.
- c. Confirm the information given in the Table of Journal Papers' IF and ranking before sending it to external reviewers.

## **A.4 The IPC's Report**

**A.4.1** The report of the **IPC** forms the basis for further review by the Scientific Council. The report shall thoroughly evaluate all significant evidence for favorable and unfavorable promotion. It should be specific, factually sound, and adequately documented by reference to supporting materials.

**A.4.2** The **IPC**'s report should contain:

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

**A.4.3** The **IPC**'s report shall contain four sections with a summary and shall be structured in the following format, along with the relevant appendices. The ***IPC Report-Template*** is available online in the Promotion System for use by the committee.

# INTRENAL PROMOTION COMMITTEE IPC-REPORT

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### SUMMARY

#### 0. INTRODUCTION

- A The Applicant's Educational and Employment Profile
- A.1 Education Profile
- A.2 Employment History

#### 1. TEACHING

- 1.1 Teaching Quality
- 1.2 Teaching Load
- 1.3 Variety of Courses
- 1.4 Curricula/Course Development
- 1.5 Student Engagement and Advising
- 1.6 **Teaching:** IPC Evaluation and Conclusion

#### 2. RESEARCH

- 2.1 IPC Review and Evaluation
- 2.2 The External Reviewers (ERs) Evaluation
- 2.3 Summary of the ERs Scores and Rating
- 2.4 Summary of the IPC Members Rating
- 2.5 Observations, Concerns and/or Inconsistencies
- 2.6 **Research:** IPC Evaluation and Conclusion

#### 3. COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC SERVICES

- 3.1 Professional Activities
- 3.2 Outreach Activities (Off-Campus)
- 3.3 Committee Contributions

#### 4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 Rating
- 4.2 Recommendations

### APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A:** Students' Evaluation of Teaching
- APPENDIX B:** Chairman Input
- APPENDIX C:** Summary of External Reviewers Reports
- APPENDIX D:** Feedback Form
- APPENDIX E:** Directions on Promotion Committee Report
- APPENDIX F:** Secret Ballots Sheet (*For Use by the IPC*)

**Teaching:** 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 collect as much information as necessary to complete its evaluation. The committee may accord an overall rating for teaching using the five-step index of *excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor*.

**Research:** 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***

**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.

**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 every item of the research evaluation. This opinion - either concurrence, full or partial, or total disagreement should be justified in a commentary. Where the **IPC's** opinion is at odds with those of the external reviewers, whether positive or negative, the **IPC** must provide a convincing, evidence-based argument. The **IPC** is burdened with convincing the Scientific Council that its assessment and evaluation are fair, unbiased, and impartial.

### **3. University and Public Service**

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

#### **Important Notes to the IPC**

- The IPC must conduct its task efficiently by genuinely reflecting on the candidate's performance/profile.
- Particular emphasis has to be given in this connection that the IPC's evaluations and observations should be meaningful and adequately revealed in its report to provide insight into the promotion case, which will assist the Scientific Council in studying the case effectively.
- The IPC's report should include the essential information and the IPC members' independent assessments of the candidate's performance in various components and in research in particular.
- The IPC should not only depend on the external reviewers' observations by merely describing their given data as per their reports. The more the IPC is expressive in its report by providing comments on the external reviewers' ratings and reflecting its deliberation on the case, the easier it is for the Scientific Council to conclude the case duly.
- The IPC's report should present data and facts and conduct analysis and discussions.
- The IPC report should include all committee members' views regarding the following issues:
  - i. **Discrepancies** among sources, e.g., Chairman input, Students' evaluation/input, and the IPC members related to teaching.
  - ii. **Discrepancies** within external reviewers' input, ratings, and observations.

- iii. **Disagreements** between the IPC members and external reviewers (if any)
- iv. **Major disagreements** (e.g., a 10-point gap) between the IPC members' teaching, research, and community services scoring and ratings.
- v. **Evaluation** of the candidate's contributions to multi-author works.
- vi. **Verification** of the candidate's research work, ensuring it is not extracted from his/her Ph.D. in case of *Associate Rank* promotions.

**Promotability:** In 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.

**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 concerning improvement in some areas of teaching, research, and services that can be brought to the candidate's attention.

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. The **IPC** is responsible for making a clear recommendation based on the average of points assigned by each committee member in each category. The points shall be solicited by secret ballot, and the members' names must not be disclosed. The report shall include a table of points as follows:

Promotion Evaluation Matrix					
IPC Members	Teaching	Research	Community Services	Total	Rating
Points Out of	(25)	(60)	(15)	(100)	*
Member-1					
Member-2					
Member-3					
Member-4					
Member-5					
Average:					
%:					
Rating:					
Total:	___/100 ( __%)	Rating:			
* Excellent (EX), Very Good (VG), Good (G), Fair (F), Poor (P)					
The Candidate’s Overall Performance					
Average:					
Rating:					
Note: Names of members must not be disclosed					

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

The total numerical score on a **100-point** scale (**25** points for **Teaching**, **60** points for **Research and Scientific Contributions**, and **15** points for **University, Department, and Public Services**) shall not be less than **60** points of which **35** points must be in **Research and Scientific Contributions** for the rank of *Associate Professor* and **40** for the rank of *Professor*.

Rating Scheme				
Rating		Teaching	Research	Community Services
	%	(25)	(60)	(15)
<b>Excellent</b>	$\geq 90$	$\geq 22.5$	$\geq 54$	$\geq 13.5$
<b>Very Good</b>	$\geq 80 - < 90$	$\geq 20 - < 22.25$	$\geq 48 - < 54$	$\geq 12 - < 13.5$
<b>Good</b>	$\geq 70 - < 80$	$\geq 17.5 - < 20$	$\geq 42 - < 48$	$\geq 10.5 - < 12$
<b>Fair</b>	$\geq 60 - < 70$	$\geq 15 - < 17.5$	$\geq 36 - < 42$	$\geq 9 - < 10.5$
<b>Poor</b>	$< 60$	$< 15$	$< 36$	$< 9$

**A.4.5** All members of the ad-hoc **IPC** shall sign the report which, with all supporting documents, shall be submitted online by the committee's Chairman to the **VPRI**.

**A.4.6** The committee should aim to complete its task within a maximum period of six (6) months from the formation of the committee.

## **A.5 Dissolution and Reformation of the IPC**

The **VPRI** has the authority to dissolve an **IPC** 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 PROMOTION DOSSIER

To initiate and complete the review process, the candidate and his/her department should provide all documentation necessary for the Internal Promotion Committee's (IPC) 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 Promotion Dossier

The candidate should prepare a well-structured *Promotion Dossier* with a brief account of his/her 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.

The proposed structure and contents of the Promotion Dossier (as shown on the next page) are available online in a ready-made *Template* in the Promotion System for download and use by the candidates. The candidate submits his/her *Promotion Dossier* online with all required materials.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

			<b>SUMMARY OF MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS</b>
<b>1.</b>		<b>*</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE RECORD (RESUME)</b>
	<b>1.1</b>		Personal Profile
	<b>1.2</b>		Education Record (recent first)
	<b>1.3</b>		Specialization (Areas of Research Interest)
	<b>1.4</b>		Employment Record (recent first)
	<b>1.5</b>		Consultation and Professional Activities
	<b>1.6</b>		Training (Training Activities, Certification, and Training Experience)
	<b>1.7</b>		Awards, Honors and Professional Affiliations
<b>2.</b>		<b>*</b>	<b>TEACHING</b>
	<b>2.1</b>		Courses Taught
	<b>2.2</b>		Course Coordination
	<b>2.3</b>		Course and/or Curricula Development
	<b>2.4</b>		Senior Projects, Summer, and COOP/Internship Supervision
	<b>2.5</b>		Student Advising
	<b>2.6</b>		Short Courses
	<b>2.7</b>		Lab Development
<b>3.</b>		<b>*</b>	<b>MASTER AND DOCTORAL STUDENTS' SUPERVISION</b>
	<b>3.1</b>		Master Theses Supervision /Advising
	<b>3.2</b>		Ph.D. Dissertation Supervision /Advising
<b>4.</b>		<b>*</b>	<b>RESEARCH</b>
	<b>4.1</b>		Research Interests /Specific Areas
	<b>4.2</b>		Research Projects (Sponsored/Funded)
	<b>4.3</b>		Publications
	<b>4.3.1</b>		<b>Refereed Journal Papers</b>
	<b>4.3.1A</b>		List of Referred Journal Papers (ISI) under the <i>Current Rank</i> (recent first)
	<b>4.3.1B</b>		List of Referred Journal Papers <i>before the attainment</i> of the <i>Current Rank</i>
	<b>4.3.2</b>		<b>Refereed Conference Papers</b>
	<b>4.3.2A</b>		List of Referred Conferences Papers under the <i>Current Rank</i> (recent first)
	<b>4.3.2B</b>		List of Referred Conferences Papers <i>before the attainment</i> of the <i>Current Rank</i>
	<b>4.3.3</b>		<b>Refereed Technical Reports</b>
	<b>4.3.4</b>		<b>Book Writing and Book Chapters</b>
	<b>4.3.5</b>		<b>Patents (Filed and Registered)</b>
	<b>4.4</b>		Citations and Contributions [i.e., excluding self-citations]
	<b>4.4.1</b>		<b>List of Publications (Main Contributions)</b>
	<b>4.5</b>		Contribution to Co-authored Papers
<b>5.</b>		<b>*</b>	<b>COMMUNITY AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</b>
	<b>5.1</b>		<b>Professional Activities</b>
	<b>5.1.1</b>		Conference Organization
	<b>5.1.2</b>		Conference Presentations
	<b>5.1.3</b>		Invited Talks/Lectures
	<b>5.1.4</b>		Review of Technical/Journal Papers, Proposals and Reports
	<b>5.1.5</b>		Membership of Refereed Journal Editorial Boards
	<b>5.2</b>		<b>Outreach Activities</b>
	<b>5.2.1</b>		National Committees and Councils/Boards (Off-Campus)
	<b>5.2.2</b>		Social, Community and Other Activities and Involvements
	<b>5.2.3</b>		Public Seminars, Lectures, and Workshops (On And Off Campus)
	<b>5.3</b>		<b>Committee Work (On Campus)</b>
	<b>5.3.1</b>		Administrative Assignments
	<b>5.3.2</b>		Departmental, College and University Committees
	<b>5.3.3</b>		Other Committees/Councils/Boards
	<b>A</b>		<b>APPENDIX A: Details of Teaching Evaluation</b>
	<b>B</b>		<b>APPENDIX B: Supporting Documents</b> (if found necessary)
	<b>C</b>		<b>APPENDIX C: Additional Information</b> (if found necessary)
	<b>D</b>		<b>APPENDIX D: Additional Work</b> (in case of re-applying for the rank)

## B.2 The Department Chairman's Input

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**.

The chairman of the candidate should briefly provide holistic commentary (a paragraph or two or in bullet format) on the candidate's Teaching, Research, University, and Community Services, taking into consideration the associated aspects/elements mentioned under each category as follows:

- I. **Teaching:** Teaching Quality: Interactivity, use of technology, IBL, infusing soft skills, etc.; Teaching Load: Number of credit hours /year (excluding summer); Variety of taught courses: Teaching different courses at undergraduate and graduate level; Student comments: Formal or informal input received from students; Curricula/Course Development: Initiating, participating, updating old or new programs/courses; Student mentoring and advising: Summer/Internship, Capstone, Trips, MSc, PhD advising; Candidate's self-development: (e.g., workshops, training, teaching techniques, IBL, etc.)
- II. **Research:** Distinction in the field (e.g., leadership); productivity; quality of research work; research collaboration; capacity building; mentoring (e.g., graduate students, junior faculty, etc.).
- III. **University and Community Services:** Public engagement: professional societies involvements, committees work and contributions; community services; recognition and awards.
- IV. **Areas for Improvement:** The chairman should briefly provide commentary on the candidate's potential areas for improvement with respect to teaching, research, university, and community services

## B.3 The Faculty and Personnel Input

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 5, 20, and 10, respectively (i.e., a total of 35) 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/her 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 Information of External 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 candidate's research output. The nominated reviewers must be from reputable universities, holding professor rank or its equivalent in their institutions, and have expertise and a significant contribution in areas (or closely related areas) of the candidate's specialization. Each list must contain at least **5** names by the candidate, **20** by the Department, and **10** by the College) as potential external reviewers. The candidate is prohibited from listing reviewers who are known to him/her or who have a personal association with him/her. The Candidate, Department and the College are obliged to provide the relevant information about the external reviewers who should be in the specialized area of the candidate. The information should be in a prescribed tabular format as given below.

1	Name
2	Rank
3	Affiliation
4	Subject Area
5	Specialty
6	Active Area of Research
7	Research Familiarity and Engagement (classified 1, 2, 3)
8	h-Index
9	QS Ranking (of University /Institute he/she is affiliated with)
10	Number of Journal Publications
11	Citations
12	Total Number of Publications
14	Phone and Fax
13	Email
15	Webpage

Since the external reviewer's evaluation plays a crucial role in the promotion process, the candidate can update his/her **Dossier** before sending his/her case to the external reviewers. After this date, any **Dossier** updates will not be entertained.

#### D.2 Selection of the External Reviewers

The Scientific Council short-lists **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 their h-index, the number of journal publications, and citations. The office of the **VPRI** sends a letter to the primary selected external reviewers soliciting their willingness to evaluate the candidate's research output (*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

### E.2: Requesting Evaluation from the External Reviewers

Dear Dr. \_\_\_\_\_.

The College of \_\_\_\_\_ at King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals (KFUPM), Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, has under consideration the request of one of its faculty members, Dr. \_\_\_\_\_, for promotion to the rank of Associate/Full Professor in [Department]. The candidate specializes in [Specialization]. The University policy requires that the scholarly and scientific contributions of a candidate for promotion be evaluated by recognized external authorities in the area of his/her specialization and specific research in order to support the decision-making of the University with a supplementary independent assessment.

Given 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 (A) **candidate's dossier**, (B) his/her **published research work** including (C) a **short list of research papers** considered by the candidate as his/her most significant research contribution; (D) our **promotion guidelines**, and (E) **Research Performance Evaluation Form**. Your evaluation report is expected within four weeks from the receipt of the materials.

As an acknowledgment and appreciation of your professional services, the University will offer an honorarium of \$US\_\_\_\_\_ after receipt of your evaluation report. Please confirm your acceptance by pressing the **ACCEPT** button on the following URL: <https://facultypromotion.kfupm.edu.sa/ExtForms/ShowWillingnessExtReviewer.aspx?appl> Upon receipt of your confirmation, you will be provided with a username and password through which you can login to the online **Faculty Promotion System** and provide your evaluation.

In case of **DECLINE** also, please click on the same URL and provide your reason.

We very much look forward to receiving your positive response.

Sincerely yours,

\_\_\_\_\_

Vice President of Research and Innovation (VPRI),  
King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals (KFUPM)

## Appendix F

### RESEARCH PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM (FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS)

Name of Candidate : \_\_\_\_\_

Applied to the Rank of: ☐ Associate Professor, ☐ Professor

Name of Reviewer : \_\_\_\_\_

To the Reviewer:

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

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

- [ ] I am actively engaged in research in the candidate's specific area.  
[ ] I have carried out research in the past in the candidate's specific area.  
[ ] My experience is in the general area and I have not worked in the candidate's specific area.  
[ ] Other Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

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

#### 1. Productivity

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. Quality of Journals

How would you rate the overall **quality of the journals** in which the candidate has published?

[ ] Excellent [ ] Very Good [ ] Good [ ] Fair [ ] Poor

Justification: \_\_\_\_\_

#### 3. Quality of Conferences

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

[ ] Excellent [ ] Very Good [ ] Good [ ] Fair [ ] Poor

Justification: \_\_\_\_\_

#### 4. Originality

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

☐ Excellent    ☐ Very Good    ☐ Good    ☐ Fair    ☐ Poor

Justification: \_\_\_\_\_

#### 5. Significance

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

☐ Excellent    ☐ Very Good    ☐ Good    ☐ Fair    ☐ Poor

Justification: \_\_\_\_\_

#### 6. Independence\* / Leadership\*\*

How would you rate the candidate's **independence\*** and **leadership\*\*** in research?

\* In case of promotion to the rank of "Associate professor"

\*\* In case of promotion to the rank of "Professor"

☐ Excellent    ☐ Very Good    ☐ Good    ☐ Fair    ☐ Poor

Justification: \_\_\_\_\_

#### 7. Citations and Impact

How would you rate the **citations** received and **the impact** of the candidate's work in his/her field (as evidenced by citations, invitation (s) as keynote speaker, etc.)?

☐ Excellent    ☐ Very Good    ☐ Good    ☐ Fair    ☐ Poor

Justification: \_\_\_\_\_

#### 8. Scholarly Stature

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

☐ Excellent    ☐ Very Good    ☐ Good    ☐ Fair    ☐ Poor

Justification: \_\_\_\_\_

#### 9. Promotability

Please indicate your assessment of the candidate's **promotability**.

☐ Promotable  
☐ Unpromotable

Justification: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix G

### COMMITTEE MEMBER'S COMMITMENT STATEMENT

Confidential

To: \_\_\_\_\_

Subject: **Serving on the Ad-hoc Internal Promotion Committee (IPC)**  
**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 <https://facultypromotion.kfupm.edu.sa/ExtLogin.aspx>.

To provide an atmosphere that 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 IPC members keep the deliberations, observations, and recommendations of the committee strictly confidential. According to these rules, you are expected to take the utmost care not to divulge any information concerning the candidate and any person involved in the promotion process and to abstain from discussing 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:

<https://facultypromotion.kfupm.edu.sa/ExtForms/ShowWillingnessPC.aspx>

Thank you.

\_\_\_\_\_,

Vice President of Research and Innovation (**VPRI**),  
King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals (**KFUPM**)



### Member's Reply of Nominated Internal Promotion Committee (IPC)

We would be pleased, if you kindly express your willingness to work as a *Member* of the **IPC** for the promotion of

Dr.  by selecting one of the following options.

☐ **Accept**

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

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

☐ **Decline** Comments (if any): \_\_\_\_\_

**Please decline in case of co-authorship with the candidate.**

**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 (**IPC**), to be formed shortly. For an impartial and unbiased evaluation, the members of the **IPC** 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 **VPRI** 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 **IPC**

- ☐ **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 the 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 acknowledgment of authorship.
- c) Appropriate use of research funds.

Preserving ethical standards and 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 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 **VPRI** 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 selecting the research methodology and analyzing data. Specifically, the researchers should :
  - Employ only research tools and analysis methods 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 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 the accuracy of results. The data must be presented in an organized fashion to allow for verification.
- d) All original data should be maintained for a reasonable length of time, e.g. 5 years from the date of publication.
- e) When research involves human respondents (e.g. 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 for results. Significant intellectual contributions 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/her 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 contributions 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 are inappropriate.
  - Sending each co-author a draft copy of the manuscript, and obtaining his/her consent, including the order of co-author's names.

### **I.3.1.3 Funded Research**

- a) All funding sources used in research 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 the sponsor permits.
- c) All rules and guidelines issued by the sponsoring agency and those issued by KFUPM regarding funded research should be strictly followed, including the management and disbursement of funds. All expenses under a funded project should be justified with prior approvals, receipts, or invoices.

### **I.3.2 Forms of Misconduct**

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

#### **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 President 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 President 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 allegations of misconduct in research.

## Appendix J

### SEQUENTIAL STEPS OF THE PROMOTION PROCESS FOR PROFESSORIAL RANKS AT KFUPM

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

#### Candidate

1. Prepares his *Promotion Dossier* as specified in *Appendix B*
2. Initiates the promotion application addressed to the *department chairman* by forwarding his/her dossier and a list of **5** possible external reviewers (*Appendix D*). The candidate submits his/her *Promotion Dossier* and all materials online. Faculty can submit their promotion application up to the end of the eighth week from the start of the second academic semester. Promotion applications submitted after this deadline will be on hold for processing by the start of the following academic semester. The candidate can check his/her promotion progress on the promotion online system until his/her file is sent to the external reviewers.

#### 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 twenty (**20**) 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 candidate's application.

#### Dean of the College

7. Suggests names of faculty members for the Adhoc Internal Promotion Committee (**IPC**) for consideration by the **VPRI**.
8. Presents the case to the College Council for approval. The Council examines the case and selects a list of at least **10** external reviewers. The Dean forwards the case to the **VPAA** within three weeks of receiving the file from the Department Chairman.

#### Vice President for Academic Affairs

9. Upon approval, The **VPAA** forwards the case to the **VPRI** for further processing by the Scientific Council.



## **The VPRI**

10. Assigns the Council's sub-committee to conduct 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 10 prioritized external reviewers based on their research publication profiles.
12. Solicits willingness by forwarding a letter (*Appendix E1*) from the three primary external reviewers and 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 conduct research evaluation (*Appendix E2*) and 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 Ad-hoc **IPC**.
15. Forms the five-member Adhoc **IPC** for the candidate.

## **The IPC**

16. The **IPC** studies the candidate's dossier, the chairman's input and comments, and all other documents submitted by the candidate in support of his/her promotion. The committee chairman ascertains that all internal documents are in order before calling for a meeting of the **IPC**.
17. The **IPC** 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 **IPC** submits a report (*Appendix A*, Section A.3.3) on the promotion case to the **VPRI**, 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 **VPRI** 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.

## **The VPRI**

21. Forwards the decision of the Scientific Council to the President for approval. If the President does not approve the Council's decision within two weeks, the decision is treated as accepted. If the President 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/her performance and further improvement.

### **Dean of the College**

24. In the case of promotion being denied, the Dean of the college shall advise the candidate about the reasons and shall inform him of any future requirements for his/her promotion. For an approved promotion case, the **VPRI** 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/her promotion to the new rank.

## FLOW CHART OF PROMOTION PROCESS



