Faculty Promotion Process Guideline

Faculty promotion is an important milestone. To be considered for promotion, an Academic Ranked Faculty member shall have contributed to all the University mission areas, notably the three domains of research, teaching, and service. They must be judged by peers to be of first rate and demonstrate promise of continued excellence and scholarly productivity.

Ranked faculty carrying other titles (Clinical, Research, of Practice) shall be assessed on the criteria defined by their faculty titles and appointments which generally would include two of the three domains. Their promotion portfolios would include only the relevant section(s) appropriate to their appointment and external independent assessors selected appropriately for their position.

The promotion procedure is based on a fair and an objective assessment of a candidate's dossier. It is based on and is complementary to the Faculty Promotion Policy. The Office of the Provost should be consulted in case of any ambiguity.

I. Minimum Standard

HBKU is a young University, and hence it is of paramount importance that high standards are set for HBKU to become a premier research intensive and primarily graduate level University. As such, distinction and excellence in the "research" domain must be clearly demonstrated as to any candidate who seeks promotion. The following is the minimum requirements to meet the University expectations:

- Candidates for Associate Professor:
  - Strong evidence that demonstrates the faculty's research excellence, research independence, international recognition and scholarly impact, (normally, but not limited to, leadership in authoring original and peer reviewed publications, leadership on submitted grants, leadership role in the supervision of graduate students, etc.).
  - Evidence that demonstrates effectiveness in student supervision, mentoring and advising
  - Student evaluations of teaching demonstrating excellence in teaching and curriculum development
  - Evidence that demonstrates appropriate level and impact of service to the University and the profession.
- Candidates for Professor:
  - Strong evidence that demonstrates faculty's sustained research excellence, international recognition, scholarly impact, leadership, and significant contribution
  - Evidence of creative and independent thinking and the ability to engage in new areas of research
  - Evidence of research support that presents a trajectory toward further growth and greater accomplishment
  - Evidence that the faculty's research and scholarly output is having impact in their academic discipline and gaining recognition
  - Evidence that demonstrates sustained successful teaching and student advising
  - Evidence of curriculum development

- Student evaluations of teaching demonstrating excellence in teaching and curriculum development
- Evidence that demonstrates exemplary level of service to the University and the profession.

The above establishes the minimum expectations for promotion. Each College may set a higher standard than the minimum University one and can establish more specific criteria that are consistent with their particular disciplines. Such criteria shall be endorsed by the Dean and must be approved by the Provost. The criteria should also be consistent with the University guidelines and in case of a conflict, the University criteria and procedures take precedence.

II. Promotion Dossier

1. Candidates intending to apply for promotion must consult with the College Dean. The Dean shall evaluate the eligibility of the applicant and provide counsel on the material to be included in the dossier.
2. The candidate is responsible for submitting a complete and detailed promotion dossier by the published deadline. Mere statements of accomplishments, not substantiated with evidence, are not encouraged. The candidate may consult with the Dean on how to include confidential evidence, if any, in the dossier. Late submissions will be automatically disqualified.

   The candidate should include the following in the promotion dossier and in sections, as detailed in the Promotion Policy:

   a. A signed memo requesting promotion consideration and a certification indicating the dossier is complete. The certification should be submitted to the Dean and the Provost.

   b. Curriculum vitae detailing the candidate's achievements. The CV should include a list of publications that includes the details of the publications, including all authors' names and order, number of pages, date of publication, publication venue and its status (e.g., ranking and place of the journal in its field, impact factor);

   c. Statement of research (not to exceed 5 pages);

   d. Teaching portfolio, including the following:
      - teaching statement that explains the faculty member's teaching style, philosophy and approach, and any significant teaching contributions while at HBKU.
      - All teaching evaluation summaries since the last successful promotion or appointment to HBKU.
      - Evidence of teaching excellence including tangible achievements, awards, students' feedback on teaching; etc.
      - Record of students' supervision at the undergraduate, Master and PhD levels. If students have already graduated, then their achievements and placements after graduation (current employers of Master and PhD graduates) should be included when available.

   e. A list of five independent external assessors. The policy details the criteria for listing independent assessors. The criteria are briefly summarized below:

      - Preferably from academia and with whom the candidate has had minimal or no interactions. Candidates to exclude would include PhD or Post-doc supervisor, a manager/colleague in a previous institution, collaborator, Co-author or Co-investigator

in a project. However, co-editor in a journal or co-chair in a conference, editor handling the applicant's papers, etc. would all be acceptable.

- Senior faculty members or equivalent with international stature, at or above the rank being considered for promotion.
- When possible, from top-tier institutions in the field.

f. The candidate may submit a list of names, if any, with whom the candidate has a conflict or perceived conflict and believes that they may not provide an objective assessment. A statement to justify the nature of the conflict is required.

g. The candidate holds the responsibility to provide documented evidence(s) that demonstrate the quality and impact of their contribution in research, teaching and service. HBKU recognizes that the quality and impact of a candidate's scholarship and standing within the disciplinary field is determined through an evaluation by internal and external peers, who draw on established indicators in the respective disciplinary area. In particular, scholarly quality and impact are discipline dependent and several measures, such as citation index and impact factor, may not be the only possible measures to demonstrate quality and impact of scholarship accomplishments. Colleges should propose measures and promotion rubric to qualify the distinction of quality and impact (e.g., Excellent vs. Very Good) as tailored to their respective disciplines and consistent with the University standards. Criteria and clarification methods used by the Colleges should be internationally recognized for the discipline and their recognition should be demonstrated via benchmarking with institutions that represent the top 25% in the discipline and as broadly recognized by the scholars of the discipline. Such methods require the approval of the Provost after consulting with the University Promotion and Appointment Committee, and the Provost endorsed methods shall be employed by all evaluation bodies at the University and College levels.

h. The dossier shall contain five publications deemed by the candidate to best reflect their research accomplishments. These sample publications will be sent to the external assessors.

i. Each College may have additional guidelines regarding the nature of the selected publications or scholarly refereed research work (e.g., books, book chapters, journal papers, etc.). However,

- The selected publications should be peer reviewed and original work and only those achieved since the current academic rank was attained may be considered as counting towards promotion;
- Publications that are under peer review should not be included, but publications that are accepted or in press may be used;
- In case the selected publications include multiple authors, then the candidate must demonstrate that they are the main contributor in at least three of them (it is noted that in some disciplines, single author publications are expected and this must be clearly stated by the College, if applicable).

j. The candidate must consult with the Dean if they would like to include additional materials. The Dean will determine the relevance of such materials. If approved by the Dean such material must be included in a separate section in the dossier under "Other Important Materials". If the candidate disagrees with the Dean, they may include a statement explaining the reasons for disagreement.

3. Once the dossier is certified as complete no additional material shall be added.

III. College Promotion and Appointment Committee (CPAC)

1. At the beginning of the academic year, the Dean forms the CPAC as per the Promotion Policy Article 4.8.2.
2. The CPAC will convene to evaluate the completeness of the dossier.
    a. If the dossier is complete the CPAC will
        i. Submit to the Dean a list of five independent assessors that are at arms-length from the candidate. These assessors are expected to be acknowledged scholars at the rank of Professor or equivalent preferably from premier universities or institutions, with whom the candidate has not worked or collaborated on research and/or teaching. Examples of independent assessors that should not be selected include a PhD or Post-doc supervisor, a mentor or colleague in a previous institution, collaborator, co-investigator in a project, co-editor in a journal, etc.
        ii. Evaluate the submitted material and the assessment reports obtained from the independent assessors (at least 3). The Dean shall be the communicating body with the independent assessors.
        iii. Deliberate the promotion case. The CPAC prepares a summary report including its assessment on the three domains (research, teaching and service) with justification for those ratings. Each of the domains must be rated as one of the following:
            - Excellent
            - Very good
            - Good
            - Unsatisfactory
        iv. The voting results and minority report, if any, must be included in the dossier.
        v. Submit the dossier to the Dean for evaluation.
    b. If the dossier is found to be incomplete, the CPAC may ask the candidate to submit the missing material or may disqualify the application and submit a reasoned report to the Dean. If the Dean concurs with the CPAC, the Dean shall notify the candidate and the Provost.

IV. Dean's Evaluation

1. The Dean evaluates the dossier submitted by the CPAC. The Dean shall submit a summary appraisal report detailing their evaluation on the three domains (research, teaching and service). The Dean's appraisal should be independent and may concur or disagree with the CPAC appraisal. The Dean shall evaluate the candidate in all three domains (research, teaching and service) using the rating scale:
    - Excellent
    - Very good
    - Good
    - Unsatisfactory

2. The Dean shall include all communications with external assessors in the dossier and forward the dossier, including their evaluation and that of the CPAC, to the Provost.

V. Assessors

1. HBKU has a policy of using external assessors to determine (as part of its determination) if an academic promotion is justified. Assessors should be persons of distinction within the disciplinary field.
2. The candidate submits in the dossier a list of five independent external assessors who are faculty members or equivalent with international stature, at or above the rank being considered for promotion.
3. The CPAC also submits to the Dean a list of five independent assessors that may or may not include independent assessors nominated by the candidate. These should be senior faculty members at the rank of Professor or equivalent with international stature.
4. The Dean shall secure input from the submitted lists of potential external assessors. The independent assessors' reports are necessary and the dossier shall not be evaluated without at least 3 independent appraisals with at least one from each list. If needed, the Dean shall ask the CPAC to nominate additional independent assessors. All communications, refusal, acceptance, not meeting the deadline should be included in the dossier.
5. The assessor's role is to act as an expert in the academic field able to offer the CPAC guidance on the candidate's scholarly impact, standing in the field, and fulfillment of HBKU/College criteria. The assessor report should:
    a. Address only the scholarly achievement of the candidate.
    b. Comment on the impact and the significance of the candidate's contribution to the discipline.
    c. Assess the potential and continued productivity of the candidate.
    d. Objectively evaluate the candidate's submitted materials.
    e. Comment on the scholarly independence and/or leadership (current or potential) in the field of the candidate.
    f. Include an evaluation of the scholarly outlets the candidate selected to present their scholarly contributions.
    g. Define their knowledge of and relationship with the candidate.
    h. Provide their professional judgment on the level of scholarship submitted by the candidate and if it warrants promotion at HBKU and their institution.
6. The Dean may reject an independent assessor's report (with a strong justification) if the Dean determines that the assessment was not objective, fair, or detailed. Superficial reports should be disqualified. The Dean shall seek input from other independent assessors to complete the required minimum number of independent reports. All communication reports for all assessors (qualified and disqualified) shall be inserted in the dossier following the Dean's evaluation. Rejection of a report must be reasoned and should be rare. Negative evaluation on its own does not justify disqualification of the report.

VI. University Promotion and Appointment Committee (UPAC)

1. The Provost forms the UPAC as per Article 4.8.3 of the Faculty Promotion Policy.
2. The UPAC convenes to review and evaluate the dossier. The Committee shall submit a summary report detailing its evaluation on the three domains. Each of the domains must be rated on the following scale with justification for those ratings:
    - Excellent
    - Very good
    - Good
    - Unsatisfactory
3. The UPAC is authorized to return incomplete files to the College without review and only commence the review once the promotion file is complete as per the University requirement.
4. The UPAC is authorized to reject independent reports if it determines that the assessment did not provide an objective, fair and detailed assessment of the applicant's scholarly achievements. In this case, the UPAC shall revert to the College and request that the Dean secure input from independent assessors to complete the required minimum number of independent reports. Strong justification of disqualification of reports by the UPAC must be placed in the dossier.
5. All committee members must vote in support or against promotion, except in case of conflict of interest.
6. The voting results and minority report, if any, must be included in the dossier.
7. Submit the completed dossier to the Provost for review.

VII. Provost Review and Recommendation

The Provost reviews the recommendations provided at all levels in the dossier. Upon appraisal of the dossier, the Provost may endorse or deny the promotion. In all circumstance, the Provost shall submit his/her recommendation to the President for review and approval.

VIII. President Approval

The President has the final authority to approve promotion applications. The President notifies the Provost and the Provost shall communicate via the Dean the President’s decision to the candidate. If the final decision, after the President’s review, is to deny the promotion application, then the Provost shall communicate via the Dean, in writing, to the applicant a reasoned memo detailing the grounds for denial.

IX. Mandatory Promotion and Appeal

An Assistant Professor must apply for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor upon completing the minimum period as articulated in the Promotion Policy. Assistant Professors who fail to apply for promotion will receive a terminal contract whereby the eighth year shall be the terminal year under all circumstances.

Assistant Professors who are denied promotion in the first attempt are allowed a second attempt before the end of the seventh year of service:

- A candidate who submitted an early promotion case (i.e., before the end of the fifth year of service) will be allowed to apply for promotion again in due course.

- A candidate who submitted a mandatory promotion case (i.e., after five years of service) may be allowed to reapply, but no later than the immediate next promotion cycle.
- If the second promotion attempt is denied, a terminal contract will be issued for one year.

Associate Professors who are denied promotion to the rank of full Professor are allowed to reapply again. However, the period between any promotion attempts shall be no less than one promotion cycle. Exception may be granted by the Provost with the Dean's endorsement.

Faculty members who are denied promotion may appeal the negative decision as articulated in the Faculty Promotion Policy on the grounds of material irregularity in the process. The appeal should be directed to the Provost within 10 working days of the candidate being notified of their unsuccessful promotion.