



UNITED ARAB EMIRATES UNIVERSITY

Section: HR-FAC

Procedure Number: HR-FAC-07-01

Supporting Policy Number: HR-FAC-07

Date Approved: August 27, 2006

Effective Date: September 1, 2006

Date Last Revised:

Responsible Office: Associate Provost for Academic Affairs

Faculty Promotion Procedure

I. Application Procedure and Requirements

To be considered for promotion, a faculty member must submit a written request for consideration of promotion along with the promotion file to the Department Chair/Program Coordinator no later than September 30 of the academic year in which he/she applies for promotion (see Time-Line for Promotion Review below). Candidates applying for promotion are responsible for ensuring that all required materials are available and complete and that the portfolio or promotion file has been prepared properly. The promotion file should include the following documents:

1. Six copies of the applicant's resume;
2. Copies of all "DEPARTMENTAL/PROGRAM ANNUAL EVALUATION FORM" and "ANNUAL EVALUATION BY THE DEAN FORM" documents, and/or any other evaluation forms used in previous annual reviews;
3. A portfolio or performance report consistent with the promotion requirements for the rank to which the candidate is applying (maximum length 10 pages);
4. Six copies of each publication submitted to support the promotion application (maximum 10 publications may be considered), in addition to a summary list of these publications that includes the publication title, name of publisher, date of publication or acceptance, pages, volume reference and name(s) of author(s);
5. A report on the candidate's participation and contribution to joint publications. If the candidate was not the first author in a publication to which he/she claims a major contribution, supporting documentary evidence of the degree of participation may be provided;
6. A copy of the candidate's thesis or dissertation and a list of any subsequent publications related to the MA thesis or PhD dissertation;
7. A list of prospective external reviewers as well as potential conflicts of interest among prospective external reviewers.

If a candidate for promotion is serving as Department Chair/Program Coordinator, his/her promotion file should be submitted to the Office of the Dean under whose supervision the full review will be conducted before being submitted to the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. The Dean will take over all responsibilities herein assigned to the Department Chair/Program Coordinator.

II. Time Line for Promotion Review

Promotion file due to Department Chair/Program Coordinator	No later than September 30 th
Department/Program's Promotion Review (including external reviewers evaluation)	Begins October 1 st and ends no later than February 15 th
Dean's Promotion Review	Begins no later than February 15 th and ends no later than March 15 th
College Promotion Review	Begins no later than March 15 th and ends no later than April 15 th
APAA Promotion Review	Begins no later than April 15 th and ends no later than May 15 th
Provost's Recommendation	By May 22 nd
Vice Chancellor's Decision	By May 31 st
Appointment in the new rank for promoted faculty	September 1 st of the next academic year

III. The Committees

Participation in evaluation and decisions related to promotion shall be limited to faculty members whose academic rank is higher than the candidate's. Department Chairs/Program Coordinators are excluded from this requirement whenever a promotion case of one of their own faculty is evaluated in the Department/Program or the College Promotion Committee, as explained below. Faculty members serving in the terminal year of a teaching contract are ineligible for appointment to a promotion committee. If the candidate being considered for promotion is the Department Chair/Program Coordinator, the promotion application shall be submitted directly to the Dean who will refer it to the College Promotion Committee.

Associate Provost for Academic Affairs Promotions Advisory Group: The Promotions Advisory Group shall consist of the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, who shall serve as Committee Chair, and his/her designees from among the various deans and/or faculty of the university. The composition of this committee is entirely at the discretion of the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs.

College Promotion Committee: At the beginning of the academic year, each Dean shall appoint a College Promotion Committee. All departments/programs should have at least one representative on the College Promotion Committee. Departments/programs that do not have a faculty member at the rank of Professor will be represented by the Department Chair/Program Coordinator. The Dean appoints the Chair of the College Promotion Committee.

Department/Program Promotion Committees: Each Dean shall also appoint a Department/Program Promotion Committee at the beginning of the academic year. Department Chairs/Program Coordinators may serve on the Department/Program Promotion Committee regardless of their academic rank, but if they do not hold the rank of Professor they may not serve as Chair of the Department/Program Promotion

Committee. The Dean will also appoint two faculty to serve on the Department/Program Promotion Committee, and one of these two will serve as Chair of the Department/Program Promotion Committee. If there are insufficient incumbent Professors or Associate Professors in the Department/Program (at least two, excluding the Department Chair/Program Coordinator), the College Promotion Committee will assume the responsibilities of the Department/Program Promotion Committee. In such cases, the Department Chair/Program Coordinator of the affected unit will be appointed as a member of the College Promotion Committee, and will participate in the evaluation of all promotion cases of his/her own faculty regardless of the Department Chair/Program Coordinator's academic rank.

If there are insufficient incumbent Professors in the department/program, Associate Professors may be appointed to the Department/Program Promotion Committee. They only participate when Assistant Professors are being considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. When Associate Professors are being considered for promotion to the rank of Professor, only faculty at the rank of Professor should participate in the process.

IV. Review Process

Upon receipt of the promotion application, the Department Chair/Program Coordinator, together with the Office of the Dean shall review the promotion file to verify that the candidate has satisfied the required years of service stipulated below under "Length of Service Requirements for Promotion." The application shall be submitted to the Department/Program Promotion Committee, where an initial evaluation of the candidate's achievements and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service is conducted. The Department/Program Promotion Committee may request any additional information it deems necessary to complete the evaluation process.

As part of the initial evaluation, the Department/Program must obtain and consider at least three letters of external evaluation from specialists in the candidate's area of expertise. Departments/Programs must adhere to the following guidelines when seeking outside evaluators:

1. External referees shall be selected from senior faculty or administrators at institutions with programs at least comparable to those at the UAEU. External referees should hold at least the academic rank for which the UAEU faculty member is being considered. External referees should not be friends, graduate school acquaintances, former professors or colleagues of the candidate. If, in an unusual situation, the latter are used, the extraordinary circumstances must be explained in the evaluator's letter. Furthermore, such letters must represent a minority of those submitted with the portfolio.
2. In assembling a list of prospective referees, candidates may submit to the Department Chair/Program Coordinator a maximum of four names of potential outside evaluators. Candidates may not contact any of the four individuals. Candidates may also supply a list of names of those he/she believes would be unable to serve as objective external reviewers. For example, if a candidate has experienced a professional conflict of interest with a colleague over a grant proposal or article review, said colleague may not be the most appropriate person to serve as an external referee. If the candidate does submit such a list, he/she should provide a brief statement on the nature of the conflict with an explanation concerning why the individual should be disqualified as an external reviewer.

3. Members of the Department/Program Promotion Committee shall assemble and submit to the Department Chair/Program Coordinator a list of at least four persons so qualified and with the same restrictions as noted in Paragraph 1 above. In cases where there are distinct and appropriate disciplinary sub-fields, the Department/Program Promotion Committee should solicit names from department/program faculty from that sub-field.
4. The Department Chair/Program Coordinator may also submit names of possible reviewers. The Department/Program Promotion Committee will select a minimum of five referees from these lists, without revealing the names to the candidate. At least one person from each list must be selected to serve as an outside evaluator.
5. The Dean shall review and approve the list of external referees prior to solicitation of their participation in the promotion process. The Dean shall provide the Chair with a template to address the issues enumerated in #6 below.
6. The Department Chair/Program Coordinator shall contact the external referees in writing. Telephone conversations conducted between the Department Chair/Program Coordinator and potential evaluators must be documented in writing. External referees should receive the candidate's complete vita together with a copy of the candidate's publications. A copy of the UAEU criteria and standards for promotion along with any additional promotion standards specific to the department/program/college should also be sent to the external referee. The referee must be counseled in the letter of request to include the following while completing the specific form:
 - a. Address only the candidate as a scholar without reference to his/her role in instruction or service, and rank the candidate's scholarship performance as excellent, very good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory;
 - b. Comment on the extent to which the candidate's scholarly/creative record constitutes a significant contribution to his/her discipline; for example, evidence of the impact of the candidate's work on the discipline and the extent to which the candidate's publications have been recognized or cited by others;
 - c. Speculate on the candidate's potential for continued productivity;
 - d. Judge whether the candidate has attained the level of scholarship required for promotion based upon the criteria of the UAEU as well as that of the candidate's college;
 - e. Define the referee's knowledge of or relationship to the candidate.

Department Chairs/Program Coordinators must forward every letter received from an outside evaluator to the Department/Program Promotion Committee along with the candidate's file. The Department/Program Promotion Committee should include these letters with the promotion file in conjunction with its appraisal summary and its recommendation to the Department Chair/Program Coordinator to either (1) proceed with promotion or (2) not to proceed with promotion. The Department Chair/Program Coordinator will forward the recommendation of the Department/Program Promotion Committee together with his/her own written evaluation and recommendation to the Dean along with the following documents:

1. The original of the promotion application, the candidate's file, and the evaluation reports from external reviewers;

2. An appraisal report by the Department Chair/Program Coordinator concerning teaching, scholarship and service accompanied by an evaluation of the candidate's commitment to academic principles, values and ethics, his/her contributions to the achievement of department/Program goals, rapport with colleagues, and interaction with students.

After considering the deliberations of the Department Chair/Program Coordinator and the Department/Program Promotion Committee, the Dean shall submit a report along with the above items to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. The report shall include an independent assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service along with a statement regarding the candidate's collegiality, and a recommendation on promotion.

If the Dean's recommendation agrees with that of the Department/Program Promotion Committee and the Department Chair/Program Coordinator, the report to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs shall be considered complete. If the Dean's recommendation is counter to that of the department/program, the Dean shall first submit his/her report to the College Promotion Committee, which may request additional information before issuing its recommendation to the Dean and the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. Recommendations from the College Promotion Committee and the Dean are advisory to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. The Dean shall submit the candidate's file to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs together with the following:

1. The original of the promotion application, together with the candidate's promotion dossier;
2. The Department/Program Promotion Committee Report;
3. The appraisal report of the Department Chair/Program Coordinator;
4. The appraisal report of the Dean and, if applicable, the recommendation of the College Promotion Committee.

The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs may accept or reject the Dean's recommendation and, if applicable, that of the College Promotion Committee. The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs may or may not request a deliberation in closed session with the Promotions Advisory Group, which would advise the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs to proceed with or deny the promotion. Note that recommendations of the Promotions Advisory Group are advisory in nature. The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs suggests approval or denial of the promotion to the Provost who, in turn, makes a recommendation to the Vice-Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor approves or denies the request for promotion. This decision is communicated to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs who shall inform the decision to the Dean as well as to the Human Resources Department. The Dean shall inform the candidate and the Department Chair/Program Coordinator of the decision.

V. Appeals

If the request for promotion is denied, a faculty member may submit an appeal in writing to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. Appeals are limited to five hundred words and should address the specific grounds upon which the request is based. Appeals are due to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs within one week of the Vice Chancellor's decision. The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs may or may not request a closed session with the Promotions Advisory Group which will advise the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs to proceed with or deny the appeal. Recommendations of the Promotions Advisory Group are

advisory in nature. The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs may suggest approval or denial of the appeal to the Provost who, in turn, makes a recommendation to the Vice Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor will either deny the appeal or accept it and reverse the original decision. The Provost and the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs are then informed with the decision that will be reported to the Dean for informing the candidate. In case the original decision is reversed, the Human Resources Department must be notified. Once a decision has been reached, the candidate's file will be returned to the Dean.

VI. Length of Service Requirements for Promotion

Assistant Professors must normally complete at least three years of teaching at the college or university level before applying for promotion. Associate Professors must complete a minimum of four years of teaching prior to applying for promotion. In both cases, at least two years of service must have been completed at the UAEU prior to the application process. New faculty with prior experience in rank shall negotiate the number of years to be counted towards the next promotion with the Department Chair/Program Coordinator and the Dean at the time of appointment.

Assistant Professors must apply for promotion latest by the beginning of the seventh year of service as a faculty member. An eighth year of service without promotion is considered the terminal year under all circumstances. There is no maximum period of service during which an Associate Professor must be promoted to the rank of Professor. Contract renewals for Associate Professors who do not make application for promotion to Professor are dependent upon continued performance at a level consistent with the expectations of the Associate Professor rank.

In exceptional cases, the minimum period for promotion may be reduced upon approval by the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs.

All requirements regarding length of service also apply to faculty seconded or contracted from other universities.

VII. Promotion Criteria for Faculty Ranks

Annual evaluation of faculty performance in teaching, scholarship and service is the foundation for promotion review. Each year Department Chairs/Program Coordinators and Deans must complete a performance evaluation for every faculty in their unit. Faculty members are judged on their performance in teaching, research and service. In addition, the Department Chair/Program Coordinator renders a judgment regarding the faculty member's collegiality.

An ideal promotion application at the departmental/program level may include three portfolios: one each for teaching, scholarship and service. Along with the annual evaluations of faculty performance, the candidate's portfolio constitutes the bulk of the evidence in support of his/her application for promotion. External evaluations of the candidate's scholarship through letters from peer evaluators provide additional evidence of the quality of the candidate's scholarship. Peer evaluation of teaching consists of a series of classroom visits rather than one single observation, and provides additional evidence of the quality of the candidate's teaching.

1. Minimum Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires documentation that the candidate complies with one of the two profiles below:

Profile A. “Excellent” rating of performance in either teaching or scholarship, and at least “Satisfactory” ratings in the two remaining areas of performance. Ratings must reflect the candidate’s performance at the UAEU as well as any previous service at other institutions, if any.

Profile B. “Very Good” rating in at least two areas of performance, and at least “Satisfactory” in the remaining area of performance. Ratings must reflect the candidate’s performance at the UAEU as well as any previous service at other institutions, if any.

2. Minimum Criteria for Promotion to Professor. Promotion to the rank of Professor requires documentation that the candidate complies with either of the two following profiles:

Profile C. “Excellent” performance in either teaching or scholarship; “Very Good” performance in one of the remaining areas, *i.e.*, teaching, scholarship or service; and at least “Satisfactory” in the remaining area. Ratings must reflect the candidate’s performance at the UAEU as well as any previous service at other institutions, if any.

Profile D. Candidates will be expected to produce a consistent and convincing record of research, publication, creative activity, and scholarly achievement beyond the “Excellent” level of performance. Candidates must demonstrate a sustained record of success in securing external funding during their service at the UAEU. External evaluations from scholars in the field must document excellent performance in scholarship at the UAEU. In addition, the candidate must be rated at least “Satisfactory” in both service and teaching (if teaching assignments have been given). Ratings must reflect the candidate’s performance at the UAEU as well as any previous service at other institutions, if any.

Detailed description concerning the different levels of performance is provided below for all performance areas.

VIII. Promotion Standards for Performance Evaluation

Minimum performance standards in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service and, faculty collegiality (for the purpose of annual review and promotion in rank) are set forth in this section. Each college and/or department/program within the university may establish additional standards to reflect the characteristics of performance levels specific to the discipline or profession. However, additional standards cannot be lower than the minimum standards identified in this section. Additional requirements at the department/program level must be approved by the Dean while the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs should approve additional requirements at the college level. While additional standards may differ across departments/programs and colleges, overall performance standards are expected to be of comparable rigor among all academic units within the university.

The determination of all ratings outlined below is qualitative and based on the professional judgment of the respective evaluator(s).

1. Standards for Evaluation of Teaching Performance

The evaluation of effective teaching and related instructional activities should be based on three criteria:

- Internal evaluation of the faculty member's teaching portfolio at the departmental/program level;
- All student evaluations for every course taught at the UAEU;
- Peer-evaluation at the departmental/program (and/or college) level. For details on peer evaluation, see the section titled "Procedure for Peer Evaluation of Teaching (PET)" included in the procedure on "Annual Evaluation of Faculty."

Teaching evaluations should include a behaviorally-anchored statement that assesses the faculty member's contributions in each criterion in a qualitative fashion (See Form T1 in Appendix B). If evaluators do not wish to provide information for each of the listed criteria on Form T1, the term "Not Applicable" should be used in the space provided. Based on this evaluation, one overall rating should be assigned from the following list of classifications **"Excellent"**, **"Very Good"**, **"Satisfactory"** or **"Unsatisfactory"** (as described below). The Departmental/Program Promotion Committee should justify its suggested rating, and provide evidence of its overall rating through clear examples of pedagogical strategies observed during the classroom observations.

Satisfactory: Faculty considered "Satisfactory" in teaching should demonstrate at least a satisfactory performance in most of the criteria outlined in Form T1. The peer-evaluation process should consist of a series of classroom visits rather than a single observation, and classroom observers should assess the faculty member's overall teaching performance in a qualitative fashion during each observation. A Satisfactory rating on Form T1 suggests that the faculty member compares favorably to a cohort at the same rank in the home department/program. In addition, the candidate's statement on teaching should demonstrate the precise ways in which his/her teaching has strengthened the major. Candidates should be well regarded by peers and students as both effective and competent teachers.

Very Good: Faculty rated "Very Good" in teaching should compare favorably to a successful cohort at the same academic rank in the candidate's home department/program. The peer-evaluation process should consist of a series of classroom visits rather than a single observation, and classroom observers should assess the faculty member's overall teaching performance in a qualitative fashion during each observation. A Very Good or Excellent rating in most of the criteria outlined in Form T1 suggests that the faculty member compares favorably to a cohort at the same rank in the home department/program. In addition, the candidate's statement on teaching should demonstrate the precise ways in which his/her teaching has strengthened the major. Candidates should be highly regarded by their peers as both very good and competent teachers, and student evaluations should rate the faculty member's teaching above the departmental/program average.

Excellent: Faculty rated "Excellent" in teaching should compare favorably to a cohort of excellent teachers at the same academic rank in the home department/program. In addition, clear demonstration of significant contributions to teaching and/or the curriculum with college or university-wide impact should be documented in the teaching statement. Evidence for this may include: significant contributions to the development of academic programs; curricular development; dissemination college-wide, university-wide or internationally of specific pedagogical practice(s); successful procurement of teaching grants; honors or awards for teaching; publications in peer-reviewed pedagogical journals with an international reputation; textbooks published by an internationally recognized press; presentations at international educational conferences; service on editorial boards of internationally-recognized educational journals, *etc.* The peer-evaluation process should consist of a series of classroom visits rather than a single observation, and classroom observers should assess the faculty member's overall teaching performance in a qualitative fashion during each observation. The peer-review process should reflect high-quality performance in teaching, and student evaluations must rate the faculty member's teaching performance as well above average.

2. Standards for Evaluation of Scholarship Performance

The evaluation of scholarship activities should be based on two criteria:

- Internal evaluation of the faculty member's scholarship portfolio at the departmental/program level, with emphasis on publication record and successful completion of external and internal research grants;
- Peer-evaluation of the candidate's scholarship by at least three external reviewers.

Although there are many possible ways for candidates to establish and sustain a strong record of productive research, publication, creative activity and scholarly achievement, the UAEU will use research publications and creative activities as evidence of successful scholarship. The expectation is that candidates should have published a substantial number of articles in well-known refereed journals of international standing in their disciplines (or the equivalent in the case of candidates whose disciplines fall within the creative, visual, or performing arts). In evaluating the record, consideration will be given to all appropriate types of original scholarship, creative effort and professional activity relevant to the candidate's discipline. The weight placed on each scholarly and professional activity will vary according to the ways in which the specific activity impacts the discipline and the candidate's overall professional stature.

In appraising the quantity and quality of a candidate's scholarly and creative contributions to the discipline, emphasis will be placed upon the following criteria: (1) the amount of productive research, publication and creative activity, and whether this activity compares favorably to others who have achieved the rank of Associate Professor or Professor in the candidate's home department/program; (2) evidence as to the substantive and consistent nature of the candidate's scholarly or creative efforts at the UAEU and, when relevant, at previous institutions; (3) the quality of the refereed journals in which manuscripts have been published (or the quality of the invited, juried or reviewed exhibitions, presentations, or performances); (4) the caliber of the publications in which the candidate's works (other than refereed journal articles) have appeared; (5) evidence of the impact of the candidate's work on the discipline, or of the extent to which the candidate's publications have been recognized or cited by others; (6) the emerging professional stature of the candidate; (7) the quality of any invitations to conferences or professional meetings; (8) the quality of any participation in external and internal research contracts or grant activities; and (9) the number of successfully completed supervised Master's or Ph.D. students, if applicable. The portfolio should include a behaviorally-anchored statement that assesses the faculty member's contribution to the relevant criterion in a qualitative fashion (See Form R1 in Appendix B). One overall rating based on this evaluation shall be calculated using the classifications **"Excellent"**, **"Very Good"**, **"Satisfactory"** or **"Unsatisfactory"** (as described below). The Department/Program Promotion Committee should justify its rating with clear examples that support the overall rating.

Satisfactory: Faculty rated "Satisfactory" in scholarship should demonstrate at least a satisfactory performance in most of the criteria outlined in Form R1. Achievement of a satisfactory rating in the first two criteria of Form R1 represents an absolute minimum for faculty in this category. The types of publications and the reputation of the journals in which candidates have published should reflect evidence of quality. Impact on the discipline and frequency of citation may also be considered. Faculty with a satisfactory rating should compare favorably to a cohort of faculty at the same academic rank in the home department/program. The portfolio must include evidence of publication of numerous articles in reputable peer-reviewed journals, including manuscripts that name the faculty member as the primary author, articles based on research carried out at the UAEU, and a significant

number of articles showing productivity in areas that extend beyond the research conducted for the PhD dissertation.

Associate Professors applying for promotion to the next rank will be judged on the number and quality of publications that have appeared in print or been accepted for publication since the date of application for the last promotion. Emphasis will be given to the candidate's consistent record of scholarly achievement and accomplishments and the potential for continued performance at a satisfactory level at the UAEU.

Very Good: Faculty rated "Very Good" in scholarship should compare favorably to a cohort at the same academic rank in the home department/program. Although very good and excellent performance in most of the criteria outlined in Form R1 is necessary, special attention will be given to the first four criteria. The types of publications and the reputation of the journals and other outlets involved should reflect evidence of quality. The portfolio must include evidence of publication of numerous articles in reputable peer-reviewed journals, including manuscripts that name the candidate for promotion as the primary author, articles based on research carried out at the UAEU and a significant number of articles showing productivity in areas that extend beyond the research conducted for the PhD dissertation.

Associate Professors applying for promotion to the next rank will be judged on the number and quality of publications that have appeared in print or been accepted for publication since the date of application for the last promotion. Emphasis will be given to the candidate's consistent record of scholarly achievement and accomplishments as well as the potential for continued performance at the UAEU.

Excellent: Faculty rated "Excellent" in scholarship should compare favorably to a cohort at the same academic rank in the home department/program. External reviewers must demonstrate in their letters the ways in which the faculty member's research has impacted the discipline. Excellence in publication may be demonstrated by: key article(s), perspectives and/or reviews published in leading journals in the field, or widely-acclaimed textbooks where the faculty member's name appears as the primary author; successful achievement of external funding for research; membership on editorial boards of internationally recognized, peer-reviewed professional journals; presentations as keynote speaker at international conferences; supervision of a significant number of Master's or Ph.D. students; development of a departmental/program research group; and involvement in collaborative research with internationally renowned research-led universities or research centers.

Associate Professors applying for promotion to the next rank will be judged on the number and quality of publications that have appeared in print or have been accepted for publication since the date of application of the last promotion. Emphasis will be given to the candidate's consistent record of scholarly achievement and accomplishments and the potential for continued performance at the UAEU.

3. Standards for Evaluation of Service Performance

Service to the department/program, college and university is expected of all members of the faculty. It is the university's policy to recognize service in academic management, university development, and community service, including national and international discipline-related and professional organizations. Examples of these types of services are listed in Form S1 in Appendix B.

Evaluation of service activities to the department/program, college, university and community (including the discipline or profession) shall be based upon the candidate's service portfolio at the departmental/program level. Department Chairs/Program Coordinators should include a behaviorally-anchored statement that assesses the faculty member's contribution to each criterion listed in Form S1 in a qualitative fashion. If evaluators do not wish to provide information for each of the listed criteria on Form S1, the term "Not Applicable" should be used in the space provided. Based on this evaluation, one overall rating should be given using the classifications **"Excellent"**, **"Very Good"**, **"Satisfactory"** or **"Unsatisfactory"** (as described below). The Department/Program Promotion Committee should justify its rating with clear examples that support the assignment of the overall rating.

Satisfactory: A satisfactory rating suggests that a candidate's record in service compares favorably to a cohort of faculty at the same academic rank in the home department/program. In addition, the portfolio must reflect service that has impacted the department/program, college, university and/or community (including the discipline or profession) in a positive fashion. Faculty whose service contribution is considered satisfactory should demonstrate satisfactory performance in most of the criteria outlined in Form S1. The criteria should not serve as a checklist; rather, the candidate's overall service contribution should be assessed in a qualitative fashion. Faculty with service on department/program, college or university committees should include a statement outlining their role and specific contributions to each committee.

Very Good: A "Very Good" rating suggests that a candidate's record in service compares favorably to a cohort at the same academic rank in the home department/program. In addition, candidates must include a statement that outlines how their service has impacted the department/program, college, university and/or community (including the discipline or profession). Faculty with a rating of very good in service must demonstrate very good or excellent performance in most of the criteria outlined in Form S1. The criteria should not serve as a checklist, but the candidate's service record should be assessed in a qualitative fashion.

Excellent: Faculty rated "Excellent" in service will compare favorably to a cohort of faculty members at the same academic rank in the home department/program. Service at this level should be far-reaching and reflect an impact on the community (including the discipline or profession) at the national or international level. Faculty that have held a pivotal position in academic management (*e.g.* Department Chair/Program Coordinator, Vice Dean, Director of a specific unit/program) with positive annual summative reports by their respective superiors will receive significant contribution reflecting excellence in the overall rating.

4. Evaluation of Collegiality

Department Chairs/Program Coordinators must include a statement concerning the candidate's collegiality in the "Appraisal Report and Recommendation." In addition, Deans must provide a written assessment of the collegial nature of the candidate in their appraisal of each candidate. Department Chairs/Program Coordinators must attest on an annual basis that the faculty member understands the nature of membership in a community of scholars, adheres to high standards of integrity and professional ethics, has the ability and desire to work as a member of a group while retaining all rights of individual expression, exhibits a sense of responsibility for the well-being of the UAEU, and demonstrates a commitment to work for the accomplishment of its goals. If a majority of these annual and summative appraisals

express concern about the collegial nature of the candidate and/or judge the candidate unsatisfactory in this regard, sufficient grounds to recommend against promotion exist.

THE PROMOTION CRITERIA AND STANDARDS DESCRIBED ABOVE, AND THE FORMS INCLUDED IN APPENDIX "B" ARE MEANT TO AID THE DEPARTMENTAL/PROGRAM COMMITTEE IN FORMULATING ITS RECOMMENDATIONS. AT THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR/PROGRAM COORDINATOR AND DEAN LEVELS, THE RATER WILL EXAMINE DATA FROM 3 SOURCES: THE APPLICANT'S FILE, THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EARLIER REVIEWS, AND HIS/HER PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE CANDIDATE. USING ALL OF THIS INFORMATION, THE RATER SHOULD ARRIVE AT AN EVALUATION LEVEL (EXCELLENT, VERY GOOD, SATISFACTORY, OR UNSATISFACTORY) FOR EACH OF THE THREE AREAS OF PERFORMANCE. A LETTER MUST THEN BE SUBMITTED GIVING THE OVERALL RECOMMENDATION OF THE RATER AND HIS/HER INDIVIDUAL RATINGS OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE. RATINGS MUST BE JUSTIFIED WITH BEHAVIORALLY-ANCHORED REASONS.

Vice Chancellor's Approval

Signature

Date

APPENDIX A

Scholarship Evaluation Form to be Used by External Reviewers

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES UNIVERSITY

Summary Evaluation of Scholarship For Promotion in Rank

Name of Candidate: _____

Department/ Program: _____

Rank Applied for : _____

Summary of Candidate's Strengths in Scholarship:*

Summary of Candidate's Weaknesses in Scholarship:*

Potential for Scholarship in the Future (e.g., does scholarship address current, viable topics; does candidate demonstrate sufficient independence in scholarship)*

What recommendations would you make to the applicant regarding his/her scholarly contributions to the discipline or profession and for improvement in his/her scholarship?*

Indicate your knowledge of the candidate and any previous relationships with the candidate:

Given the context of UAEU and the standards and criteria for promotion, does the candidate provide sufficiently convincing evidence of scholarship to merit promotion to the rank of _____? Please write down either "Yes" or "No"

Brief justification:*

Name of Reviewer:

Institution/Agency:

Address:

Signature:_____

***Attach additional pages if necessary**

APPENDIX B

Performance Evaluation Forms for Promotion

Form T1

Performance Evaluation Criteria in Teaching and Instructional Activities

Name of Candidate: _____

Criterion	Qualitative Assessment
• Student evaluations for courses taught for each semester.	
• Peer-evaluation at the Departmental/Program (and/or College) level, consisting of a series of class-room visits.	
• Teaching loads assigned to the faculty member and the diversity of courses he/she can deliver.	
• Methodology and documentation of the teaching process, including the development of course plans and the achievement of course outcomes.	
• Development of course content.	
• Use of and development of modern teaching methods (e.g. integration of Active and Cooperative Learning into courses) and techniques (e.g. use of computers and computer programs)	
• Contribution to the development of academic programs, curricula and courses.	
• Preparation of appropriate examinations and the development of effective student evaluation tools, to support course objectives and to achieve course goals.	
• Interaction with students and encouraging them to develop their skills and enhance their self-learning capabilities.	
• Supervision of hands-on training, graduation projects, laboratory activities and seminars.	
• Dissemination of teaching practices, methodologies <i>etc.</i> at the Departmental/Program, College or University levels.	
• Honors or awards for teaching.	
• Grants awarded for teaching innovation.	
• Publications in peer-reviewed pedagogical journals of international standing.	
• Presentations (oral and/or poster) at international educational conferences.	
• Any other achievements in the area of teaching.	

Teaching

Excellent

Very Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Comments: *

Name:

Position:

Signature:

*** ATTACH AS MANY ADDITIONAL PAGES AS NECESSARY**

Form R1

Performance Evaluation Criteria in Scholarship and Creative Activity

Name of Candidate: _____

Criterion	Qualitative Assessment
• Peer-evaluation by external reviewers.	
• Quantity and quality of research publications, noting particularly a continuation of this effort at the UAEU.	
• Presentations (oral and/or poster) at international research conferences.	
• External & internal research grants.	
• Impact of candidate's research on his/her discipline.	
• Successful supervision of Master's or Ph.D. students, if applicable.	
• Any other achievements in the area of scholarship.	

Scholarship

Excellent

Very Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Comments: *

Name:

Position:

Signature:

*** ATTACH AS MANY ADDITIONAL PAGES AS NECESSARY**

Form S1

Performance Evaluation Criteria in University & Community Service

Name of Candidate: _____

<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Qualitative Assessment</u>
• Service in academic management (Chair, Vice-Dean, Director of Program etc.) at the university, college or departmental/program level.	
• Participation in the activities of national, regional or international professional organizations/ associations committees in his/her field of specialization.	
• Provision of consultancy or advisory services related to his/her area of expertise.	
• Contribution to the planning and/or delivering of continuous professional development activities for faculty on-campus.	
• Contribution and commitment to the application of international standards.	
• Participation in peer evaluations for academic purposes	
• Contribution to student's advising and counseling activities, extra curricular activities or any other activity pertaining to student services.	
• Contribution to the selection, development of orientation programs and offering other supportive services for new students.	
• Contribution to the organization of professional workshops and/or training programs off-campus.	
• Membership of editorial/advisory boards of academically refereed publications, such as: scientific journals, periodicals and magazines.	
• Refereeing research papers submitted for publication in scientific periodicals or conference proceedings.	
• Any other achievement in the area of university and community service.	

University and Community Service

Excellent

Very Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Comments: *

Name:

Position:

Signature:

***ATTACH AS MANY ADDITIONAL PAGES AS NECESSARY**

APPENDIX C

Checklist for Promotion Application and Basic Information Form

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES UNIVERSITY

CHECKLIST FOR PROMOTION APPLICATION

FACULTY MEMBER'S FULL NAME: _____

DEPARTMENT/ PROGRAM: _____

COLLEGE: _____

RANK APPLIED FOR: _____

Initials:

Sr.	Inclusions of Promotion File	Date	Signature
1	Basic Information Form (include promotion criteria and offer letter)		
2	Curriculum Vita (include a one page self-assessment of teaching, scholarship and service accomplishments)		
3	Teaching Evaluations (statistical summaries of each semester of the candidate's teaching effectiveness)		
4	Peer Evaluation of Teaching (PET) Report		
5	One copy of any publications submitted for promotion		
6	Annual Evaluation Forms (cumulative results of all annual evaluations by Chair and Dean)		
7	External Evaluations (at least 3 letters of external evaluation) and copies of all correspondence between the Department Chair/Program Coordinator and reviewers		
8	Recommendation of Department/Program Promotion Committee		
9	Appraisal Report and Recommendation of Department Chair/Program Coordinator		
10	Appraisal Report and Recommendation of the Dean		
11	Recommendation of the College Promotion Committee, if applicable		

Name:

Position:

Signature:

All documents enumerated above must be submitted from the College to the APAA.
The only publications to be forwarded to the APAA are those submitted for the promotion process.

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES UNIVERSITY

BASIC INFORMATION FORM

DATE: _____

COLLEGE: _____

DEPARTMENT/ PROGRAM: _____

FACULTY MEMBER'S NAME: _____

ACADEMIC PROGRESS at UAEU:

Date of employment: _____ Rank: _____

Date of Promotion: _____ Rank: _____

Current Rank: _____

Years at current rank at end of current academic year: _____

LIST OF COURSES TAUGHT AT UAEU (number of times taught in parentheses)

Undergraduate

Graduate

Name:

Job:

Signature: