



**FACULTY PROMOTION PROCEDURES & GUIDELINES
2021-2022**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	2
2. SCOPE	2
3. EXPECTATIONS FOR PROMOTION	2
4. ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AND PROMOTION MANAGEMENT.....	3
5. MANAGING THE PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS.....	4
6. RECORDKEEPING.....	12
7. CONFIDENTIALITY AND DATA PROTECTION.....	12
APPENDIX I: DOSSIER REQUIREMENTS.....	13
APPENDIX II: SAMPLE CV.....	19
APPENDIX III: PEER REVIEW BY DIVISION.....	22
APPENDIX IV-A: ASSESSMENT LETTER FOR PROMOTION TEMPLATES	25
APPENDIX IV-B: REQUEST FOR REFERENCE LETTER	26
APPENDIX V: PROMOTION REVIEW WORKSHEET.....	27
APPENDIX VI: REFEREES COMMUNICATION LOG.....	29

FACULTY PROMOTIONS

Overview and Expectations

2021-2022

1. INTRODUCTION

The promotion process is an integral part of academic assessment and review. It is fundamental to ensuring excellence and promoting the development of the Faculty.

2. SCOPE

This document details the process for Faculty promotions from the rank of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from the rank of Associate Professor to Professor. It does not detail the competitive process for initial Faculty appointments or the appointment process for Distinguished Professors.

3. EXPECTATIONS FOR PROMOTION

Successful promotion is the result of the creation of an academic portfolio that demonstrates impact. Faculty are evaluated on research, teaching and service/outreach. The documentable impact of their accomplishments in these areas determines the outcome of the promotion process.

3.1 Promotion to Associate Professor

For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must successfully pass internal and external reviews that document the following:

- a. the establishment of an independent research portfolio that demonstrates focus, excellence, potential for impact, international visibility and a trajectory to attain international recognition;
- b. a successful teaching program and student advising program, including documentation of progress of students under the Faculty member's supervision, the rigor of the courses taught and the student evaluations of those courses; and
- c. an appropriate level of service to both the institution and the discipline. Included in this is the establishment of an effective, collegial working relationship with colleagues and a demonstration of the ability and willingness to engage in shared academic and administrative tasks while maintaining high standards of professional integrity.

3.2 Promotion to Professor

For promotion to the rank of Professor, a candidate must successfully pass internal and external reviews that document the following:

- a. a sustained research program that has been recognized for its impact and has clearly attained substantial international recognition;
- b. a sustained, successful teaching and student advising program, including documentation of the accomplishments of students under the Faculty member's supervision, the rigor of the courses taught and the student evaluations of those courses; and
- c. an appropriate level of service to both the institution and the discipline, including leadership activities within the discipline. Included in this is the establishment of an effective, collegial working relationship with colleagues and a demonstration of the

ability and willingness to engage in shared academic and administrative tasks while maintaining high standards of professional integrity.

3.3 Evaluation Dimensions

The Faculty member's achievements will be assessed on the dimensions stated in the table below:

Table 1 – Promotion Evaluation Dimensions

Dimensions	Description
Excellence	Evidence of the quality and impact of research achievements on the discipline, the KAUST mission and the relevant Research Center, if appropriate
Independence	Contributions that demonstrate creative and independent thinking and the ability to identify and engage in new areas of research
Sustainability	Ability to maintain a research program and to extend its trajectory toward further growth and greater accomplishments

4. ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AND PROMOTION MANAGEMENT

4.1 Annual and Three Year Reviews

Faculty members undergo an annual evaluation of their performance, as part of the *Faculty Evaluation Process Procedure*. The evaluation cycle, criteria, ratings (and descriptions), expectations, and the documentation submission and procedural requirements and deadlines are set forth in the *Faculty Evaluation Process Procedure* which will be communicated every year at the beginning of the evaluation cycle which is aligned with the calendar year. Each Faculty member will receive a copy of his or her performance evaluation, in writing. Written annual performance evaluations will highlight the Faculty member's main achievements and progress in research, teaching, commitment to University service and outreach, areas for development, improvement or both, and will also establish expectations for future performance that provides a basis for merit increases.

Every three years of an appointment or a promotion, faculty members participate in a more extensive Three-Year Review that assesses progress and achievements over a longer horizon. The three-year review is similar in spirit to the annual review. However, there is a more in-depth evaluation of the faculty member's cumulative achievements in research, teaching and service. In the Three-Year Review faculty members must also provide a research plan that outlines their research projects for the next three years. The Three-Year review provides key assessment to junior faculty (Assistant and Associate Professors) with regards to their progress towards promotion.

A Three-Year Review is not required for Faculty members who are undergoing consideration for promotion during the year indicated for the Three-Year Review; instead, the Faculty member will be asked to submit an annual review.

4.1 Mandatory Promotion Review Milestones

Mandatory promotion review milestones are determined based on the Faculty member's KAUST Hire Date, and are outlined in the following Table 2 (*Promotion Review Milestones*):

KAUST Hire Date	Academic Year Clock Starts *	Year of First Three-Year Review	Asst. Prof. Mandatory Promotion Review Year *	Assoc. Prof. Mandatory Promotion Review Year *
2015	2015-16	2019	2020-21	2021-22
2016	2016-17	2020	2021-22	2022-23
2017	2017-18	2021	2022-23	2023-24
2018	2018-19	2022	2023-24	2024-25
2019	2019-20	2023	2024-25	2025-26
2020	2020-21	2024	2025-26	2026-27

**Academic Year starts on July 1 and ends on June 30.*

Promotions are effective on July 1 of the year, following the date of review unless otherwise stated.

4.2 Early Promotion

While it is not typical, a Faculty member may request consideration for early promotion prior to the year of mandatory promotion review; it is advised to first seek advice and approval of the Dean for early promotion. The Faculty member must request in writing to the Dean his/her intent to come up for promotion early. The minimum "time in rank" at KAUST before being considered for early promotion is **THREE** years.

If the Dean approves the early consideration of a Faculty member for promotion, he/she will submit an endorsement of such a request, with detailed justification, to the Provost for approval. Only when the Provost approves the early promotion request, a faculty member may initiate the process of submitting a promotion dossier. Upon such approval, the process is identical to the one followed in the mandatory promotion review year.

4.3 Extensions to the Mandatory Promotion Review Period

A Faculty member's mandatory promotion review period may be extended, typically for up to one year, under special circumstances, including but not limited to personal circumstances such as extended leave after childbirth, and professional circumstances such as exceptional delays in establishing a laboratory. A request from the Faculty member must be made in writing to the Dean, who will make a recommendation to the Provost. All extensions require the written approval of the Provost. The extension request must be made prior to the initiation of the mandatory promotion review.

5. MANAGING THE PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS

The mandatory promotion review process may be initiated at any time of the academic year during which the mandatory promotion review is required, based on the mutual agreement of the candidate and the Dean, and with endorsement of the Provost. Promotion reviews in the mandatory promotion review year must be completed by **April 1st** of that academic year.

The promotion review process can be lengthy and may take six months or more to complete. Thus, typically, it is recommended that the promotion process start at the beginning of the mandatory promotion review year (i.e., July), with the aim of sending the dossier to the Faculty Affairs Office in January of the mandatory promotion review year.

In support of the promotion review process, each May, the Faculty Affairs Office will send each Dean a list of the Faculty members who are about to begin their mandatory promotion review year. The Faculty Affairs Office will also follow up with each Dean at the end of September to obtain from the Deans a list of the proposed timing of the reviews of the promotion dossier for each scheduled Faculty member and to learn if any early promotion reviews will be initiated. A hypothetical timeline is shown below:

Timeline	Process Step	Responsibilities
May - June	1. List of Faculty Members due for Mandatory Promotion sent to Dean	Faculty Affairs Office
June- August	2. Promotion discussion with Dean	Promotion Candidate
	3. Creation and submission of promotion dossier	
	4. Initial review of dossier	Division
	5. Reference letters	
September - December	6. Technical presentation	
	7. Peer review by division	
	8. Extended promotion dossier sent to Faculty Affairs Office	
January - May	9. Case heard by Promotions and Appointments Committee	Faculty Affairs Office
	10. Promotion decision/Appeal	
	Within 30 days of the Decision	11. Promotion Appeal

5.1 Process Steps

STEP 1: PROMOTION DISCUSSED WITH DEAN

Each Faculty member must discuss the promotion process with his/her Dean prior to initiating the mandatory promotion review process. The Dean is responsible for communicating the institution's expectations, requirements and each step of the mandatory promotion review process, as well as for keeping the Faculty member updated on the progress of his/her promotion dossier throughout the process.

STEP 2: CREATION AND SUBMISSION OF PROMOTION DOSSIER

At the initiation of the mandatory promotion review process, the Faculty member shall produce a detailed promotion dossier. All Faculty members should be guided by **Appendix I: Promotion Dossier Requirements**.

The Faculty member shall submit the promotion dossier to his/her Dean upon completion of all the **Appendix 1: Promotion Dossier Requirements**.

STEP 3: INITIAL REVIEW OF PROMOTION DOSSIER

The Dean will confirm receipt of the completed promotion dossier, in writing, to the Faculty member with a copy for the Faculty Affairs Office, and will review the promotion dossier for completeness and compliance with the promotion dossier requirements, described in **Appendix 1: Promotion Dossier Requirements**.

STEP 4: SOLICITATION OF REFERENCE LETTERS

(1) Goal and Purpose

When obtaining internal and external Referees, minimal or no conflict of interest is desired, to ensure candid and unbiased assessments of the Faculty candidate's research accomplishments. Referees must be free of actual, potential, apparent and perceived conflicts of interest that could lead to any bias in the Referee's assessment of the Faculty candidate.

(2) Internal Reference Letters

If the Faculty member seeking promotion is a member of a Research Center, the Center Director will be asked to provide a letter to the Dean on the accomplishments of the Faculty member with respect to the Center's mission. The Dean shall ask the Program Chair of the Faculty candidate's discipline to provide a summary letter that assesses the accomplishments of the Faculty candidate. The Dean may also, at his/her discretion, request additional reference letters from sources internal to KAUST that assess the Faculty member's performance in specific areas, such as teaching.

(3) External Reference Letters

External reference letters provide essential insight into the Faculty member's accomplishments. Reference letters are requested by the Dean of the Division from independent members of the international scientific community. Names are to be selected from both the list of reference letter writers ("Referees") provided by the Faculty member and a list developed by the Dean. The Dean will develop his/her list of Referees in collaboration with experts in the Faculty candidate's field. Requirements for selecting Referees are in **Appendix I: Promotion Dossier Requirements**. A Dean's request letter template is in **Appendix IV-B: Request for Reference Letter**.

(4) No Contact with Referees

Faculty candidates should not have any contact with the proposed Referees about any aspect of the promotion review process for the duration of the promotion review process.

(5) Requesting Reference Letters

The Dean will send out requests to Referees from both the promotion candidate's list and the Dean's list. While it is recognized that the source of the Referees who respond cannot be predicted, the original requests should be balanced between the Faculty candidate's and the Dean's Referee lists. The Faculty candidate will not be told which names were selected from his/her Referee list nor will he/she be told the Referees' names on the Dean's list. The **Appendix IV-B: Request for Reference Letter Template** may be amended only with the prior approval of the Provost.

(6) Following up with Referees

It is common practice to send reminders to Referees, in order to maintain the integrity of the promotion review process. Reminders also allow Deans to determine if additional reference letters need to be requested. Copies of all communication should be retained as part of the Faculty candidate's promotion dossier.

(7) Number of Reference Letters Required

A minimum of eight reference letters is required for a complete promotion dossier. While it is recognized that the source of the letter writers who respond cannot be predicted, the original requests should be balanced between candidate's and the Dean's list.

Under unusual circumstances, the Dean may petition the Provost for an exception to the number of required reference letters.

(8) Copies of Reference Letters

Referees are not legally obliged to disclose the content (or provide a copy) of reference letters to Faculty candidates or former Faculty members about whom the reference letter is provided. The decision to disclose the contents (or provide a copy) to the Faculty candidates or former Faculty members about whom the reference letter is provided rests with the Referee; however, **KAUST, as a policy, will not give a Faculty candidate access to the reference letters written about the Faculty candidate in support of the promotion review process, subject to applicable data protection laws.**

STEP 5: TECHNICAL COLLOQUIUM PRESENTATION

The Dean will ask the Faculty member to present a technical colloquium that will be open to the entire university community. The presentation must focus on the Faculty candidate's scientific accomplishments during the promotion review period and his/her impact on the field. It is NOT meant to focus on activities prior to the promotion review period or to cover topics that are easily obtained from the promotion dossier, such as publication statistics or grant activity. If possible, this presentation should be attended by all Faculty members in the Faculty candidate's Academic Division, who are of equal or higher rank to the rank being considered in the promotion of the Faculty candidate. Peers might comment on the presentation when they are voting for the case in the comments section.

STEP 6: PEER REVIEW AND VOTING BY ACADEMIC DIVISION

- (1) All Faculty members in the Academic Division who are of equal or higher rank than the rank being considered in the promotion of the Faculty candidate will be expected to review the Faculty member's promotion dossier and, then, to formally vote anonymously on whether the Faculty candidate should be promoted. The Academic Division, at its discretion, may hold a Faculty meeting of eligible voters to discuss each promotion case prior to requesting the Faculty vote.
- (2) **Under no circumstances may the Faculty share ANY details of the promotion dossier or Faculty peer review and voting process with the Faculty candidate. All communication with the Faculty candidate on the peer review process must go through the Dean.**
- (3) Academic Division deliberations are to be based on the information in Faculty candidates' promotion dossiers and the Faculty vote should be based on the promotion dossier and the results of the deliberations prior to voting. The Dean must provide the results of the vote in his/her summary recommendation to the Promotions and Appointments Committee ("PAC").
- (4) In cases in which a Faculty member is jointly appointed to two Academic Divisions and does not have an assigned primary and secondary Academic Division, both Academic Divisions will be asked to jointly complete the Faculty peer review process.
- (5) Once the Academic Division-level peer review process is complete, the Dean will write a report on the results of the Academic Division deliberation and the Dean's assessment of the Faculty candidate and provide a recommendation to PAC on whether the Faculty candidate should be promoted.
- (6) For full details on this Academic Division peer review and voting process, see: **Appendix III: Peer Review by Division.**

STEP 7: EXTENDED PROMOTION DOSSIER SENT TO FACULTY AFFAIRS OFFICE

All documentation gathered throughout the promotion review process, including the report of the Dean, summary of the program evaluation and any other qualitative and quantitative information and documentation related to the Faculty member's promotion review process will be collated into an extended promotion dossier by the Academic Division and sent by the Dean to the Faculty Affairs Office. It is the Academic Division's responsibility to ensure that all required documentation is included and that the contents of all documentation are complete, in accordance with **Appendix I: Promotion Dossier Requirements**. If the promotion dossier is not complete, it will be returned to the Academic Division for completion. The Academic Division is encouraged to contact the Faculty Affairs Office if any questions arise at any stage of the promotion review process.

The Faculty member will be given the opportunity to document any changes to his/her CV prior to his/her promotion case being heard by the PAC.

STEP 8: PROMOTION CASE HEARD BY PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

The Faculty Affairs Office will prepare the final promotion dossiers and provide all members of the PAC the promotion dossiers for review in advance of the PAC meetings. Each Dean will present the promotion cases from his/her Academic Division to the PAC. The Dean's recommendation letter and presentation to PAC should address the merits of the promotion case and any concerns that might have been identified during the promotion review process, such as peer reviews and external reference letters.

The PAC members will carry out the obligations and responsibilities stated in the PAC Charter.

Under no circumstances may the PAC members share with the Faculty candidate any details of the final promotion dossier, the PAC process, or deliberations. All communications with Faculty candidates related to the PAC process must go through the Dean or Provost.

STEP 9: PROMOTION DECISION

The President will make the final decision on each Faculty candidate's promotion case after considering the recommendation of the PAC members. The President will notify in writing by email or a formal letter the Provost, who will notify the Dean of the Academic Division for the Faculty candidate of President's decision, in writing by email or a formal letter.

Each Faculty candidate will be notified in writing by letter from the Provost of the President's decision on his/her promotion outcome.

For Faculty candidates who will not be promoted, the President will notify the Provost and the Dean in writing by email or a formal letter of the President's decision to not promote a Faculty candidate. The Dean, Provost and Chief Human Resources Officer will consult and determine the length of the Faculty candidate's terminal contract, which should normally be for up to one year.

The Provost's formal letter of the decision to the Faculty candidate must state the reasons for the adverse decision with sufficient detail and provide notice of the terminal contract end date. No further promotion review process can be requested by an unsuccessful Faculty candidate. No further notice of termination is required. Unless a new contract is entered into with the Faculty member, at the expiration of the terminal contract, the terminated Faculty member must comply with the KAUST's separation from employment and departure clearance procedures.

A copy of all decision letters will be sent to the Chief Human Resources Officer for placement in the Faculty member's personnel file and to the Faculty Affairs Office for placement in its records.

STEP 10: APPEAL PROCESS

An unsuccessful Faculty candidate may appeal the President's unsuccessful promotion decision within thirty (30) days from the date on the decision letter. Any appeal shall be on the grounds of the basis of two reasons:

- a. "clear error", where clear error means that the information that formed the basis for the reasons for the President's decision (stated in the decision letter) was not supported by the record of the promotion review process (the final promotion dossier) and that the information that formed the basis for the reasons for the decision (stated in the decision letter) was important to the outcome of the promotion case; or
- b. there is substantial evidence of significant achievement that was not included in the Faculty candidate's promotion dossier when the Faculty candidate's case was reviewed by PAC.

The appeal should be directed to the Provost. Once an unsuccessful Faculty candidate appeals, the implementation of the promotion decision is delayed until the appeal is decided.

The Provost will convene a panel of three Faculty members at the rank of Professor, one from each of the Academic Divisions, who are not members of the PAC, and who have no actual, potential, apparent or perceived conflicts of interest with the Faculty candidate (the "Appeals Panel").

The Appeals Panel shall review the final promotion dossier, the minutes of the PAC meeting and any other documentation that the President used to make his decision. Within 60 days (or such extension(s) of time communicated, in writing, to the Faculty candidate), the Appeals Panel will recommend that the President do one of the following:

- (1) Affirm the President's decision (meaning, the President's decision was supported by the record of the promotion review process, and the right decision, and the decision will stand);
- (2) Modify the President's decision (meaning, the President's decision is "Affirmed" with minor modification to the record of the promotion review process, that does not affect the substance of the PAC Report or the President's decision;
- (3) Declare the President's decision "Harmless Error" (meaning, even though there was an error in the record of the promotion review process, the error does not affect the decision (i.e., outcome of the promotion case) enough to make a difference.)
- (4) Declare the President's decision "Clear Error" and, in such case, reverse the promotion review decision (meaning, that the President's decision was the wrong decision based on the record of the promotion review process and the opposite decision should have been made) and the President may then either:
 - (a) enter a revised decision; or
 - (b) refer the case back to the PAC for reconsideration as instructed, in writing, by the Appeals Panel. Cases referred for reconsideration must be returned to the President for his final decision.

- a. The President will review the Appeals Panel’s recommendation and issue a final decision, in writing to the Provost for further transmission to the Faculty candidate’s Dean, the Faculty Affairs Office, and the CHRO, who shall close the case in the University records.
- b. The President’s final decision shall be binding on the appealing Faculty member and no further appeals will be considered.

STEP 11: IMPLEMENTATION OF PROMOTION DECISIONS

All promotion decisions, whether successful or unsuccessful outcome, alter the terms and conditions of the Faculty member’s employment contract. A new contract will be required in accordance with the procedures.

Table 2 outlines the contract requirements related to implementing promotion decisions.

Table 2 – Contract Amendments

Promotion Review Type	Successful Promotion Decision	Unsuccessful Promotion Decision
Early Promotion Review	<p>New Contract: The Faculty member will receive a new fixed-term (or if a Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC)-national, an unlimited term) employment contract, which must be signed by the Dean and the Faculty member before the promotion shall be effective. The new contract shall address, among other terms and conditions:</p> <p>(1) <u>Effective date</u>: July 1 of the next academic year following the promotion decision, unless otherwise specified in the new employment contract</p>	<p>Terminal Contract: The Faculty member will receive a terminal contract of up to one year to make plans for the next step in his/her career. There will be no further contracts. There should be no expectation of continued employment in any other capacity.</p>
Mandatory Promotion Review	<p>(2) <u>Salary Increase</u>: Salary increase aligned with the new rank</p> <p>(3) <u>Baseline Funding</u>: Review of Baseline funding allocation and new funding allocation based on the Faculty</p>	

	member's research area and new rank	
--	--	--

6. RECORDKEEPING

- 7.1 The Faculty Affairs Office is responsible for maintaining all records related to the faculty promotion process, in accordance with the retention schedule for academic records.
- 7.2 Human Resources is responsible for maintaining the employment records of all University Personnel, in accordance with the retention schedule for personnel records.

7. CONFIDENTIALITY AND DATA PROTECTION

KAUST will take reasonable steps to ensure the Confidentiality and Privacy of all documentation related to, and the identities of all persons involved in, the Faculty promotion review process. KAUST will take reasonable steps to only disclose a Faculty candidate's participation in the promotion review process and information and documentation related to the promotion review process to persons who have a right-to-know (e.g., members of the Promotions and Appointments Committee, Deans, Center Directors, peer reviewers, Vice Provost, data protection authority, arbitral tribunal or court judge) or a need-to-know (e.g., Referees, Human Resources and Office of the General Counsel Staff Members), in the pursuit of the Faculty candidate's promotion decision.

APPENDIX I: DOSSIER REQUIREMENTS

FACULTY INSTRUCTIONS

1. GENERAL STYLE REQUIREMENTS

- All submitted documents should have page numbers and should be single spaced size 11 Cambria font style.
- Any lists within documents, such as lists of publications or conference proceedings, should be numbered.
- Documents should be submitted in a searchable PDF format.

2. DOSSIER DOCUMENTS

All promotion dossiers must contain the documents listed in the table below.

Documents from the Faculty Member	
1.	An up-to-date CV including a full list of publications
2.	A statement on research (limited to 5 pages)
3.	A teaching portfolio, including a teaching statement, syllabi and teaching evaluations. The teaching statement should be labelled "For Internal Use". It will not be sent to external Referees.
4.	Names and details of six possible Referees
5.	Citation indexes
6.	Four or five publications

1. CV

The CV submitted as part of the dossier will be used throughout the promotion process. It will be sent to Referees and eventually will be included in the dossier forwarded to the Faculty Affairs Office to be given to the Promotions and Appointments Committee. See Appendix II for a sample Common CV. It is the Faculty member's responsibility to submit his/her CV in that format.

Prior to review by the Division or the Promotions and Appointments Committee, the candidate may submit an amended CV with the changes since it was submitted in the initial dossier highlighted in grey. Promotion candidates are strongly advised to submit a CV with their most recent accomplishments easily identified by highlighting them or using another font color as this ensures that their case will be reviewed based on the most up-to-date information.

2. STATEMENT ON RESEARCH (Not to exceed FIVE pages)

For promotions to Associate Professor, the statement on research should provide an overview that summarizes all major research activities undertaken during the candidate's time as an independent investigator.

For promotions to Professor, the statement on research should provide an overview that summarizes all major research activities undertaken since the time of the promotion to Associate Professor. Emphasis should be placed on activities while at KAUST.

This statement should detail the rationale for the research directions pursued by the Faculty member and how research achievements fit in the context of the area of research. Future research should also be briefly described in the document.

Statements exceeding five pages will be returned for revision.

3. A TEACHING PORTFOLIO

The teaching portfolio should contain the following information:

- A teaching statement that explains the Faculty member's teaching style, philosophy and approach, and any significant teaching contributions while at KAUST. The teaching statement should be labelled "For Internal Use".
- All syllabi and teaching evaluation summaries since the last successful promotion or appointment to KAUST.

4. NAMES AND DETAILS OF SIX POSSIBLE REFEREES

4.1 Choice of Referees

Potential independent Referees should be identified in line with the guidelines established in Section 5 of the main document. They should predominantly be:

- From academia;
- Senior Faculty members with international stature, at or above the rank being considered for promotion;
- First-hand knowledge of the Faculty candidate;
- Free from obvious conflict, such as former advisors, collaborators, close personal friends, or others having a relationship that might reduce objectivity ; and
- When possible, from top-tier institutions in the field.
- While a few Referees may have established collaborations with the Faculty candidate, former advisors (either PhD or post doc) must be avoided.
- Selected Referees may come from non-academic institutions. In such cases, the reviewer must be of international stature and must be capable of assessing the candidate using criteria set forth by academia.
- Referees will be evaluated based on their international stature, knowledge of the relevant field and independence from the promotion candidate.
- The promotion candidate must not contact the nominated Referees regarding participation in the promotion process or after the dossier has been submitted.

4.2 Details of Proposed Referees

The Faculty member should provide the following information on each proposed reviewer:

- Name
- Title/Current Position
- Postal and Email Address
- One Paragraph Biosketch

- Relationship details:
 - Does the promotion candidate know the reviewer? If so, in what capacity? If the reviewer does not have first-hand knowledge of the Faculty candidate, then either do not use the reviewer or the reviewer should be advised to stick to only known facts and to disclose the limited capacity in which the reviews knows the Faculty candidate.
 - Is the Faculty member engaged in any current activities or collaborations with the reviewer?
 - Has the Faculty member ever submitted any research funding applications with the reviewer?
 - Has the reviewer ever received any research funding, honoraria, travel support or accommodations paid from the Faculty member's KAUST funding?

4.3 Special Requests regarding Proposed Referees

If there is a compelling reason, Faculty members may request that certain individuals not be approached for letters of reference. The request must be made in writing to the Dean, and it must include a clear and reasoned justification.

4.4 Communication with Referees

All communication with the proposed Referees should be retained as part of the candidate's extended promotion dossier. Please use **Appendix VI** as a template to record all communication.

4.5 Content

Reference letters should provide only the information that is requested and contain only information that is genuinely believed to be correct, based on fact and can be backed up by professional evidence and examples. The information provided should be placed in context and should not be inaccurate, misleading, defamatory, embellished, or a misrepresentation of the Faculty candidate's research and teaching record. Reference letters should be prepared by the reviewer in such a manner that, if the current Faculty candidate or former Faculty member were to gain access to the reference letter, he/she would be satisfied that it gives an accurate, fair and just representation of the individual's record of research and teaching, conduct, character and other indicia of employment while employed at KAUST.

4.6 Unfavorable Comments

Care must be taken to safeguard the reputation of the individual for whom the reference letter is provided and KAUST's reputation. Unfavorable comments should only be made if true, accurate and fair, and also the current Faculty candidate or former Faculty member must be (or have been made) fully aware of the negative facts while still employed. Inclusion of sensitive information is strictly prohibited (i.e., information relating to an individual's physical or mental condition, age, gender, ethnic or racial origin, religious beliefs, personal life, and/or admissions of wrongdoing (or liability)).

5. CITATION INDICES

Citation indices should be generated using Google Scholar, Scopus and Web of Science; these citations will be updated prior to the presentation of the case to the Promotions

and Appointments Committee. A candidate’s unique ORCID and Researcher ID number (Web of Science) should be included in his/her CV.

6. FOUR OR FIVE PUBLICATIONS

The Dossier should also contain four or five peer-reviewed publications or conference papers deemed by the candidate to best reflect his/her research accomplishments. The selected material should:

- Have been published or presented since the last promotion; and
- Be predominantly from research work undertaken at KAUST

Papers that are under review should not be included, but papers that are accepted or in press may be used.

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS: A Faculty member can request to add additional documents to his/her dossier, which may include articles from external media or evidence of impact in his/her field. The Dean will determine whether these additional documents are relevant to the promotion dossier. If they are deemed relevant, they will be included in a separate section.

DEAN’S INSTRUCTIONS

DOCUMENTS ADDED BY THE DIVISION

The following documents are gathered by the division and are **in addition to** those supplied by the Faculty member:

1	Promotion Review Worksheet (See Appendix V)
2	Recommendation from Dean – including the result of the Faculty vote
3	Recommendation from Center Director (if applicable)
4	Summary of program evaluation
5	Teaching Evaluation Summary Report - prepared by Faculty Affairs and shared with the Deans in the Fall
6	Summary of reference requests (See Appendix VI)
7	All evaluation letters and correspondence with Referees
8	A short biography for each reviewer – candidate submits biographies for their suggested Referees, while division prepares biographies for Dean’s choice Referees

EXTENDED PROMOTION DOSSIER CONTENTS AND ORDER OF DOCUMENTS

The extended promotion dossier should consist of three “sub-dossiers”:

- A. Promotion sub-dossier
- B. Teaching sub-dossier
- C. Publication sub-dossier

Each of these three sub-dossiers should be saved as a separate PDF file. Page numbers in the format of “1 of n” should be added to each sub-dossier starting with page number 1 in the top right hand corner and at least ½” from the top of the page (in the header).

A. PROMOTION SUB-DOSSIER

The “Promotion sub-dossier” PDF document shall contain the following bookmarked sections, in the order listed below. Items in **green** are from the Faculty member’s original dossier submission. Items in **blue** are added by the division.

1. PROMOTION REVIEW WORKSHEET

The promotion review worksheet template is found in **Appendix V**.

2. RECOMMENDATION FROM DEAN

The Dean’s recommendation should summarize the key points of the promotion case. In addition to highlighting the merits of the case, it is also important that the Dean directly address and comment on any weaknesses or concerns identified in the promotion file or reference letters. The recommendation should focus on the promotion dimensions listed below.

Excellence	Evidence of the quality and impact of research achievements on the discipline, the KAUST mission and the relevant Research Center, if appropriate
Independence	Contributions that demonstrate creative and independent thinking and the ability to identify and engage in new areas of research
Sustainability	Ability to maintain a research program and to extend its trajectory toward further growth and greater accomplishments

Furthermore, the Dean should comment specifically on the:

- Quality and impact of research contributions, including the potential to establish or sustain a career with impact and international recognition;
- Relevance of contributions to KAUST’s mission and relevant Research Center;
- Faculty vote and feedback – The Faculty feedback should be a summary and include any concerns identified during the review;
- Teaching performance;
- Citizenship and role within Program and Division; and
- Any concerns expressed by either the Division or the external Referees.

3. RECOMMENDATION FROM CENTER DIRECTOR (if applicable)

4. SUMMARY OF PROGRAM EVALUATION

Faculty members from the candidate’s program who are eligible to vote on the promotion should provide a single report assessing the candidate’s research achievements, teaching effectiveness and promise of future professional development and impact.

5. CV

Any updates made to the CV since its original submission should be highlighted in grey.

6. RESEARCH STATEMENT

7. TEACHING STATEMENT

Note: A copy of the teaching statement should **also** be included in the Teaching Sub-Dossier.

8. REFEREE LOG (For referee log template, see Appendix VI)

9. CANDIDATE SPECIAL REQUESTS REGARDING REFEREES (if submitted)

10. TEMPLATE LETTER SENT TO REFEREES (For letter request template, see Appendix IV)

11. EVALUATION LETTERS AND REFEREE BIOS

Please indicate on the top right corner of each letter whether the reviewer was a “Candidate’s Choice” or a “Dean’s Choice”.

A short biography of each reviewer should be placed after their letter.

12. CITATION INDEXES

B. Teaching sub-dossier

The teaching sub-dossier PDF document shall contain the following bookmarked sections, in the order listed below:

1. [Teaching Evaluation Summary Report](#) as provided by Faculty Affairs
2. [Teaching statement](#)
3. [Course syllabi](#)
4. [Teaching evaluations submitted by candidate](#)

C. Publications sub-dossier

The publications sub-dossier should contain the four to five publications that were sent to Referees. These should be individually bookmarked.

DOCUMENT RETENTION

The Division should keep hard or electronic copies of the extended promotion dossiers for their records.

APPENDIX II: SAMPLE CV

John Smith

King Abdullah University of Science and Technology

Division/Program/Center

Email: @kaust.edu.sa

EDUCATION

Institution, City, State, Country, 1999-2000

Ph.D. in,

Dissertation Title:

Advisor:

Institution, City, State, Country, 1999-2000

MSc in,

Dissertation Title:

Advisor:

B.S. in ENGINEERING, June 1997

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2009-present Assistant Professor, Division, KAUST

2004-2009 Assistant Professor, Department, Institution

2004-2005 Visiting Scholar, Institution

2000-2003 Post-Doctoral, Institution, Country

Others

RESEARCHER ID NUMBER

ORCID:

Web of Science Researcher ID: X-0000-0000

SCOPUS:

HONORS AND SCHOLARLY AWARDS (Student or post-doc advisees are underlined)

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATION

PUBLICATIONS

*Since I joined KAUST I published XX papers in peer-reviewed journal articles of which YY (Publications: 1-4, 15, 23-29) were the outcome of work generated by students and post-docs I supervised.

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles (*corresponding author; student or post-doc advisees are underlined)

Publications at KAUST

Publications before joining KAUST

Journal Articles Under Review (*corresponding author; student or post-doc advisees are underlined)

Publications at KAUST

Journal Articles in Preparation (*corresponding author; student or post-doc advisees are underlined)

Publications at KAUST

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

Invited Speaker

Peer-Reviewed Conference Proceedings (*Platform Speaker; **Poster; Student or post-doc advisees are underlined)

Conferences after joining KAUST
Conferences before joining KAUST

Abstracts (*Platform Speaker; **Poster; Student or post-doc advisees are underlined)

Conferences after joining KAUST
Conferences before joining KAUST

RESEARCH FUNDS

King Abdullah University of Science and Technology
Project Title. Funding Agency/Body. Principal Investigator: ; Co-Principle Investigators: Name (Institution if other than KAUST). Start and End Date (\$Total Value).

RESEARCH SUPERVISED

Supervision at KAUST		
Primary Supervision - Masters	Primary Supervision - PhD	Post Doc Supervision
Completed: In Progress: 0 3	Completed: 0 In Progress:	Total: 0

King Abdullah University of Science and Technology

PhD: Advisor

1. Student's Name, Program; Project Title (Start date: Term Year; Graduated/Expected Graduation: Term Year; First or current position/ location).

PhD: Co-advisor

1. Student's Name, (Co-Advisor :.....) Program; Project Title (Start date: Term Year; Graduated/Expected Graduation: Term Year; First or current position/ location).

PhD: Dissertation Committee

1. Student's Name, (PhD Advisor :.....) Program; Project Title (Start date: Term Year; Graduated/Expected Graduation: Term Year).

MS: Advisor

1. Student's Name, Program; Project Title (Start date: Term Year; Graduated/Expected Graduation: Term Year; First or current position/ location).

MS: Thesis Committee

1. Student's Name, (Advisor :.....) Program; Project Title (Start date: Term Year; Graduated/Expected Graduation: Term Year).

Postdoc supervised

1. Postdoc's Name (Start date, departure date, institution awarding the doctoral degree, First or current position/ location)

UNIVERSITY SERVICE AND OUTREACH

University Committees

Outreach

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

REVIEWER FOR JOURNALS

APPENDIX III: PEER REVIEW BY DIVISION

Peer review is an essential part of the Faculty promotion process. Senior Faculty members are able to submit their feedback to the Dean of their Division and are expected to vote on each promotion case within their Division.

1. VOTING ELIGIBILITY

Voting is an essential obligation of all Faculty members. A deadline date must be established for final casting of votes. The number of abstentions and absences is reported as part of the vote tally and, in the PAC review process, will be considered an indication of lack of support for the candidate by those abstaining.

To be eligible to vote, a Faculty member must be:

- A full-time, Board-approved KAUST Faculty member (Visiting Professors and Sabbatical Visitors are not eligible to vote);
- A primary member of the Division that is evaluating the candidate; and
- At or above the rank being considered for promotion.

Level of Promotion Case	Faculty Entitled to Vote
Promotion to rank of Associate Professor	Associate Professors Professors
Promotion to rank of Professor	Professors

2. PROMOTION FILE

The following documents from the Promotion Dossier will be made available for review by senior Faculty:

Process Documents

- Description of the promotion processes used at KAUST
- Template of the reference request letter used to obtain references

Promotion Documents

- Candidate's dossier
- Reference Letters

3. REVIEW PROCESS

Each candidate's Promotion Dossier should be available for Faculty review for at least five days; this should be during the semester or during a period when the majority of Faculty members are on campus.

Divisions should allocate a private place where Faculty members may read the promotion documents in confidence. Faculty may not remove the dossier from this area.

Divisions may arrange to upload a dossier to a "password protected read only" shared folder (Dropbox is the best option) where eligible faculty are invited to access within a limited period

of at least five days. All faculty will be reminded of the confidentiality rules via the following statement in the email sent with the link to the dossier:

“By accessing the documents via the above link, you commit to abiding by strict confidentiality. The link will allow you to view the documents online. It is important that you do not share the link and the password with anybody, do not attempt to download and/or store any of the documents on your computer, and do not send via e-mail or otherwise share any copies or screenshots of the documents with anybody.”

4. MAINTAINING CONFIDENTIALITY

When requesting references, KAUST guarantees the confidentiality of all letters of reference. To maintain this commitment, the following confidentiality principles are maintained:

4.1 Storage

- All documents related to the promotion case are normally stored electronically by the Dean’s Office. Only the Dean, the respective Program Chair, the Center Director (where relevant), and senior staff member(s) of the Dean’s office tasked with managing the promotion process in the Division will have access, at given times, to folders containing the promotion documents.
- If there is a printed dossier, the dossier should not be left unattended. It should be locked in a secure location when not being reviewed by a Faculty member.
- Faculty members may not take the dossier to their office for review.

4.2 Coordination of files

Files in the dossier:

- May not be photocopied
- May not be removed from the dossier
- Must be kept together and not divided

4.3 Use of Information

- Faculty participating in the voting process **may not disclose or discuss ANY contents of the candidate’s file, including reference letters**, with the candidates or individuals who are not eligible to review the file.
- Information should not be used for anything other than the assessment of the candidate for promotion.

It is the responsibility of the Division to control access to the files and to maintain confidentiality at all times. The electronic files included in the promotion package should be handled with strict confidentiality. Aside from the eligible voting Faculty, they can only be shared with the Faculty Affairs Office, the Provost and the President. In particular, sharing electronic copies of external evaluation letters with anyone other than those listed above is strictly forbidden.

5. COLLATING FACULTY FEEDBACK

The Dean may accept votes and feedback in any way he/she deems appropriate, including in-person voting or voting online/via email. It is the Dean’s responsibility to encourage Faculty members to vote.

The vote must be recorded and submitted as part of the Promotion Review Worksheet (see **Appendix V**).

The Dean should include a summary of the feedback and the voting results as part of his/her letter as documented in **Appendix I**.

APPENDIX IV-A: ASSESSMENT LETTER FOR PROMOTION TEMPLATES

Attached to the request letter will be the following documents:

- (a) CV;*
- (b) Research Statement; and*
- (c) Sample publications.*

Dear XXXX,

I write to request a confidential letter of reference for Dr. XXX, who is being considered for promotion to Associate Professor of XXXX.

KAUST expects Associate Professors to have demonstrated significant achievements and have the potential to produce international impact, leadership and reputation. Our appointments come with a significant level of guaranteed research support and access to world-class facilities. Thus, our expectations align with those of highly selective graduate research universities in the U.S. and Europe.

In making your evaluation, which should focus on both past achievements and future potential, it would be helpful if you could:

1. Evaluate the quality and significance of the papers provided with this letter, including their importance both within the general discipline and to the broader scientific community;
2. Compare the candidate's research accomplishments to the leading researchers of his/her generation;
3. Finally, KAUST asks not for a recommendation for or against promotion, but rather for your assessment of Professor _____'s scholarly and professional work in relation to the criterion of excellence. Specific appraisal of significant accomplishments, in addition to a judgment of the quality of the body of work in relation to the discipline's norms, would greatly assist the committee.

For your convenience, I attach a copy of Dr. XXXX Curriculum Vitae, his/her research statement and a set of sample publications.

KAUST holds external letters in strict confidence, with the understanding that they will be made available to members of the KAUST Promotions and Appointments Committee and voting Faculty within the candidate's Division. The letters will be retained in the Dean's office, and the candidates will not have access to them.

We would greatly appreciate receiving your evaluation if at all possible by XXXX. Knowing of the effort expended to write such letters, my colleagues and I are very grateful for your efforts in this matter.

Dean
Division
KAUST

APPENDIX IV-B: REQUEST FOR REFERENCE LETTER

Attached to the request letter will be the following documents:

- (a) CV;*
- (b) Research Statement; and*
- (c) Sample publications.*

Dear XXXX:

I write to request a confidential letter of reference for Dr. XXX, who is being considered for promotion to the rank of Professor of XXXX.

KAUST expects Professors to have demonstrated breakthrough achievements and have established an international reputation for impact and leadership. Our appointments come with a significant level of guaranteed research support and access to world-class facilities. Thus, our expectations align with those of highly selective graduate research universities in the U.S. and Europe.

In making your evaluation, which should focus on both past achievements and future potential, it would be helpful if you could:

1. Evaluate the quality and significance of the papers provided with this letter, including their importance both within the general discipline and to the broader scientific community;
2. Compare the candidate's research accomplishments to the leading researchers of his/her generation;
3. Finally, KAUST asks not for a recommendation for or against promotion, but rather for your assessment of Professor _____'s scholarly and professional work in relation to the criterion of excellence. Specific appraisal of significant accomplishments, in addition to a judgment of the quality of the body of work in relation to the discipline's norms, would greatly assist the committee.

For your convenience, I attach a copy of Dr. XXXX Curriculum Vitae, his/her research statement and a set of sample publications.

KAUST holds external letters in strict confidence, with the understanding that they will be made available to members of the KAUST Promotions and Appointments Committee and voting Faculty within the candidate's Division. The letters will be retained in the Dean's office, and the candidates will not have access to them.

We would greatly appreciate receiving your evaluation if at all possible by XXXX. Knowing of the effort expended to write such letters, my colleagues and I are very grateful for your efforts in this matter.

Dean
Division
KAUST

APPENDIX V: PROMOTION REVIEW WORKSHEET

**Promotion Review Worksheet
2020-2021**

Candidate's Name: First Name Last Name	
Division: Full Division Name	
Program: Full Program Name	
Center Affiliation: Full Name of Center	
Candidate for: Rank	
Year Hired/ Last Promotion: 20XX	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Promotion <input type="checkbox"/> Early Promotion

Dean's Recommendation for Promotion:		Yes/No		
Faculty Vote	FOR #	AGAINST #	ABSTAIN #	ABSENT #

Teaching and Mentoring Record			
Course Taught	Semester	No. of Students	Ave. Score On Question re Teaching Effectiveness
Supervision at KAUST			
Primary Supervision - Masters	Primary Supervision – PhD	Post Doc Supervision	
Completed: # Current: #	Completed: # Current: #	Completed: # Current: #	

Students and Postdocs with completed degrees at KAUST under candidate's primary supervision:			
STUDENT/POSTDOC NAME	COMPLETED DEGREE	YEAR COMPLETED	FIRST OR CURRENT POSITION/LOCATION

Referees	Contacted: #	Received: #	
NAME	INSTITUTION	Rank of Institution by THE *	SOURCE (CANDIDATE or DEAN)

List only referees who sent letters.

*World University Ranking according to Times Higher Education 2021 Rankings.

APPENDIX VI: REFEREES COMMUNICATION LOG

Referees Communication Log
Candidate's Name

Name	Institution	Date Contacted DD/MM/YYYY	Agreed to Write Y/N
Candidate's Choice			
<i>Ex: John Smith</i>	<i>University of California, LA</i>	<i>July 1, 2017</i>	<i>Y</i>
Dean's Choice			
<i>Ex: John Smith</i>	<i>University of California, LA</i>	<i>July 1, 2017</i>	<i>N</i>