

2016

# ACADEMIC STAFF PROMOTION GUIDELINES

## PROMOTION PROCESS AND CRITERIA

The purpose of these guidelines is to provide criteria and procedures for appointment, evaluation and promotion faculty at CUHAS.



## Contents

ACADEMIC STAFF PROMOTION GUIDELINES .....	3
1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
2. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES .....	3
3. ACADEMIC PROMOTION PATHWAYS .....	4
3.1. Traditional Pathway.....	4
3.2. Clinicians Promotion Pathway .....	5
3.3. Fast Track Promotion.....	6
4. ELIGIBILITY .....	7
5. PROMOTION CRITERIA.....	7
5.1 General Considerations.....	7
5.2 Research.....	8
5.3 Consultancy.....	11
5.4 Teaching.....	12
5.5 Service and Academic Leadership .....	12
6. RECRUITMENT AND PROMOTION REQUIREMENTS.....	13
6.1 Tutorial Assistant .....	13
6.2 Assistant Lecturer .....	14
6.3 Lecturer.....	14
6.4 Senior Lecturer.....	15
6.5 Associate Professor .....	15
6.6 Professor .....	16
6.7 PROFESSOR EMERITUS OR PROFESSOR EMERITA .....	16
7. MEASURES TO BE TAKEN FOR STAFF WHO DO NOT FULFILL PROMOTION REQUIREMENTS	18
8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	21



# The Catholic University of Health and Allied Sciences

---

## ACADEMIC STAFF PROMOTION GUIDELINES

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Activities of the Catholic University of Health and Allied Sciences (CUHAS) are guided by the following mission statements: *“Train skilled and competent human resources in the health sector who are vested with moral and ethical values; search, discover and communicate the truth to advance the frontiers of knowledge; and provide quality services to the individual and the community”*. The goal of the appointment, promotion process at CUHAS is to encourage and reward faculty contributions and achievements that support the missions of the University.

The Appointments Committee is charged with ensuring that scholarly achievement and excellence are the criteria for academic advancement, independent of whether a faculty member's achievements derive primarily from research, teaching, and contributions through service and academic leadership to the department, institution, and medical and scientific communities. Selection of individuals for appointment and promotion to the CUHAS faculty must be in accordance with the highest standards but also in tune with guidelines of the Tanzania Commission for Universities. There are no quotas and all staff meeting the promotion standards can advance.

Every faculty member is expected to strive to the highest academic rank within his/her selected specialization. The School and its departments shall endeavor to provide mentoring to enable individuals to reach their full academic career potential. Faculty must receive feedback on their performance and on their potential for advancement in order to make informed choices regarding career paths. These guidelines focus on procedures and criteria for evaluation, appointments promotion through the academic ladder at the Catholic University of Health and Allied Sciences

### 2. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES

- 2.1 All appointments, reappointments and promotions of the faculty require approval of the Appointments Committee except for appointments and promotions of the rank of Professor and Associate Professor, which shall be referred to the Council for approval.
- 2.2 The Head or Acting Head of the Department shall ultimately be responsible for initiating recommendations to the Appointments Committee. Heads of Department are required to establish a departmental committee to advise on recommendations for appointments, reappointments and promotions.

- 2.3 An individual academic member of staff can also initiate the process of his/her promotion, through the head of department.
- 2.4 Recommendations for appointment, reappointment or promotion shall be submitted to the Appointments Committee on staff review forms provided by the Appropriate School.
- 2.5 An appropriate statement from the Head of Department shall be an essential part of each recommendation for appointment, reappointment or promotion. The statement should explicitly document the scholarly, educational, clinical or other activities of the candidate that warrant the appointment, reappointment or promotion.
- 2.6 The Head of Department recommending an individual for a faculty appointment, reappointment or promotion is responsible for verifying the curriculum vitae and bibliography of the candidate and organizing peer review process of any publications submitted.
- 2.7 The candidate due for promotion is required to produce twenty (20) copies of Curriculum Vitae and publications as required.
- 2.8 The Head of Department is expected to submit his/her recommendations to the Dean or Director of the School/ Directorate/Institute for further input.
- 2.9 In the event that a Head of Department's recommendation for an appointment, reappointment or promotion is not approved, the reason(s) for such decision shall be communicated to that individual through the Head of Department. The individual may appeal through the Head of Department.
- 2.10 The Appointments Committee will consider a recommendation for appointment or promotion in at its earliest staff review meeting but will consider pending issues at its Mini-Staff Review meeting in September.
- 2.11 A letter of appointment, reappointment or promotion, signed by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Planning and Finance), will confirm the rank and type of appointment made. The letter will contain details on the term of appointment and information relevant to the reappointment process.
- 2.12 **Publications alone without effective teaching at B grade and above will not be sufficient criteria for promotion**

### 3. ACADEMIC PROMOTION PATHWAYS

#### 3.1. Traditional Pathway

At CUHAS currently members of staff in basic sciences as well as clinical departments have one pathway. The pathway starts from Tutorial Assistant, Assistant Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Associate Professor and Full Professor. To ascend on this academic ladder members of staff are expected to meet certain targets of Excellency which constitute the promotion criteria.

## 3.2. Clinicians Promotion Pathway

Both basic science and clinical staff are expected to engage in teaching, research, consultancy or service. Teaching has always been a priority in medical schools, as faculty is entrusted with the training of the next generation of physician-scientists. Research is also a visible and is a highly regarded responsibility of medical school faculty. Excellency in research is routinely rewarded. However research achievements have always been weighted most heavily in promotion as compared to teaching and service. Regarding service, the third leg of the academic tool, medical schools are very different from other university institutions. In most non-medical universities, as is in basic sciences; “service” consists mainly of donated time in the form of consultancies. In contrast medical schools, particularly clinical departments, have a more conspicuous service mission; namely providing direct medical care to patients. Clinical Members of staff may spend 75-90% of their time in clinical practice and teaching; and take both tasks seriously. Research is usually a minor component of their work. They have a large teaching load in a variety of settings such as outpatient clinics, hospital wards, intensive care units, and operating rooms. Often they are available evenings; nights and weekends both to supervise students and attend to urgent patient care needs. It can be argued that there is a remarkable disconnect in many medical schools between the job assignment of clinical-teachers and the traditional requirements for career advancement. Although these are judged by hospitals on the number of patients seen per month or per hour, patient satisfaction, waiting time, practice income and other measures clinical productivity; in contrast promotions committee value teaching performance, scholarly achievements more in spite of the observation that the number of patients seen per month, practice income and other measures of “clinical productivity” are inversely proportional to academic productivity. This raised a number of questions:

- What can be done to help clinical-teachers to manage the extraordinary demand on their time?
- What support would they need to enable them succeed as scholars in their university communities.
- Is it reasonable to expect clinical-educators to conduct traditional hypothesis-driven research or compete for funding?
- In a practical sense, the question is how to recognize, promote and retain clinical-educators who have talents and skills that are widely sought in the private medical sector.

With this in mind some institutions decided to review and revise its policies and procedures for faculty promotion. Some Medical Schools adopted three separate tracks for faculty promotion: A Tenure Track, A Specialty/Research Track, and A Special/Clinical Track designed for clinician-teachers. In some institutions the three track system has been abolished. These Schools created a single tenure-eligibility

track. It expanded the definition of scholarship to include the scholarship of discovery, integration, teaching, and application of knowledge:

**The scholarship of application**

This is a type of activity, which builds bridges between theory and practice; applying knowledge to practical problems. Examples include development of a new medical treatment modality, or shaping public policy on health care, leadership roles in patient care quality improvement, investigational drug studies, and patient guidelines.

**The scholarship of teaching**

Includes the development of new teaching methods; studies on teaching approaches, innovative curricula and receipt of training grants.

**The scholarship of integration**

A type of activity that seeks to interpret, analyze and draw together the results of original research. This a “horizontal” scholarship looking for connections across disciplines; bringing new insights to bear on original research. This includes activities like reviewing articles, case reports and book chapters.

**The scholarship of discovery**

This is the traditional, disciplined pursuit of phenomena which results in the generation of new knowledge; “vertical” scholarship.

These provided “alternative” products of scholarship. Case reports began being given weight. In medicine case reports highlight unusual manifestations of common diseases, describe odd conditions, or highlight the benefits (or harms) of medical treatment or procedures. Case reports have long been considered “inferior” to original research, since they place less emphasis on scientific method or the collection of quantitative data. Yet case reports are, by their nature, original, bedside observations that are communicated in a written form for others to see. They represent an appropriate type of scholarship for academic physicians who are engaged fully in the practice of clinical medicine.

At CUHAS rather than starting a separate pathway for clinical-teachers we need to incorporate the broad definition of scholarship into our criteria for promotion. The objective should be to recognize forms of scholarship that are alternative to hypothesis-driven research.

### **3.3. Fast Track Promotion**

CUHAS is striving to be a research intensive institution. CUHAS may wish to consider creating opportunities that would allow some members of staff for accelerated promotion in which a candidate may seek promotion to a higher level before the required duration provided they have at least twice as many publications or exhibitions as required in the Ordinary Track; a Fast Track Promotion Path. Makerere University, as have other institutions, has introduced a Fast Track Promotion Pathway to encourage prolific researchers and writers to continue writing and publishing. In

this regard CUHAS proposes to create a more flexible appointment and promotion with two avenues as follows:-

- i) **Ordinary Track Promotion:** Requiring a defined number of publications plus a number of years of teaching in a position.
- ii) **Fast Track Promotion:** Requiring at least twice as many publication points or exhibitions as required in Ordinary Track minus the required defined number of years of teaching in a particular position.

## 4. ELIGIBILITY

4.1 All continuing and fixed term contract staff are eligible for promotion, with the following exceptions

- Staff on leave without pay for a period in excess of 12 months.
- Staff who have served in their current appointment for less than 3 years. In exceptional circumstances this may be waived by application for consideration for Fast Track Promotion.
- A staff member who has resigned or has submitted notice of resignation.
- A staff member whose performance is found to be unsatisfactory by the relevant Committee in any area.
- Staff while on probation.

4.2 Promotion will be primarily based on performance since appointment to the University, or last promotion at the University, whichever is the most recent.

4.3 Furthermore, while not a requirement to have reached to the top of the relevant scale to be considered for promotion, a staff member due for promotion will be presumed to have reached the top of the relevant salary scale and their performance will be assessed on that presumption.

## 5. PROMOTION CRITERIA

### 5.1 General Considerations

5.1.1 Candidates will be expected to have successfully performed the duties outlined in their current job as per their job description. For purposes of promotion they will be assessed by reference to their scholarly and other contributions to the University as evidenced by:

**Research:** Contribution to the advancement of the subject by research and scholarship through the acquisition and synthesis of knowledge and understanding,

and resulting in publication. For the purposes of any promotion the term 'research' is understood to mean publications of good quality.

**Teaching:** Contribution to the advancement of a particular subject area by teaching, and by educational innovation where appropriate.

**Service and Academic leadership:** Contribution through administrative service, clinical care, consultancy and community service as well as receipt of grant awards and development of novel innovations that enhance and build up the reputation of the institution.

## 5.2 Research

5.2.1 Objective evidence for excellence in research is required for faculty advancement for all members of academic staff. Peer-reviewed scholarly publications are an important benchmark and are evaluated on **quality, focus, and impact of the contribution**. Work that has not been disseminated does not meet the definition of scholarship. An individual's role in scholarship is a factor to consider, for example whether the individual has developed independence in an area of research, or contributed with some level of independence as a collaborator with **a major role in a particular research endeavor**. Each department must judge the quality of the scholarship for faculty being considered for promotion

5.2.2 Under the category of research, the University will use the following academic materials/works for the purpose of promotion; *thesis, Satisfactory PhD progress, research reports, conference papers, technical notes, book reviews, chapters in a book, journal articles, case reports*. Each material/work shall be reviewed and graded according to the respective guidelines and criteria:

5.2.2.1 **PhD thesis** can be counted for promotion if it has not been used for promotion before and if not a mandatory for a promotion in a certain rank. A PhD monograph thesis as other books shall be awarded 3 points. In the case of PhD by publications, the published articles shall be evaluated and awarded like any other journal articles. **Post PhD thesis** (Post doc) and post **M.Med/M. Dent thesis** (M.Sc super-specialization degrees) and **Fellowships thesis** shall be awarded 2 points. In case theses are by publications, the published articles shall be evaluated and awarded like any other journal articles.

*\*NB: Super-specialization is defined as an acquisition of Master's of Science or its equivalent qualification post M.Med/M.Dent in the relevant areas of clinical care of specialization such as Cardiology, Nephrology, Neurology, Neurosurgery, Gastroenterology, Endocrinology, Cardiothoracic surgery, Pulmonology, Infectious diseases, Neonatology, Interventional radiology etc.*



**5.2.2.2 Satisfactory PhD Progress:** A candidate will be considered to have satisfactory PhD progress if he/she has completed at least one year since when he/she was provisionally registered and has achieved the following:

- The candidate has developed full proposal which has been approved by the higher degree committee
- The candidate has been full registered as PhD candidate
- The candidate has published at least one manuscript in relation to his/her PhD work in a peer review Journal and another manuscript has been approved by supervisors to be submitted (OR in case of PhD by monograph, the candidate has completed half of his/her research work)

**5.2.2.3 Research Reports:** Research reports have to be officially registered with relevant School/Institute before consideration and evaluation for promotion. Research reports shall be awarded 0 – 0.5 points for each report.

**5.2.2.4 Conference Papers Retrievable from Proceedings:** Only papers retrievable from refereed proceedings shall be considered for promotion. Published papers in proceedings shall be awarded a maximum of 0.5 points. A maximum of 3 conference papers can be used in the promotion in one rank

**5.2.2.5 Technical Notes and Book Reviews:** Technical notes, Editors of books and book reviews shall be considered for promotion. They shall be evaluated and awarded a maximum of 0.5 points. A maximum of 3 Technical Notes/Book Reviews can be used in the promotion in one rank

**5.2.2.6 Textbooks and Chapters in a book:**

a. A book that has been published locally or internationally by a recognized publishing house and bears an ISSN, shall upon evaluation, be taken to constitute six articles and shall be awarded 0-6 points as follows:

A	-	6 points
B+	-	4 points
B	-	2 points
C	-	0.5 points

b. In case a book is co-authored, points will be shared according to author's contribution. Confirmation of one's contribution shall be made in writing by the co-authors.

c. A chapter in a book that bears an ISSN shall be reviewed as research article and be awarded 0 – 1 point.

d. A teaching manual shall be sent to an external reviewer and internal reviewer for the assessment of quality and shall be awarded 0 – 2 points. Only one teaching manual shall be considered in one specialized discipline in moving from one rank to another.

e. For subject dictionaries, e.g. Dictionary of Legal Terms, Medical Dictionary, Dictionary of Computer Sciences and Information Technology, Dictionary of Literary Terms etc., each dictionary shall be evaluated as a book and hence have a maximum of 3 points.

**5.2.2.7 Case Reports:** A case report published in a retrievable and refereed journal shall be considered for promotion. Case Reports shall be evaluated by two reviewers and shall be awarded a maximum of 1 point.

**5.2.2.8 Co-authored peer reviewed Papers and awarding of points:** Like other publications all co-authored papers shall be awarded a maximum of a maximum of 1 point.

### **5.2.3 REVIEW OF PUBLICATIONS**

**5.2.3.1** All publications submitted to the CUHAS Appointments Committee for consideration for promotion should have undergone peer review by at least two reviewers.

**5.2.3.2** For the promotion from assistant lecturer to Lecturer one reviewer will suffice.

**5.2.3.3** For the promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer two internal reviewers will suffice.

**5.2.3.4** For promotion to the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor at least one reviewer must be external to the university.

**5.2.3.5** The reviewer should hold an academic rank higher than that of the applicant.

**5.2.3.6** The reviewer should as far as possible belong to the same or closely related discipline however should not be a co-author.

**5.2.3.7** In the event an internal reviewer cannot be available two external reviewers can be used.

**5.2.3.8 At professorial rank the reviewer should clearly indicate area of publications focus in a specific area of specialization in the field**

**5.2.3.9** Assessors should be requested to submit the following information on each publication:

- a. Originality,
- b. Contribution to knowledge,
- c. Relevance to the academic discipline,
- d. Presentation,
- e. Relevance or consistency to the individual's own specialization in an academic discipline,
- f. The individual's Contribution to the research Endeavour,
- g. Overall quality.

**5.2.3.10** For each aspect a grade should be given as per the grading system shown below. For number (g) above (i.e. overall quality), the grade should reflect the average of numbers (a) to (f) above.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Remark</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	75-100%	1
<b>B+</b>	Very Good	70-74%	1
<b>B</b>	Good	60-69%	1
<b>C</b>	Average	50-59%	0.5
<b>D</b>	Poor	0-49%	0

**5.2.3.11** For the purpose of determining the points of publications the letter grade awarded for “overall quality” should be used.

**5.2.3.12** The University expects that there should be consistency in all Schools and Institutes in awarding authors of co-authored papers. Points awarded to the co-authored papers in local or international journal shall take into consideration the contribution of each author as follows:

- (a) First author/corresponding author can score up to a maximum of 0.7 points.
- (b) All other authors shall score proportional to their contribution.
- (c) The sharing of points shall be agreed between the authors.
- (d) At least **one third** of the publication points required for promotion by the candidate shall be derived from publications in which the candidate is either the first or corresponding author.
- (e) In the sharing of points, consideration should only be given to institutional staff.
- (f) If the first or corresponding author is not from the institution the points should be divided equally.
- (g) If the applicant is not a first or corresponding author and all other authors are from other institutions the applicant will score a maximum of 0.5 points”
- (h) If the local authors in (g) are more than one then points will be shared equally.

### **5.3 CONSULTANCY**

Consultancy Reports: Defined as contributions outside the research, teaching and engagement roles that demonstrate the applicant’s ability to either enrich knowledge and skills or to apply knowledge and skills in a particular situation. Other activities included under this category include service in institutional, regional, national and/or international communities in developing or evaluating educational materials such as syllabi, curricula related to an area of expertise. Service in Institutional, regional, national and/or international communities in developing or evaluating programs, guidelines and policies for management in an area of expertise. Consultancy reports registered by Departments, Institutes, and Schools shall be considered for promotion at all ranks. Two reviewers shall evaluate and rate the registered consultancy reports/activities that demonstrate intellectual merit. For a consultancy report/activity to be used for the purpose of promotion there must be evidence of active participation/involvement for the applicant. Consultancy reports shall be awarded a maximum of 1 point (A and B+ =1 point and B= 0.5 points).

**5.3.1 Grant Awards:** Individuals who contribute to institutional development through a scholarly grant award shall be awarded points as follows:

- i) 30,000 – 49,000 USD                      0.5 point
- ii) 50, 000 – 99,000 USD                    1.0 point
- iii) 100,000 USD or more                    2.0 points

If the grant is multi-authored the points shall be proportionately shared according to contribution.

## 5.4 TEACHING

**5.4.1** Evaluation of teaching effectiveness remains a critical component of the promotion process. Rating by learners (students, residents, and other trainees) has generally received the most weight, but peer ratings, course administration, mentoring, innovative curricula and other examples of teaching scholarship should be also considered.

**5.4.2** The evaluation of teaching should be based upon the quality and value of teaching interactions with students, residents, practicing physicians, and other health care professionals.

**5.4.3 *Teaching Effectiveness:*** Teaching effectiveness shall be assessed by students and by the department staff evaluation team. The University shall evolve a system that will ensure smooth assessment of staff members.

**5.4.4** The contribution of teaching effectiveness will be as follows: Students (undergraduates (20%) & Postgraduates (30%) and department/School promotion review committee 50%.

**5.4.5** Teaching effectiveness shall be evaluated annually and awarded grades as follows:

A	-	80-100%	(2.0 points)
B+	-	70-79%	(1.5 points)
B	-	60-69%	(1 point)
C	-	<60%	(0 point)

**5.4.6** For promotion purposes, the average grade of the period in question will be considered

## 5.5 SERVICE AND ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP

### 5.5.1 *Administrative Duties:*

Effective administration of teaching, research, and clinical programs is crucial to departmental success. Effective leadership/administration is defined as significant involvement in the leadership activities of a Department, Faculty, School, Institute, or the University or service on internal institutional Committees. Administrative work is a distinct and important activity that should be evaluated at the time of promotion, along with research, teaching, clinical care, and scholarship activities, though it is not a substitute for teaching and/or research. The evaluation under this category will be done by the immediate supervisor and peers. This shall be awarded a maximum of 1 point.

### 5.5.2 *Clinical Care:*

Faculty who provide clinical professional services as part of their expected academic responsibilities must have peer clinical evaluations as a component of academic advancement. The weight given to the quantity and quality of clinical service should be aligned with the time spent in clinical activities. Peer clinical performance evaluations should be conducted on a regular basis using a structured format. The evaluation should focus on two main areas: (1) medical knowledge, problem-solving skills, management of complex patients, psychomotor skills, and overall clinical skills; and, (2) humanistic qualities, responsibility, and compassion.

Peer clinical evaluations should be obtained from a combination of other faculty and residents who work with the individual in the same clinical setting. At least some of the faculty should be outside of the individual's specific area of expertise and no more than one-half of the evaluations should come from residents. Peer evaluators should be chosen the department head.

- a. The score will be as follows. A= 2 points, B+= 1.5 points, B= 1points and C= 0.5 points.
- b. At the Professorial level a "C" will score zero.

### 5.5.3 *Supervision of students to completion*

Supervision of graduate students to completion will also be awarded points that can be used for promotion. This is much encouraged especially at professorial ranks. A maximum of 0.25 points will be awarded per supervised thesis. The points shall be shared among supervisors. The maximum number of theses to be used for promotions in one rank is as follows:

- a. Lecturer to Senior Lecturer: **2 dissertations/theses**
- b. Senior Lecturer to Associate Professor: **4 dissertations/theses**
- c. Associate Professor to Professor: **6 dissertations/theses**

## 6. RECRUITMENT AND PROMOTION REQUIREMENTS FOR TEACHING STAFF

### 6.1 Tutorial Assistant

- (i) A Holder of an MD/DDS or equivalent degree and score of at least B in the relevant subject and a GPA of at least 3.5.
- (ii) A Holder of a Bachelor's degree at First or Upper Second class level and scored at least B+ in the relevant subject.

#### **General attributes:**

- a. Adherence to professional ethics,
- b. Language proficiency in medium of instruction.
- c. Ability to communicate information, knowledge and skills to others,
- d. Computer literacy,
- e. Good interpersonal skills,
- f. Ability to work as part of a team,

- g. Enthusiasm and self motivation,
- h. Ability to exercise initiative and be proactive and
- i. Motivation for innovation, further learning and continuing professional development.

## 6.2 Assistant Lecturer

- (i) A Holder of a master's degree (by coursework and dissertation/thesis) with a GPA of 3.5 and above from recognized University provided criteria stated in 6.1 above are met.
- (ii) By promotion of Tutorial Assistant who have acquired an appropriate Master Degree with a GPA of 3.5 and above from recognized University.

### General attributes:

- a. Adherence to professional ethics;
- b. Ability to prepare and deliver own teaching materials;
- c. Problem solving and innovation skills;
- d. Ability to recognize students having difficulties, intervene and provided help and support and;
- e. Ability to prepare quality research proposals.

## 6.3 Lecturer

- (i) A holder of a PhD from a recognized institution.
- (ii) A holder of M.Med, M.Dent or its equivalent with an average of B+ grade from a recognized institution
- (iii) By promotion of an Assistant Lecturer with at least 2 years working experience coupled with commendable academic service **AND** has made a satisfactory progress in his/her PhD training (as stated in 5.2.2.2) **AND** has acquired at least 2 publication points in peer reviewed journals (apart from his/her PhD work).

### General attributes:

- a. Adherence to professional ethics;
- b. Ability to design set, administer and supervise different assessment items;
- c. Ability to recognize students having difficulties, intervene and provide help and support;
- d. Ability to mark student scripts and course work assessment items and provide feedback;
- e. Computer skills and application;
- f. Ability to prepare and deliver own teaching materials;
- g. Potential to be a good role model and steer students towards dedication to learning, creativity and problem solving;
- h. Possession of sufficient breadth and depth of specialist knowledge in the relevant discipline and of teaching methods and techniques to work within own area;
- i. Ability to carry out independent research and provide feedback and;

- j. Ability to supervise research and other knowledge generating and development activities.

#### 6.4 Senior Lecturer

- (i) A holder of a PhD/M.Med/M.Dent or its equivalent qualification from a recognized institution with at least 3 years of teaching/research experience and 5 publication points since the award of PhD/M.Med/M.Dent.
- (ii) By promotion of a lecturer with a PhD/M.Med/M.Dent and at least 3 years of teaching experience (of at least B+) and has acquired at least 5 points from scholarly activities since last promotion (at least 4 points should come from publications) since last promotion. At least 25% of publication points should be from diversified journal publications.

##### **General attributes:**

- a. Adherence to professional ethics;
- b. Ability to establish academic or professional chairs for the institution;
- c. Ability to recognize student having difficulties, intervene and provide help and support;
- d. Ability to promote the vision of the institution;
- e. Ability to attract funding for different activities of the institution;
- f. Leadership and management abilities;
- g. Ability to solve complex institutional problems.

#### 6.5 Associate Professor

- (i) A holder of a PhD/M.Med/M.Dent from a recognized institution with a minimum of SIX years of notable academic service since award of PhD/M.Med/M.Dent and at least 12 publication points since award of PhD/M.Med/M.Dent.
- (ii) By promotion of a Senior Lecturer with a PhD or MMED who has obtained MSc or equivalent as a superspeciality with a minimum of three years of notable academic service (of at least B+) in that position and has acquired at least 8 points from scholarly activities since last promotion (at least 6 points should come from publications). At least 30% of publication points should be from diversified journal publications.
- (iii) By promotion of a Senior Lecturer with MMED with a minimum of three years of notable academic service (of at least B+) in that position and has acquired at least 10 points since last promotion (at least 8 points should come from publications). At least 30% of publication points an applicant should be first or corresponding author. At least 30% of publication points should be from diversified journal publications

**NB: At Professorial rank publications should show focusing in a specific area of specialization in the field**

##### **General attributes:**

- a. Adherence to professional ethics;

- b. Demonstration of experience in the application of course materials;
- c. Ability to recognize students having difficulties, intervene and provide help and support;
- d. Ability to apply specialist knowledge and skills to the resolution of problems in the society;
- e. Ability to offer examples from a variety of sources to support course content;
- f. Ability to remain current in his/her field through active consultation and continuing education and;
- g. Ability to establish academic or professional chairs for the institution;
- h. Ability to maintain vibrant relationships with academic and professional colleagues through attendance at participation in various activities.

## 6.6 Professor

- (iv) A holder of a PhD/M.Med/M.Dent from a recognized institution with a minimum of NINE years of notable academic service and at least 17 publication points since award of PhD/M.Med/M.Dent.
- (v) By promotion of an Associate Professor with a minimum of three years of distinguished academic service in that position and has acquired at least 10 points from scholarly activities since last promotion (at least 8 points should come from publications). At least 40% of publication points should be from diversified journal publications.

### **General attributes:**

- a. Adherence to professional ethics;
- b. Ability to recognize student having difficulties, intervene and provide help and support;
- c. Ability to command authority in a specific field of one's profession or discipline;
- d. Ability to establish academic or professional chairs for the institution;
- e. Ability to spearhead new knowledge, innovation and processes taking into account the current state of development as well as forecasting the future trends, and ;
- f. Ability to establish a professorial chair.

## 6.7 PROFESSOR EMERITUS OR PROFESSOR EMERITA

### a. **Qualifications**

The title Professor Emeritus or Professor Emerita (for female staff) shall be conferred to a:-

*Renowned Retired Professor who has served the university with distinction over a period of years may be awarded the title of Emeritus or Emerita (for females) upon retirement. He/she must have an outstanding performance and track record for soliciting and attracting research funding for the University. Post holder shall hold office as long as is still active and able to attract research/project funds for the University. Shall be remunerated from the funds*



*that he/she generates/attracts from funders for the University.*

**b. Duties and Responsibilities**

To solicit and attract research funds for the University in addition to performing academic duties as a professor.

## **7. RECRUITMENT AND PROMOTION REQUIREMENTS FOR RESEARCH FELLOWS**

- 7.1** In addition to teaching staff there will be a cadre of Research Fellow who will be engaged in research activities. Generally, the activities of a Research Fellow cadre will include the following:-
- i. To design research projects.
  - ii. To identify areas of research.
  - iii. To conduct research activities.
  - iv. To assist students' supervisors in guiding students in their research projects
  - v. To design/manage data bank in different areas/disciplines
  - vi. To assist in training to either undergraduate or postgraduate students when there is a scarcity in his/her area of specialization
  - vii. Any other duties assigned by the superior.
- 7.2** The method of entry and promotion for research fellows is as follows
- 7.2.1 Research Fellow Trainee**  
First Degree in the relevant discipline with at least upper second class and a minimum GPA of 3.8 from recognized University.
- 7.2.2 Assistant Research Fellow**
- (i) Possession of an appropriate Master Degree with a GPA of 3.5 and above from recognized University provided criteria stated in 7.2.1 above are met
  - (ii) By promotion of Research Fellow Trainee who have acquired an appropriate Master Degree with an average GPA of 3.5 and above from recognized University
- 7.2.3 Research fellow**
- (i) Possession of a PhD in the relevant area of Specialty plus three years of relevant working experience.
  - (ii) By promotion of Assistant Research Fellow with 3 years working experience since last promotion and have acquired an appropriate relevant PhD.
- 7.2.4 Senior Research fellow**
- (i) Possession of a PhD in the relevant area of specialty with a minimum of 3 years working experience in research in similar position and at least 6 publication points since attainment of PhD (at least 4 of the publications, the

candidate must be a single/ first author). At least 25% of papers irrespective of authorship position should be from diversified international journals.

- (ii) By Promotion of Research Fellow with 3 years working experience since last promotion and has acquired at least 6 publication points since last promotion (at least 4 of the publications, the candidate must be a single/ first author). At least 25% of papers irrespective of authorship position should be from diversified international journals.

#### **7.2.5 Associate Research Professor**

- (i) Possession of a PhD in the relevant area of specialty with a research experience of not less than 6 years after PhD and at least 14 publication points since attainment of PhD (at least 5 of the publications, the candidate must be a single/ first author). At least 30% of papers irrespective of authorship position should be from diversified international journals.
- (ii) By promotion of Senior Research Fellow with 3 years working experience since last promotion and has acquired at least 10 publication points since last promotion (at least 5 of the publications, the candidate must be a single/ first author). At least 30% of papers irrespective of authorship position should be from diversified international journals.

#### **7.2.6 Research Professor**

- (i) Possession of a PhD in the relevant area of specialty with a research experience of not less than 9 years after PhD and at least 24 publication points since attainment of PhD (at least 10 of the publications, the candidate must be a single/ first author). At least 50% of papers irrespective of authorship position should be from diversified international journals.
- (ii) By promotion of Associate Research Fellow with 3 years working experience since last promotion and has acquired at least 12 publication points since last promotion (at least 8 of the publications, the candidate must be a single/ first author). At least 40% of papers irrespective of authorship position should be from diversified international journals.

### **8. MEASURES TO BE TAKEN FOR STAFF WHO DO NOT FULFILL PROMOTION REQUIREMENTS**

#### **8.1 Staff who do not submit original masters/PhD certificates and copies of dissertations**

- 8.1.1** Staff shall be required to submit original certificates and copy of dissertation within one year after completion of studies. Requirement to submit original certificates should be incorporated in the “Terms and Conditions of Sponsorship”
- 8.1.2** Staff who fail to submit original certificates and copy of dissertation within the specified period shall be considered to have failed to complete the program and therefore liable for termination.
- 8.1.3** Certificates from unaccredited Universities shall not be recognized.

## 8.2 Staff who stay in one position for too long

8.2.1 Measures to be taken against staff shall be diversified with regard to period and rank as shown in Table 2.

8.2.2 A two-year period (after the normal three (3) years) shall be adopted for an (in-depth) assessment of progress made by staff in implementation of directives.

**Table 2: Measures to be taken against staff that stays in one position for too long**

Post/years on post	5 years	7 years	9 years	>9 years
<b>Asst. Lecturer/ Asst. research fellow/ Asst. Librarian</b>	Within 5 years of service, staff should have registered for Ph.D or its equivalent. If failed, staff to explain why he /has not registered for Ph.D. Head of Department (HoD) to find out the reasons for the delay and create a conducive atmosphere for staff to be able to register for Ph.D.	The Appointment Committee to recommend staff to seek an alternative employment within or outside the University; if staff has failed to register for Ph.D. or its equivalent	Not applicable	Not applicable
<b>Lecturer/research fellow Librarians</b>	Staff to explain why he/she has not published enough for promotion. HoD to find out the reasons for not publishing enough. HoD to remove/diminish the obstacles.	If staff does not have enough publications, Dean/Director to warn staff on the possibility of re-categorization. Dean /Director to give support to the HoD to implement Head's action.	Seek for alternative employment	Not applicable
<b>Senior Lecturer/Senior Research</b>	Staff to explain why he/she has not published	Dean/Director to find out reasons for not publishing	DP-ARC to give a 6-month time	Seek for alternative employment

<b>Fellow/Senior Librarian</b>	enough for promotion. HoD to encourage staff to publish more. HoD to create conducive atmosphere for staff to be able to intensify research and to publish	enough. Dean to assist the HoD to reduce workload on staff, and/or ensure that staff concentrates on research/publication	off to allow staff to do research and to publish more	
<b>Associate Professor/Associate Research Professor/Associate Librarian professor</b>	Staff to explain why he /she has not published enough for promotion. HoD to encourage staff to publish more. HoD to create conducive atmosphere for staff to do more research and to publish more	Dean to assist the HoD to reduce workload on staff, particularly the administrative one.	DP-ARC to assist staff to arrange a sabbatical leave	The case should be considered by the Appointment Committee individually

## 9. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

These guidelines were reviewed by a committee consisting of:

1. Dr. Mange Manyama Associate Dean Weill Bugando School of Medicine
2. Dr. Erasmus Kamugisha Associate Director Postgraduate studies
3. Dr. Mariam Mirambo Lecturer –Microbiology/Immunology
4. Dr. Benson Kidenya Senior Lecturer –Biochemistry
5. Dr. Rodrick Kabangila Senior Lecturer –Internal Medicine
6. Dr. Peter Rambau Senior Lecturer and HOD Pathology
7. Mr. Karol Marwa Lecturer Department of Pharmacology
8. Dr. Hyasinta Jaka Senior Lecturer –Internal Medicine
9. Dr. Peter Masikini Lecturer Department of Internal Medicine
10. Dr. Domenica Morona Senior Lecturer and HOD department of Parasitology