

# **St. Augustine University of Tanzania**



## **Guidelines for Recruitment, Performance Assessment and Promotion of Academic Staff, 2013**

(REVISED VERSION -2021)

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
Definition of Terms .....	1
PART I: GUIDELINES FOR RECRUITMENT .....	2
1.1 Criteria for Direct Recruitment of Full Time Academic Staff.....	2
1.2. Recruitment of Part Time Academic Staff .....	3
1.2.1. Nomination and appointment of a Part Time Academic staff.....	3
1.2.2 Assessment of a Part Time Academic Staff for Re-nomination .....	3
1.2.3. Assessment of a Part time Staff’s teaching Effectiveness and Points Allocation .....	3
PART II: WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTION .....	5
PART III: PROMOTION ASSESSMENT .....	6
3.1 Section 1: Performance Assessment.....	6
3.1.1. Criteria for allocation and distribution of OPRAS points required for Promotion .....	6
3.2. Section 2: Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness.....	6
3.2.1. Teaching effectiveness .....	6
3.3. Section 3: Assessment of Administrative Duties and Special Assignments.....	7
3.3.1. Administrative Duties and Special Assignments .....	7
3.3.2. Assessment Scale for Administrative Duties and Special Assignments .....	7
3.4. Section 4: Assessment of Scholarly Works .....	8
3.4.1. Point Allocation for Publications of Scholarly Works.....	8
3.4.2. Books and Book Chapters.....	9
3.4.2.1. Assessment Scale for Books (maximum 6 points) .....	10
3.4.2.2. Assessment of Jointly Authored Books.....	11
3.4.2.3. Assessment Scale for Book Chapters .....	11
3.4.3. Assessment Criteria for Journal Papers/Articles.....	11
3.4.3.1. Assessment Scale for Journal Papers (maximum 1.0 points) .....	12
3.4.3.2. Assessment of Jointly Authored Journal Papers.....	12
3.4.4. Assessment Criteria for Unpublished Works.....	12
3.4.4.1. Grading of Unpublished Works.....	13
3.4.4.2 Assessment of Jointly Undertaken unpublished Work.....	13
3.4.5. Published Presentations or Proceedings of Conferences.....	13
3.4.5.1. Assessment Criteria and Scale for Conference Papers .....	13
3.4.5.2. Assessment Criteria and Scale for Scholarly papers .....	13
3.4.6. Assessment Criteria and Scale for Consultancy Works .....	13
3.4.7. Assessment Criteria and Scale for Book Reviews.....	14
3.4.8. Assessment Criteria and Scale for Manuals and Compendia.....	14
3.4.9. Assessment Criteria and Scale for Patents .....	14
3.4.10. Summary of the grading System for Publications .....	14
3.4.11. Contribution of Various Scholarly Publications towards Total Publication Points.....	15
3.5. Section 5: The Balance of Points and Criteria for Academic Staff Promotion.....	15
3.5.1. Academic and non-academic activities .....	15
3.5.2. Conversion of Letter Grades to Points for Publications.....	16
3.6. Section 6: Criteria for Promotion of Academic Staff .....	16
3.7. Section 7: General Conditions Governing Promotions and Promotion Process.....	18
3.7.1. Key Requirements for Promotion .....	18
3.7.2. Levels of Promotion.....	19

3.7.3. Using Residual Points for Subsequent Promotions.....	19
3.7.4. Assessment Forms.....	19
3.7.4. Assessment Team Requirements.....	20
3.7.5. Key Steps in the Promotion Process .....	21
3.7.6. Appeals.....	24
3.7.7. Turnaround Time for Processing Promotions .....	24

## **Introduction**

The aim of Saint Augustine University of Tanzania (SAUT) is to provide access to quality higher education and training, research, outreach and offer community service. In order to realize this SAUT is committed to recruiting, developing and retaining skilled, experienced and high-performing academic staff.

The guidelines herein shall be used for recruiting, promoting and evaluating the performance of the existing members of academic staff of SAUT, its constituent colleges and centers. Accordingly, the criteria for the said recruitment shall include academic qualification, professional experience, publication of scholarly works and the results of the evaluation from the Open Performance Review Appraisals (OPRAS) for already in-service academic staff members. In alignment to the Standards and Guidelines for University Education in Tanzania, 2019, these guidelines constitute the first revision of SAUT Guidelines for Recruitment and Promotion 2013.

By virtue of these Guidelines, the academic ranks of new members of academic staff joining SAUT, which were awarded before joining SAUT, shall be scrutinized both in terms of their authenticity and comparability with SAUT standards. If the said ranks shall be deemed to fall short of these standards, the said new members of staff shall be advised to take an academic rank which is appropriately commensurate with SAUT standards.

## **Definition of Terms**

### **i) Person who is external to the University**

A person will be external to the University if he/she: does not teach at SAUT either on full time or visiting basis; he/she does not serve as advisor to, or sitting in any of the boards of the university or other such fora.

### **ii) Scholarly work**

Any academic discourse on any branch of knowledge, existing or published in print, electronic, audio, or audio-visual form.

### **iii) Contribution to Knowledge**

Contribution to any of the existing and known branches or areas of knowledge

### **iv) Author**

The person who puts intellectual efforts behind a scholarly work.

### **v) Community Service**

A task or an undertaking by a member of SAUT academic staff that serves the University, the local, the national or the international community.

## PART I: GUIDELINES FOR RECRUITMENT

### 1.1 Criteria for Direct Recruitment of Full Time Academic Staff

Filling a vacant position at SAUT will be by direct recruitment from outside the university or its constituent colleges or by appointment of staff from within the University (in-service recruitment). The criteria or minimum requirements for direct recruitment of academic staff at SAUT are given in Table 1.

**Table 1: Criteria for Direct Recruitment of Full Time Academic Staff**

S/N	Position	Minimum Requirements	General Attributes
1	Tutorial Assistant/ Assistant Librarian Trainee/ Research Fellow Trainee	- Bachelor Degree with minimum GPA of 3.5 (Minimum of a B+ Grade in the relevant subject or its equivalent, where applicable).	- Teaching Language Proficiency; - Good communication skills; - Computer literacy; - Good interpersonal skills; - Ability to work as part of a Team; - Motivation for innovation, further learning and continuing professional development.
2	Assistant Lecturer/ Assistant Librarian/ Assistant Research Fellow	- Master Degree in a relevant field with a minimum GPA of 4.0; - Bachelor degree with a minimum GPA of 3.5 and at least B+ grade in the relevant subject (or its equivalent, where applicable).	Attainment of Level/Category 1 attributes as well as the following: - Ability to prepare and deliver own teaching materials; - problem solving and innovation skills; and - ability to prepare quality research proposals.
3	Lecturer/Librarian/ Research Fellow	- PhD; - Master degree in a relevant field with a minimum GPA of 4.0; - Bachelor degree with a minimum GPA of 3.5 and at least B+ grade in relevant subject (or its equivalent, where applicable).	Attainment of Level/Category 2 attributes as well as the following: - ability to design, set, administer and supervise different assessment items; - ability to mark student scripts and course work assessment items and provide feedback; - ability to carry out independent research; - ability to supervise research and other knowledge and skills development activities; and - Ability to write research proposals and projects that attract funding.
4	Senior Lecturer/ Senior Librarian/ Senior Research Fellow	- PhD; - Master degree in the field with the minimum GPA of 4.0; - Bachelor degree with a minimum GPA of 3.5 with minimum score of B+ in relevant subject (or its equivalent, where applicable); - Three (3) years of university level teaching experience in related field; - minimum of 5-points: (3 points derived from peer reviewed publications from at least two sources with minimum journal diversification of 35% and the remaining 2 points derived from community service).	Attainment of Level/Category 3 attributes as well as: - ability to plan and promote the vision of the institution; - ability to attract funding for different activities of the institution; and - leadership and management ability.
5	Associate Professor/ Associate Library Professor/ Associate Research Professor	- PhD; - Master degree in the field with minimum GPA of 4.0; - Bachelor degree with minimum GPA of 3.5 and at least B+ grade in relevant subject (or its equivalent, where applicable); - Six (6) years of university level teaching experience post-PhD in related field; - 8 points derived from scholarly works since last promotion - 3 years of supervising research work, including postgraduate dissertations and theses and/or community service.	Attainment of Level/Category 4 requirements as well as the following attributes: - demonstration of ability to mentor and supervise postgraduate research students; - demonstration of actual experience in the application of course materials to real life situations. - ability to apply specialist knowledge and skills to the resolution of problems in the society; and - ability to remain current in his or her field through active consulting and continuing education.

6	Professor/ Library Professor/ Research Professor	- PhD; - Master degree in the field with minimum GPA of 4.0 - Bachelor degree with minimum GPA of 3.5 and at least B+ grade in relevant subject (or its equivalent, where applicable); - 9 years of university level teaching experience; - 10 points derived from publication since last promotion.	Attainment of Level/Category 5 requirements as well as the following attributes: - command of authority in a specific field of his profession or discipline; - ability to establish academic or professional chairs for the institution; - ability to spearhead new knowledge, innovation and processes taking into account the current state of development as well as focus on future trends.
7	Distinguished Professor/ Distinguished Library Professor / Distinguished Research Professor	- Person holding the title of Professor for not less than 10 years and has produced at least 15 publications in that time.	
8	Professor Emeritus	- A retired Distinguished Professor with outstanding achievement in academics, but still in good health that could enable him/her to continue contributing accumulated knowledge, experience and wisdom to the University.	

**NB:**

1. The GPA grades stated in the Guidelines above shall not apply in the recruitment of academic staff who has been in the university academic career before 2014.
2. Only Certificates from institutions recognized by TCU shall be accepted.

---

**1.2. Recruitment of Part Time Academic Staff**

If and when need arises SAUT shall engage part time academic staff.

**1.2.1. Nomination and appointment of a Part Time Academic staff**

- a) All part time academic staff shall be nominated or re-nominated by the DVCAA upon recommendation by the respective Dean of the Faculty/School in consultation with the Head of Department.
- b) The Head of Department shall ensure nomination forms are correctly filled in and all supporting documents are attached.

**1.2.2 Assessment of a Part Time Academic Staff for Re-nomination**

Academic activities that shall be considered for re-nominating the part timer will include teaching effectiveness, and contribution to academia in research, dissemination and community service.

**1.2.3. Assessment of a Part time Staff's teaching Effectiveness and Points Allocation**

The teaching activities for which effectiveness shall be assessed will include giving lectures, tutorials, practical teaching, facilitating tutorials, journal club sessions and seminars, facilitating grand rounds, conducting formative assessments, contributing questions and material for skills knowledge and skills assessments, invigilating examinations and supervising students' research work.

The head of department shall ensure that teaching effectiveness of the part time academic staff is assessed in the following areas:

- a) Planning/preparation of subject matter for a teaching session
- b) Delivery of the teaching sessions
- c) Appropriateness of assessment questions/materials provided
- d) Quality in grading scripts and practical skills
- e) Students rating of the staff's teaching
- f) Punctuality to assigned teaching tasks

**Table 2: Summary of Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness**

S/N	Activity	Assessment Score Percent
1	<b>Planning/preparation of subject matter</b>	
a)	Proportion of routine and examinations, department academic meetings attended	10%
b)	Quality of submitted summary – content scope, planned assessments and references for students	10%
2	<b>Delivery of the teaching sessions</b>	
a)	Logical flow of content of lectures	10%
b)	Clarity of concepts delivered to students when teaching	10%
c)	Appropriateness and quality of teaching/learning aides used	10%
d)	Responsiveness to questions from students	5%
3	<b>Student Evaluation</b>	
a)	Timelines in submitting assessment questions and materials for summative and formative assessments	5%
b)	Quality of submitted questions and materials for summative and formative assessments	5%
4	<b>Competence in grading scripts and clinical/practical skills</b>	
a)	Fairness in giving student's merit where due in formative assessments	5%
b)	Fairness in giving student's merit where due in summative assessments	5%
5.	<b>Student Assessment</b>	
a)	Average % score for sessions that staff taught	5%
6.	<b>Punctuality and Availability</b>	
a)	Punctuality to lecture, seminars, tutorials, journal clubs & grand rounds, major rounds, clinics and other practical training settings.	10%
b)	Availability for consultation by students and staff	10%
	Average % score _____ (*subject to periodic change after review by SAUT DQA)	Points: _____

## PART II: WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTION

In determining the minimum workload for teaching and non-teaching activities, it is assumed that the average notional working duration per week shall be 40 hours for any academic staff. Understanding the workload per academic rank is helpful during setting of OPRAS objectives and staff evaluations.

Table 3 below gives workload estimate for academic staff. These include both academic and non-academic tasks at SAUT.

**Table 3: Allocation of workload for academic staff**

Activity	Tutorial Assistant		Assistant Lecturer		Lecturer		Senior Lecturer		Associate / Full Professor	
	%	Hours	%	Hours	%	Hours	Hours	%	Hours	%
Teaching/Class time	5	12.5	7	17.5	10	25	10	25	8	20
Preparations/Resource search	20	50	7	17.5	3	7.5	2	5	3	7.5
Research/publications/ research consultancy	11	27.5	19	47.5	18	45	18	45	14	35
Service: community/public etc.	3.6	9	6	15	4	10	3	7.5	7	17.5
Administration	0.4	1	1	2.5	3	7.5	4	10	2	5
Mentoring/Counseling/Supervision	-	-	-	-	1	2.5	3	7.5	6	15
<b>Hours/Week</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Annual Teaching Load</b>	<b>175</b>		<b>245</b>		<b>350</b>		<b>350</b>		<b>280</b>	

## PART III: PROMOTION ASSESSMENT

### 3.1 Section One: Performance Assessment

Each member of the academic staff of SAUT is required to perform his/her duties and responsibilities to best of his/her ability. For that reason, regular assessment of performance shall be conducted annually based on prior agreed targets between the staff and the University. The assessment shall be carried out through the OPRAS. The agreed OPRAS targets shall be drawn from institutional strategic plan objectives.

#### 3.1.1. Criteria for allocation and distribution of OPRAS points required for Promotion

This will be assessed by taking into consideration scores from performance in all sections of the OPRAS (*see appendix 1 for the proposed OPRAS Form*). Any academic staff whose overall OPRAS average rating score is less than 1.0 points (*see the scoring below*) shall not be eligible for promotion to any academic level regardless of the total points obtained from any other source in this guideline.

Overall OPRAS average rating score points for promotion eligibility shall be derived from the average of overall OPRAS ratings accumulated in the past three (3) evaluated years as follows:

- a) Overall average OPRAS Rating 1.0 – 2.5: (1.0 points)
- b) Overall average OPRAS Rating 2.6 – 3.0: (0.5 points)
- c) Overall average OPRAS Rating 3.1 – 5.0: (0 points)

NB: The points scored in this sub-section are to be used only for determining whether there should be further processing for promotion of the candidate or not as explained in Table 1 above. The points shall not be further used in the balance of points for in-service promotion.

### 3.2. Section Two: Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

#### 3.2.1. Teaching effectiveness

The criteria for assessment of effectiveness of teaching shall include quality in the following:

- a) Planning/preparation of subject matter for a teaching session;
- b) Delivery of the teaching sessions;
- c) Appropriateness of assessment questions/materials provided;
- d) Quality in grading scripts and practical skills;
- e) Students rating of the staff's teaching;
- f) Punctuality to assigned teaching tasks.

Effective teaching shall be awarded a maximum of 1.0 points accumulated over 3 consecutive years provided the points have not been used for promotion purposes before. A "C" grade in teaching effectiveness should not be used for promotion at any rank (A = Excellent, B+ = Very Good, C = Good).

Teaching that has been carried outside SAUT can be considered for promotion. This includes also the supervision of theses and dissertations from outside SAUT where the academic staff has served as external supervisor.

### **3.3. Section Three: Assessment of Administrative Duties and Special Assignments**

#### **3.3.1. Administrative Duties and Special Assignments**

It has to be taken into recognition that academic staff in administrative posts usually divide their time between administrative roles and academic commitments. For that reason, their administrative activities and other community service activities should be taken into consideration during their promotion to higher ranks. The following aspects must be taken into consideration:

- The main criterion shall be the level of duties or assignments, whereby the higher the duties the more the points earned.
- Points shall be earned for holding a position for not less than 3 years. This shall apply to all kinds of positions and duties. However, if a person moved through more than one type of duty or position within this period of 3 years, he/she will earn an average of points available for the positions he/she held. For example, if a person started with a position which attracts 1.0 points, then 2.0 points, then 3.0 points, the computation shall be:  $(1.0 + 2.0 + 3.0) \div 3 = 2.0$ .
- If a position has been held for less than 3 years, the points shall be assigned on pro-rata basis, where fractions shall be rounded up. For example, if a person has held a position which attracts 3.0 points for 1 year only, the computation shall be  $3.0 \div 3 = 1.0$ . Therefore, that person shall be awarded 1.0 points.

If an academic member of staff holds a position for more than 3 years, each period of 3 years will earn him/her new points, and any unfinished terms shall be computed on pro-rata basis.

- Without prejudice to the 3 years requirement, if a person serves in more than one type of duty in tandem (not in series), he/she shall benefit from all the duties. For example, if an individual is assigned duties that deserve 1.0 points and 2.0 points respectively, and he/she carries those duties at the same time, this person shall be awarded 3.0 points.
- Administrative duties shall be those held during the tenure of employment at SAUT or/ and its Constituent Colleges only.

#### **3.3.2. Assessment Scale for Administrative Duties and Special Assignments**

- Top university level responsibilities (VC, DVCAA, DVCAF) = 1.0 points
- Associate university level responsibilities (Principals, DPAs, DPAFs, Corporate Counsel) = 0.5 points
- Dean of Faculty/School/Directors, = 0.5 points
- Departmental responsibilities, HODs = 0.25 points
- Responsibilities in boards, commissions, and committees = 0.15 points

### 3.4. Section Four: Assessment of Scholarly Works

#### 3.4.1. Point Allocation for Publications of Scholarly Works

The University shall use a number of scholarly works for the purpose of promotion. These scholarly works shall include books, peer reviewed publications of all types including journal articles, case reports and conference papers, dictionaries, technical notes, research and consultancy reports, book reviews and chapters in a book. For the purpose of promotion at any level, unpublished dissertations, editing of a book and reviewing of curricula shall not be awarded any point. Publications, like the overall OPRAS rating awarded, play an independent role in permitting for the promotion process to continue but shall not earn the applicant any point. Point allocation for these different publications and scholarly works are explained hereunder.

All permitted forms of publications shall be evaluated on the basis of coverage of subject matter, originality, presentation, contribution to knowledge, relevance to academic discipline and overall quality. The candidate's scholarly works shall be sent to two reviewers who shall read and award grades that correspond to the following assigned points:

- |                         |                          |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) A grade = 1.0 points | b) B+ grade = 1.0 points |
| c) B grade = 0.5 points | d) C grade = 0 points.   |

Grades offered for each publication shall be entered into the SAUT Publication Assessment Form (*See Appendix 2 for the proposed PAF*) by the reviewer. The departmental review committee which shall be made of three persons at least two should be holders of PhD upon receipt of evaluated publications shall accordingly assign points to the reviewer's grades as above and calculate average points for each publication. The average points for each publication shall then be multiplied with the percentage given to the author according to the Author's Contribution Agreement Form (*ACAF*) (*see Appendix 3*). The department review team shall then fill SAUT Form Summarizing Point Distribution (*SPD*) (*Appendix 4*) and submit to the DVCAA through the Dean of Faculty/School.

Example: **Reviewer X** has given a B+ grade to a publication and **Reviewer Y** has given a B grade to the same publication. If the type of publication has a **maximum allowable point** of 1.0, the average points shall be  $(1+0.5)/2=0.75$ . If for this publication all eligible authors have agreed and signed to confirm that the contribution of this academic staff was 30%, then points that shall be allocated to this Author is  $0.75 \times 0.3$  (i.e. 30%) = 0.225 points.

In order to determine publication points, all publications that were not used in the immediate past promotion and are dated after submission of publications for the last assessment for promotion, shall be eligible for submission for the current promotion. It is very important to note the following:

- i. Two reviewers are needed.
- ii. Reviewers shall assign grades.
- iii. In the event of gross discrepancy between reviewers, e.g.; one reviewer assigns a C grade and the second a B+ or A grade (i.e. a 2.0-grade difference or more), the review committee must send the

publication to another reviewer. Subsequently, two of the three grades that are less divergent (i.e. similar or within 1.0-grade difference) shall be used in computing the final score.

- iv. Staff must submit a signed SAUT Authors Contribution Agreement Form (Appendix 3). Departments shall calculate average points and total points for the staff and fill in SAUT Summary Form (Appendix 4).
- v. Each publication type has specified point ceiling.
- vi. Points calculated from all the evaluated publications shall be added together in order to obtain the total publication points.

Scholarly materials and maximum allowable points are given hereunder: -

### **3.4.2. Books and Book Chapters**

Books and book chapters shall be assessed according to the following criteria:

1) Publication Information

Books must be in the area of specialisation of the author, must have been published by a known publisher, and must bear an official ISBN. However, the ISBN shall not be graded.

2) Status of the Publisher

The publisher could either be specialized or general.

A specialized publisher is expected to be specialized in publishing books in the thematic area of the book being assessed, or has a reputable history of publishing books in that area, or has a reputable peer review and editorial mechanisms in that area.

A general publisher lacks most of the qualifications of a specialized publisher.

Different grades shall be assigned between books published by a specialized publisher and those published by a general publisher.

3) Contribution to Knowledge

In terms of contribution to knowledge, a book can be ground-breaking or a continuation of existing knowledge or partly ground-breaking and partly continuation of existing knowledge.

A book is ground-breaking if it is considered a pioneer work on the subject matter for which it was written or in the context in which it is written; or if it addresses a new angle which had not been sufficiently addressed in the past.

A book which reviews an earlier edition in order to update it is partly ground-breaking and partly a continuation of existing knowledge.

A book is a continuation of existing knowledge if it only elaborates or reorganizes information in an area where there exists sufficient knowledge.

Different scores shall be assigned between ground-breaking books and books that are a continuation of existing knowledge.

### Examples

A book on *General Principles of Management* is a continuation of existing knowledge, but a book on *Principles of Management of Small and Medium Enterprises in the Manufacturing Sector* can be deemed ground-breaking. A book on *General Principles of Sociology* is a continuation of existing knowledge, but a book on *The Sociology of the Fishing Industry in Tanzania* can be considered ground-breaking. A book on *General Principles of Investment* is a continuation of existing knowledge, but a book on *Principles of Investment in the Oil and Gas Industry in Tanzania* can be considered ground-breaking.

#### 4) Depth of Coverage of Subject Matter and Substance

Depth of coverage of subject matter for which the book was written and the substance of it, refer to the extent to which the subject matter has been discussed, especially when examined from the point of view of scholarly expertise in that area and the contribution to knowledge the book makes.

The length of the book shall also be taken into consideration when assessing the substance of it. Therefore, larger books should be deemed to have more substance than smaller ones, although caution should be exercised in this regard because it is not always the case that larger books have more substance.

Different grades shall be assigned for the different levels of coverage with regard to treatment of subject matter and substance.

#### 5) Form and style of presentation

A book must be presented in scholarly acceptable standards, including the arrangement of the work and citation and referencing system.

### **3.4.2.1. Assessment Scale for Books (maximum 6 points)**

- |    |                                                                      |              |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1) | <u>Status of the Publisher</u>                                       |              |
|    | Specialized publisher                                                | = 1.5 points |
|    | General publisher                                                    | = 0.5 points |
| 2) | <u>Contribution to Knowledge</u>                                     |              |
|    | Ground-breaking                                                      | = 2.5 points |
|    | Partly ground-breaking and partly continuation of existing knowledge | = 1.0 points |
|    | Purely continuation of existing knowledge                            | = 0.5 points |
| 3) | <u>Treatment of Subject Matter and Substance</u>                     |              |
|    | Very comprehensive                                                   | = 2.5 points |
|    | Comprehensive                                                        | = 2.0 points |
|    | Average                                                              | = 1.5 points |
|    | Fair                                                                 | = 1.0 points |
|    | Low                                                                  | = 0.5 points |

4) <u>Form and Style of Presentation</u>	
Excellent	= 0.5 points
Very good	= 0.4 points
Good	= 0.3 points
Average	= 0.2 points
Below average	= 0.1 point

#### **3.4.2.2. Assessment of Jointly Authored Books**

A book written by more than one person shall be assessed first and then the points garnered shall be divided equally by the number of authors unless the percentage of the contribution is indicated by the authors.

#### **3.4.2.3. Assessment Scale for Book Chapters**

For book chapters, the whole book shall be assessed first using the criteria stipulated in 3.4.2.1 above, then the total points obtained shall be divided by the number of chapters in that book. Fractions must be rounded up.

For example, if a book scores 4 points and it has 5 chapters, then each chapter will score 0.8 points. Therefore, a Chapter shall score 0.8 points.

#### **3.4.3. Assessment Criteria for Journal Papers/Articles**

##### 1) Substance of the Paper

The significance of the substance of a journal paper is the same as for books. However, the length of the paper shall also be taken into consideration when assessing the substance of the paper, even where the length is limited by the editorial policy of the journal in which the paper was published. Therefore, longer papers should be deemed to have more substance than shorter ones.

##### 2) Depth of Research and Supporting Evidence

Papers are based on research which comes up with evidence that supports the various positions, arguments and conclusions advanced by the author. Depth of research and supporting evidence is usually established by looking at the amount and nature of references that support the various premises. This aspect shall be taken into consideration when assessing the paper.

##### 3) Status of the Journal in which the Paper is Published

A journal in which a paper is published can either be international or local. An international journal must have the following qualifications: international editorial board, international classification index, and international source of the contributions. All the three (3) qualifications must be there. If one element is missing, the journal shall be considered local. This factor shall be considered when grading a journal paper.

### 3.4.3.1. Assessment Scale for Journal Papers (maximum 1.0 points)

- 1) Substance of the Paper

Excellent	= 0.5 points
Very good	= 0.4 points
Good	= 0.3 points
Average	= 0.2 points
Low	= 0.1 points
- 2) Depth of Research and Supporting Evidence

Very High	= 0.25 points
High	= 0.24 points
Average	= 0.23 points
Low	= 0.22 points
- 3) Status of the Journal in which the Paper is Published

International journal	= 0.25 points
Local journal	= 0.24 points

### 3.4.3.2. Assessment of Jointly Authored Journal Papers

A journal paper written by more than one person shall be assessed first and then the points garnered shall be divided equally by the number of authors, unless the percentage of the contribution is indicated by the authors.

### 3.4.4. Assessment Criteria for Unpublished Works

#### 1) Introduction

Two categories of unpublished works shall be accepted in promotion of academic staff: unpublished research report and occasional/position paper.

A research report is an academic discourse which is prompted by a clearly defined problem, governed by objectives, guided by research questions or hypotheses, having a clear methodology, and containing findings and conclusion. If a work does not fall under this category, it shall be considered a position / occasional paper.

Regardless of the nature of the initiative to undertake the research work, the Office of the DVCAA and or the office of the Directorate of Post Graduate Studies, Research and Consultancy, or other body or bodies charged with the responsibility of research by SAUT, must be informed and updated about ongoing research works.

Once an unpublished work has been used in the promotion, it cannot be used again after being published.

2) Articulation of the Content

A good research report will have a clear and straightforward statement of the problem, statement of objective(s), research questions/hypotheses, and methodology. These elements shall be graded.

3) Presentation of Findings, Analysis and Discussion

A good paper will show how the objectives of the research have been attained through the research, and how the research questions have been answered or hypotheses proved or disproved through discussion and analysis of findings. Attention shall be paid on the depth of analysis and the logic in the presentation and discussion of findings. Different levels of discourse shall be graded differently.

4) Conclusions and Recommendations

A good report draws conclusions which are logically connected to the problem, objectives, questions or hypotheses, and the findings. It finally makes recommendations based on the findings.

**3.4.4.1. Grading of Unpublished Works**

An unpublished research report shall be awarded a maximum of 0.5 points while an unpublished occasional /position paper shall be awarded a maximum of 0.25 points. A candidate for promotion shall be allowed to present a maximum of two unpublished reports and/or two occasional / position papers.

**3.4.4.2. Assessment of Jointly Undertaken unpublished Work**

An unpublished work undertaken by more than one person shall be assessed first and then the points garnered shall be divided by the number of contributors.

**3.4.5. Published Presentations or Proceedings of Conferences**

**3.4.5.1. Assessment Criteria and Scale for Conference Papers**

For a conference paper to be accepted for promotion it should be retrievable from referred proceedings. Such papers shall be awarded a maximum of 0.5 points.

**3.4.5.2. Assessment Criteria and Scale for Scholarly papers**

Scholarly papers appearing in proceedings of professional international symposia or conferences recognised by the University and the Commission for the purpose of academic staff promotions and the papers having been peer-reviewed like any other scholarly articles published in journals. Such papers shall be awarded a maximum of 1.0 points.

**3.4.6. Assessment Criteria and Scale for Consultancy Works**

Consultancy should be registered and approved by SAUT or its constituent colleges or centres. Consultancy work consists of all assignments that an individual is given in order to give expert and

professional advice or individual initiatives that attract grants or other benefits to SAUT. This also includes handling of special projects and programmes.

Since the quality of consultancy work is usually controlled by the client or the giver of the assignment, the criteria for assessment shall be the acceptance of the work by the client and the level of the work determined by the client by filling an evaluation form from the University. This form will be called Consultancy Evaluation Form (CAF) (Appendix 5 ...).

The successful development and or review of an academic programme shall also be considered as a consultancy once the programme is approved by the University Senate. Successful accomplishment of assignment, special project, reception of grants or benefits, and development of new academic programme shall be awarded a maximum of 0.5 points while the review of existing programme shall be awarded a maximum of 0.25 points.

The person involved in consultancy work shall be awarded full mark. Save for development of academic programme, where all participants shall be awarded the maximum points garnered, points garnered from consultancy work done by more than one person shall be shared equally.

#### **3.4.7. Assessment Criteria and Scale for Book Reviews**

A review of a book that has been approved by a recognised publisher and which has been published in a recognised peer reviewed journal or periodical may be evaluated. However, editorship of a book should not be evaluated.

Such a review shall be awarded a maximum of 0.5 points.

#### **3.4.8. Assessment Criteria and Scale for Manuals and Compendia**

The basis of assessment for manuals or compendia will be its usefulness for the purpose for which it was intended and the adequacy of coverage of the subject matter. The assessment scale for this usefulness shall range from high to low.

Such Manuals and Compendia shall be awarded a maximum of 0.5 points.

#### **3.4.9. Assessment Criteria and Scale for Patents**

- a) Patented material shall be awarded a maximum of 6.0 points.
- b) The awarded points shall be shared according to the level of contribution as agreed among contributors whose names are recognized by both SAUT and an authorized patent awarding body.

#### **3.4.10. Summary of the grading System for Publications**

The letter grade system shall be used. For the purpose of determining publication points, the letter grade awarded for "overall quality" of the publication shall be used. The publications points assigned to letter grades are summarized in table 4 below.

**Table 4: Conversion of Letter Grades to Points of Publication**

Letter grade	Journal Papers	Conference Papers	Chapter in Book	Consultancy/ Research Report	Case Report	Books / dictionary / patents	PhD Thesis (Monograph)	Technical notes & Book Reviews
A	1.0	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	6	1.0	0.5
B+	1.0	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	6	1.0	0.5
B	0.5	0.25	0.5	0.25	0.25	3	0.5	0.25
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**3.4.11. Contribution of Various Scholarly Publications towards Total Publication Points**

The points earned from various scholarly publications shall contribute towards Total Publication Points in manner indicated in Table 5.

**Table 5: Allowable Percentage Contributions to Total Publication Points**

Type of Activity	Lecturer to Senior Lecturer	Senior Lecturer to Associate Professor	Associate Professor to Professor
Journal papers	Minimum 60%	Minimum 60%	Minimum 60%
Books, Chapters in a book, Conference papers, Research Reports, Theses, Manuals, etc.	Maximum 30%	Maximum 25%	Maximum 25%
Consultancy reports	Maximum 10%	Maximum 15%	Maximum 15%

**3.5. Section 5: The Balance of Points and Criteria for Academic Staff Promotion****3.5.1. Academic and non-academic activities**

There shall be evaluation and point award to several academic and non-academic activities as presented in previous sections of these guidelines. The awarded points shall be categorized into those emanating from scholarly works as well as from teaching effectiveness and community service.

**Table 6: Balance of minimum points between various types of academic and non-academic activities**

	Category	Lecturer to Senior Lecturer	Senior lecturer to Associate Professor	Associate Professor to Professor
<b>I</b>	Publications	3.0	6.0	7.0
<b>II</b>	a) Community Service	1.0	1.0	1.0
	b) Teaching effectiveness	1.0	1.0	1.0
	<b>Total minimum points</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>9.0</b>

Table 6 shows that the weights given in the distribution of these points for each activity shall differ by academic rank as outlined below:

a) Weight of publications shall increase with a rise in rank.

b) Publication points shall be accumulated from at least two sources for each rank. Points for publications in peer reviewed journals shall increase with advancing rank.

### 3.5.2. Conversion of Letter Grades to Points for Publications

**Table 7: Conversion of Letter Grades**

<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B+</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>Qualitative Evaluation of the Publication</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Poor</b>
Journal Papers	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.0
Chapters in a Book	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.0
Consultancy Reports	0.5	0.5	0.25	0.0
Scholarly Books and Patents	6	6	3	0.0
Books for Lower Levels	2	2	1	0.0
Published Book Reviews, Conference papers, Case Reports and Extension Material	0.5	0.5	0.25	0.0

### 3.6. Section 6: Criteria for Promotion of Academic Staff

This section outlines the criteria to be used in guiding the processes of promotion of academic members of staff.

<b>S/N</b>	<b>POSITION</b>		<b>MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMOTION</b>
	<b>FROM</b>	<b>TO</b>	
1	Tutorial Assistant / Assistant Librarian Trainee /Research Fellow Trainee	Assistant Lecturer / Assistant Librarian / Assistant Research Fellow	Master Degree with GPA of 4.0.
2	Assistant Lecturer/ Assistant Librarian / Assistant Research Fellow	Lecturer / Librarian / Research Fellow	<p>PhD</p> <p><b>[OR</b></p> <p>1) A Master Degree, and</p> <p>2) Not less than 3 years of university level teaching/research experience, 2 of which must have been at SAUT or its constituent colleges, and</p> <p>3) A total of 3.0 points derived from scholarly works and community service apportioned as follows:</p> <p><i>i)</i> Not less than 2.0 points must be derived from scholarly works.</p> <p><i>ii)</i> The remaining 1.0 points derived from community service].</p> <p>For Assistant Research Fellow 5 points from scholarly works should be accrued as follows:</p> <p><i>i)</i> 3 points from research works and</p> <p><i>ii)</i> 2 points from other types of scholarly works.</p>

	Lecturer / Librarian / Research Fellow	Senior Lecturer / Senior Librarian / Senior Research Fellow	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) PhD Degree, and</li> <li>2) Not less than 3 years of university level teaching experience, for those who entered the rank of <b>Lecturer</b> with a PhD degree, 2 of which must have been at SAUT, or its constituent colleges / Not less than 5 years of university level teaching / research experience, for those who entered the rank of Lecturer with a Master degree, 3 of which must have been at SAUT, or its constituent colleges, and</li> <li>3) A total of 5.0 points derived from scholarly works and community service as a Lecturer apportioned as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Not less than 3.0 points must be derived from scholarly works.</li> <li>ii) The remaining 2.0 points can be derived from community service.</li> </ol> For applicants to Senior Research Fellow a total of 7.0 points from scholarly works <b>as a Research Fellow</b> apportioned as follows: i) 5 points must be derived from research works, ii) 2 point from other types of scholarly work.</li> <li>4) The academic staff should have either, taught, examined, supervised or co-supervised at (2) two postgraduate students who have completed postgraduate studies/research.</li> </ol>
	Senior Lecturer / Senior Librarian / Senior Research Fellow	Associate Professor / Associate Library Professor / Associate Research Professor	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) PhD Degree, and</li> <li>2) Not less than 6 years of university level teaching / research experience for those who entered the rank of Lecturer with a PhD degree, 3 of which must have been at SAUT, or its constituent colleges / Not less than 7 years of university level teaching / research experience for those who entered the rank of Lecturer with a Master degree, 3 of which must have been at SAUT, or its constituent colleges, and</li> <li>3) A total of 8.0 points derived from scholarly works and community service as Senior Lecturer apportioned as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Not less than 6.0 points must be derived from scholarly works; including at least one paper as single author published in international peer reviewed journal as a review or research based paper in area of specialization.</li> <li>ii) The remaining 2.0 points can be</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

			<p>derived from teaching experience and community service, and  Not less than 2 years of teaching and/or supervision or co-supervision/examination of postgraduate degree/research students who have completed studies/research.  For Associate Research Professor a total of 9.0 points derived from scholarly works since last promotion, and  Not less than 3 years of supervising research work, including postgraduate theses and dissertations of students to completion.  4) The academic staff should have either, taught, examined and/or supervised or co-supervised at least three (3) postgraduate students who have completed studies.</p>
	Associate Professor / Associate Library Professor / Associate Research Professor	Professor / Library Professor / Research Professor	<p>1) PhD Degree, and  2) Not less than 9 years of university level teaching / research experience, and  3) A total of 9.0 points since last promotion apportioned as follows:  i) Not less than 7.0 points derived from scholarly works; including at least one paper as single author published in international peer reviewed journal as a review or research based paper in area of specialization.  ii) The remaining 2.0 points derived from teaching or supervising to completion at least 4 postgraduate students and/or community service.  4) For Research Professor at least 10.0 points from publication since last promotion.  5) The staff should have either; taught, examined, supervised or co-supervised at least four (4) postgraduate degree students who have completed.</p>
	Professor / Library Professor / Research Professor	Distinguished Professor / Distinguished Library Professor / Distinguished Research Professor	Persons holding the title of Professor for not less than 10 years and have produced at least 15 publications as Professor.

### 3.7. Section 7: General Conditions Governing Promotions and Promotion Process

#### 3.7.1. Key Requirements for Promotion

Key requirements for promotion are four, namely:

- i) Highest level of academic degree qualification attained (earned Master or PhD degree)
- ii) Number of years of experience in university level teaching.

- iii) Points earned from scholarly works and community service.
- iv) Experience in postgraduate degree teaching, examination & research supervision of students who have completed their postgraduate degree/research work where relevant.
- v) All relevant publications by the academic staff after the date of submission of the last application for promotion shall be eligible for consideration in the next promotion.

### **3.7.2. Levels of Promotion**

Based on the accomplishment of the 4 key requirements for promotion, an individual shall be entitled to receive a single notch promotion.

### **3.7.3. Using Residual Points for Subsequent Promotions**

If the assessment of scholarly works and community service works generate more points than it is required for a particular level of promotion, the residual points cannot be transferred to a subsequent promotion.

### **3.7.4. Assessment Forms**

The following forms shall be used in the assessment of academic works of candidates who apply for promotion.

#### **Form A**

**Form A** is the '**Academic Promotion Application Form**'. This shall be filled in by the candidate seeking promotion and submitted to the Head of the Department or to the Dean of the Faculty/School if the Head of the Department himself/herself is the applicant.

In this Form, the candidate shall list all the Scholarly Works and Community Service work which he/she wants to rely upon to support the application for promotion. The applicant should submit his/her published works together with an updated CV and for each publication, information of authorship, title of the publication, publisher and place and year of publication and for the works that are not yet published but have been accepted for publication, a letter or official email message for acceptance by the publisher. A note of sharing formula from the publisher will be required for co-authored works.

The candidate shall also provide OPRAS forms as well as other relevant information on Community Services.

#### **Form B**

**Form B** is the '**Academic Assessor's Appointment Form**' which shall be filled in by the Head of the Department or the Dean as the case shall be, indicating the names of proposed assessors and their qualifications. Note that: in the case of promotion to the position of Associate Professor and above, the names of the proposed assessors must first be approved by the DVCAA before the assessors are formally appointed or by the VC if the applicant is the DVCAA.

### **Form C**

**Form C** is the '**Scholarly Works Assessment Form**' which shall be sent to all the assessors and shall be used for assessing the scholarly works of the candidate. Each assessor shall be given one form for each work.

### **Form D**

**Form D** is the '**Community Service Assessment Form: Manuals and Compendia**' which shall also be sent to all the assessors for assessing the manuals and compendia produced by the candidate. Each assessor shall be given one form for each work.

### **Form E**

**Form E** is the '**Community Service Assessment Form: Administrative Duties, Consultancies, and Position & Occasional Papers**' which shall be filled in by the person handling the promotion process.

### **Form F**

**Form F** is the '**Assessment Summary Form**' which shall be filled in by the person handling the promotion process, summarizing the results of the assessment, including computation of averages before submission to the DVCAA for verification and eventual forwarding to the Office of Director for Human Resource. Note that, the Assessment Summary Form shall be accompanied by all the original forms relating to the assessment of the work of the candidate.

#### **3.7.4. Assessment Team Requirements**

<b>S/N</b>	<b>Level of Promotion</b>	<b>Assessment Team Composition</b>	<b>Assessment Team Qualifications</b>
1	From Tutorial Assistant to Assistant Lecturer  From Research Assistant to Assistant Research Fellow	No need of composing team.  Automatic promotion upon fulfilment of requirements	
2	From Assistant Lecturer to Lecturer.  From Assistant Research Fellow to Research Fellow	-PhD – no need of composing a team  or  -No PhD – a team of 2 assessors who are competent in the candidate's academic field	The assessment shall be done internally by two (2) academicians with the rank above that of the individual being assessed.
3	From Lecturer to Senior Lecturer  From Research Fellow to	Team of 2 assessors who are competent in the candidate's academic field.	The assessment shall be done internally by two (2) academicians with the rank above that of the individual being assessed.

	Senior Research Fellow		
4	From Senior Lecturer to Associate Professor/  From Senior Research Fellow to Associate Research Professor.	Two (2) assessors who are competent in the candidate's academic field.	At least two (2) external assessors one of who must be the rank of Full Professor or Full Research Professor who have no close working/social relationship with the candidate and who shall be renowned academician in the academic field of the staff member being assessed.
5	From Associate Professor to Professor  From Associate Research Professor to Research Professor	Two (2) assessors who are competent in the candidate's academic field	At least Two (2) external assessors with the rank of Full Professor or Full Research Professor who has no close working/social relationship with the candidate and who is a renowned academician in the academic field of the staff being assessed.
6	Distinguished Professor	Evidence of 15 publications 10 years after holding the position of Professor.	
7	<b>Professor Emeritus</b>	No need of composing a team	The University Senate confers this honorary title to a retired professor who continues to be engaged by the university due to his or her distinguished contribution to academia.

### 3.7.5. Key Steps in the Promotion Process

#### Step 1

The promotion process shall be initiated by filling in Form A: Academic Promotion Application Form outlining the achievement of promotion requirements by the candidate seeking the promotion, and submitting them, together with original copies of his/her scholarly works, to the Head of the Department who shall submit them to the chairperson of the departmental promotion committee.

Whoever handles the promotion process as stated in Step 1 above, and any person holding the position of VC, DVCAA, DVCAF, DPA, DPAF, Corporate Counsel, and Director for Human Resource, shall refrain from taking part in assessing the works of any candidate.

No process for promotion shall be initiated if the candidate has not attained the requirements of the OPRAS. If this requirement is fulfilled the process can be initiated if the candidate has attained: (1) the level of academic qualification required in terms of relevant academic degrees; (2) the number of years in university level teaching experience; and (3) the teaching and supervision experience which is required for the highest rank he/she seeks to be promoted to.

## **Step 2**

Upon receipt of FORM A, the person handling the promotion process shall initiate the process of assessing the works of the candidate, by filling in Form B: Academic Assessors Appointment Form. The person handling the promotion process shall formally appoint the assessors. However, for the position of Associate Professor and above, Form B must first be presented to and approved in writing by the DPA in the case of a Constituent College, or the DVCAA in the case of SAUT Main Campus, before proceeding to appointment and assessment.

The assessors shall only assess the scholarly works of the candidate plus the manuals and compendia.

## **Step 3**

The person handling the promotion process shall send the work to be assessed to the assessors. He/she shall give each of the assessors the following:

- (i) A copy of these Guidelines in order to guide him/her in the assessment process.
- (ii) A set of original scholarly works of the applicant.
- (iii) A copy of all manuals and compendia produced by the applicant, if applicable.
- (iv) Form C: Scholarly Works Assessment Form for assessing the scholarly works. Note that, each assessor shall be given a number of forms commensurate with the number of works.
- (v) Form D: Community Service Assessment Form for Manuals and Compendia for assessing manuals and compendia, where applicable.
- (vi) A copy of Form A: Academic Promotion Application Form as dully filled in by the applicant in order to give the assessor an overall picture of all the achievements of the candidate.

In order not to jeopardize the independence of assessors, all care must be taken to ensure that an assessor does not know the other persons who are assessing the same candidate, and that the names or identities of assessors shall not be disclosed to the candidate.

In order to expedite the assessment process, a candidate shall be advised to submit three sets of original documents. However, if three sets are not available, then the set of original documents available shall be given to one assessor after the other.

## **Step 4**

The person handling the promotion process shall fill in Form E: Community Service Assessment Form – Administrative Duties, Consultancies, and Position & Occasional Papers, following strictly the provisions of these Guidelines.

## **Step 5**

Upon completion of the assessment process and receipt of assessment forms from assessors, the person handling the promotion process shall compile the results of the assessment using Form F: Assessment Summary Form which shall indicate the results of the assessment of scholarly works and community service, and he/she shall submit the same together with the original copies of all assessment forms to the DPA in the

case of a Constituent College, or the DVCAA in the case of SAUT Main campus, with recommendations. It shall be advisable that the relevant Department keeps a copy of the entire dossier of each candidate for records.

### **Step 6**

The DPA or the DVCAA, as the case shall be, shall scrutinize and ascertain the assessment process, and when satisfied he/she shall endorse the recommendations of the person who handled the promotion process and forward the application, together with the accompanying assessment results, to the Office of Director for Human Resource, for the case of SAUT Main Campus, or the Human Resource and Appointments Committee for the case of a Constituent College.

The DPA or the DVCAA as the case shall be, shall forward the dossier only when the assessment results show that the candidate qualifies for promotion.

If the scores which a candidate has garnered from the assessment fall short of the requirements for promotion, the Office of the DPA or DVCAA as the case shall be, shall inform him/her in writing about the shortfalls and retain the dossier. When the candidate makes up for the shortfalls, it is only the additional work which shall be sent for assessment to the 2 assessors following the same assessment process. When the shortfalls are made up for, the whole application can be forwarded to the Office of Director for Human Resource, for the case of SAUT Main Campus, or the Human Resource and Appointments Committee for the case of a Constituent College.

### **Step 7**

For SAUT Main Campus, upon receipt of the dossier from the DVCAA, the Directorate for Human Resource shall compile the information received, summarize it, and forward it to the Appointments and Promotions Committee for discussion. The Appointments and Promotions Committee shall only scrutinize the process to satisfy itself that it was handled properly, and that these Guidelines were followed. The Committee shall not have the power to question the judgment of the assessors. If satisfied about the process, the Committee shall approve the promotion.

In the case of a Constituent College, upon receipt of the dossier from the DPA the Human Resource and Appointments Committee shall discuss the application. The Committee shall only scrutinize the process to satisfy itself that it was handled properly, and that these Guidelines were followed. The Committee shall not have the power to question the judgment of the assessors. If satisfied about the process, the Committee shall approve the promotion. Then the application shall be forwarded to the governing board for endorsement.

Note that: the process for promotion to the position of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer shall end at this step. The information about the promotion is presented to the University Senate and Council for noting.

### **Step 8**

For promotions to the rank of Associate Professor and Professor, both the applications from SAUT Main Campus and Constituent Colleges shall be forwarded to the Senate for endorsement and subsequently to the

Council for approval. Upon approval by the University Council the DPAF or DVCAF as the case shall be, shall inform the candidate in writing.

### **Step 9**

Information on all promotions from the rank of lecturer shall be communicated to the candidate in writing and be published in notice boards and other means of communication at the university and colleges.

### **3.7.6. Appeals**

If a candidate is not satisfied about the assessment and /or promotion process, he/she may appeal to the DPA or the DVCAA as the case shall be, and the assessment process will be repeated by appointing different assessors.

However, an assessment exercise cannot be repeated more than once.

### **3.7.7. Turnaround Time for Processing Promotions**

**Table 8: Turnaround time for processing promotions**

S/N	Administrative Process	Responsible	Turnaround time (weeks)
1	OPRAS Process	HOD and Departmental Promotion Committee	1
2	Receiving and Sending of Promotion materials for assessment	HOD, Dean, DVCAA, VC	2
3	Assessment period	Assessors	4
4	Receiving and forwarding Promotion materials and assessment summaries	Dean for Lecturer and Senior Lecturer	1
5	Receiving and forwarding promotion materials and assessment summaries	DVCAA --from Dean --for Associate Professors and above	Immediate next promotions meeting Immediate next Senate meeting
6	Receiving and forwarding promotion materials and assessment summaries	VC --for DVCAA/DVCAF --from Senate	Immediate next Council meeting
7	Communication of Results in writing for all successful promotions	DVCAF	1

The effective date for promotion to be stated in the promotion letter shall be the date of the meeting of the highest organ that approved the promotion of the staff. Exception is promotions from Tutorial Assistant to Assistant Lecturer or Assistant Lecturer to Lecturer which shall be administrative and shall occur at time upon fulfilment of requirements and successful completion of PhD respectively.

Since OPRAS points are cumulative, it shall be mandatory for the feedback on approved OPRAS points to be officially communicated annually down to the department level and the responsible staff. Each department shall keep and update OPRAS point records for its academic staff. OPRAS points to be used in the promotion shall be drawn from all the last three completed and evaluated years irrespective of the points to be gained during the year of promotion.

# **APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX I**

**ST AUGUSTINE UNIVERSITY OF TANZANIA (SAUT)**



**OPEN PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND APPRAISAL FORM FOR ACADEMIC STAFF**

(4 original copies to be filled)

From: November ..... to October.....

(**Note:** Section 1 and 2 shall be filled at the beginning of the appraisal year. i.e. before 30<sup>th</sup> of October each year)

**SECTION 1: PERSONAL PARTICULARS**

1.1. Personal File No:

1.2. Date of birth

1.3. Name in full (3 names)

1.4. Date of the first appointment

1.5. Sex M/F

1.6. Age

1.8. Nationality

1.9. Marital Status

1.10. No. of children (a) Total

(b) No. of children below age of 18 years

(c) No. of Children above 18years who are in school

1.11. Name of School/Directorate/Institute

1.12. Name of Department

1.13. Academic Qualifications (Starts with the highest)

(i) \_\_\_\_\_

(ii) \_\_\_\_\_

(iii) \_\_\_\_\_

(iv) \_\_\_\_\_

(v) \_\_\_\_\_

1.14. Duty post (Post on Leadership)

1.15. Substantive Post (Post as Faculty)

1.16. Date of Appointment to present substantive post (last promotion date)

1.17. Salary Scale

1.18. Period served under

Present Supervisor in months

1.19. Terms of Employment (put tick): Contract

Part Time

1.20 Supervisor's Name

1.21 Employee Signature

-----

Date:

-----



**SECTION 2 B: PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT**

**(b) Agreed Teaching and Assessment Objectives**

<b>2.1(b) S/N</b>	<b>2.2 (b) Individual Agreed Objectives</b>	<b>2.3 (b) Agreed Performance Targets</b>	<b>2.4 (b) Agreed Performance Criteria/ Means of Verification</b>	<b>2.5 (b) Agreed Resources</b>

**SECTION 2 C: PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT**

**(c<sub>1</sub>) Agreed Research Objectives**

<b>2.1(c<sub>1</sub>) S/N</b>	<b>2.2 (c<sub>1</sub>) Individual Agreed research grant/project and research consultancy Objectives</b>	<b>2.3 (c<sub>1</sub>) Agreed Performance Targets</b>	<b>2.4 (c<sub>1</sub>) Agreed Performance Criteria/ Means of Verification</b>	<b>2.5 (c<sub>1</sub>) Agreed Resources</b>

***(c<sub>2</sub>) Agreed publication Objectives***

<b>2.1(c<sub>2</sub>) S/N</b>	<b>2.2 (c<sub>2</sub>) Individual Agreed publication objectives*</b>	<b>2.3 (c<sub>2</sub>) Agreed Performance Targets**</b>	<b>2.4 (c<sub>2</sub>) Agreed Performance Criteria/ Means of Verification</b>	<b>2.5 (c<sub>2</sub>) Agreed Resources</b>

\*Please specify the following: Publication type (journal paper, case report, book, thesis, research report, consultancy report etc.), and the status as whether to be published, accepted or just submitted manuscript etc.

\*\*Please indicate here the target number of publications

**SECTION 2 D: PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT**

***(d) Agreed non-research Consultancy/Public Service Objectives***

<b>2.1(d) S/N</b>	<b>2.2 (d) Individual Agreed Objectives</b>	<b>2.3 (d) Agreed Performance Targets</b>	<b>2.4 (d) Agreed Performance Criteria/ Means of Verification</b>	<b>2.5 (d) Agreed Resources</b>

**SECTION 3A: MID-YEAR REVIEW (MAY .....)**

*To be filled by the Appraisee in Consultation with the Supervisor*

***(a) Agreed objectives as DVCAA / Dean / Director / Head of Department/Unit where applicable***

<b>3.1(a) S/N</b>	<b>3.2(a) Agreed Objectives (As per Section 2)</b>	<b>3.3(a) Progress Towards Target</b>	<b>3.4 (a) Factors Affecting Performance</b>

**Note: Add more rows to accommodate all your objectives**

**SECTION 3 B: MID-YEAR REVIEW (MAY .....**)

**(b) Agreed Teaching and Assessment Objectives**

<b>3.1(b) S/N</b>	<b>3.2 (b) Agreed Objectives (As per Section 2)</b>	<b>3.3 (b) Progress Towards Target</b>	<b>3.4 (b) Factors Affecting Performance</b>

**SECTION 3C: MID-YEAR REVIEW (MAY .....**)

**(c<sub>1</sub>) Agreed Research Objectives**

<b>3.1(c<sub>1</sub>) S/N</b>	<b>3.2 (c<sub>1</sub>) Individual Agreed research grant/project and consultancy Objectives (As per section 2)</b>	<b>3.3 (c<sub>1</sub>) Progress Towards Target</b>	<b>3.4 (c<sub>1</sub>) Factors Affecting Performance</b>

**(c<sub>2</sub>) Agreed publication Objectives**

<b>3.1(c<sub>2</sub>) S/N</b>	<b>3.2 (c<sub>2</sub>) Individual Agreed publication objectives (As per section 2)</b>	<b>3.3 (c<sub>2</sub>) Progress Towards Target</b>	<b>3.4 (c<sub>2</sub>) Factors Affecting Performance</b>

**SECTION 3 D: MID-YEAR REVIEW (MAY .....**)

**(d) Agreed non-research Consultancy/Public Service Objectives**

<b>3.1(d) S/N</b>	<b>3.2 (d) Agreed Objectives (As per Section 2)</b>	<b>3.3 (d) Progress Towards Target</b>	<b>3.4 (d) Factors Affecting Performance</b>

**Note: Add more rows to accommodate all your objectives**

.....

.....

Name of Appraisee (in capital letters)

Name of Supervisor (in capital letters)

Signature.....Date.....

Signature.....Date.....

**SECTION 4 A: REVISED OBJECTIVES (if any)**

*a) Agreed Objectives as DVCAA/Dean/ Director/ Head of Department/Unit where applicable.*

<b>4.1(a) S/N</b>	<b>4.2 (a) Agreed Revised Objective(s)</b>	<b>4.3 (a) Agreed Performance Targets</b>	<b>4.4 (a) Agreed Performance Criteria</b>	<b>4.5(a) Agreed Resources</b>

**Note: Add more rows to accommodate all your objectives**

**SECTION 4 B: REVISED OBJECTIVES (if any)**

**b) Agreed Teaching and Assessment Objectives**

<b>4.1(b) S/N</b>	<b>4.2 (b) Agreed Revised Objective(s)</b>	<b>4.3 (b) Agreed Performance Targets</b>	<b>4.4 (b) Agreed Performance Criteria</b>	<b>4.5 (b) Agreed Resources</b>

**SECTION 4 C: REVISED OBJECTIVES (if any)**

**c) Agreed Research and Consultancy Objectives**

<b>4.1(c<sub>1</sub>) S/N</b>	<b>4.2 (c<sub>1</sub>) Individual Agreed research grant/ project and consultancy Objectives</b>	<b>4.3 (c<sub>1</sub>) Agreed Performance Targets</b>	<b>4.4 (c<sub>1</sub>) Agreed Performance Criteria/Means of Verification</b>	<b>4.5 (c<sub>1</sub>) Agreed Resources</b>

**(c<sub>2</sub>) Agreed publication Objectives**

<b>4.1(c<sub>2</sub>) S/N</b>	<b>4.2 (c<sub>2</sub>) Individual Agreed publication objectives*</b>	<b>4.3 (c<sub>2</sub>) Agreed Performance Targets**</b>	<b>4.4 (c<sub>2</sub>) Agreed Performance Criteria/Means of Verification</b>	<b>4.5 (c<sub>2</sub>) Agreed Resources</b>

\*Please specify the following: Publication type (journal paper, case report, book, thesis, research report, retrievable conference papers, books or chapter in a book, consultancy report etc.), and whether to be published, accepted or submitted manuscript etc.

\*\*Please indicate here the target number of publications

**SECTION 4 D: REVISED OBJECTIVES (if any)**

*(d) Agreed non-research Consultancy/Public service Objectives*

<b>4.1(d) S/N</b>	<b>4.2 (d) Agreed Revised Objective(s)</b>	<b>4.3 (d) Agreed Performance Targets</b>	<b>4.4 (d) Agreed Performance Criteria</b>	<b>4.5 (d) Agreed Resources</b>

\*Indicate the type of consultancy or service provided and the amount of funds served if any.

.....  
 .....

Name of Appraisee (in capital letters)

Name of Supervisor (in capital letters)

Signature.....Date.....

Signature.....Date.....

**SECTION 5 A: ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW & APPRAISAL (OCTOBER .....)**

*To be filled by the Appraisee and the Supervisor*

**a) Agreed Objectives as DVCAA/Dean/ Director/Head of Department/Unit where applicable.**

<b>5.1(a) S/N</b>	<b>5.2 (a) Agreed Objective(s)</b>	<b>5.3 (a) Progress made</b>	<b>5.4 (a) Rated Mark</b>		
			<b>Appraisee</b>	<b>Super visor</b>	<b>Agreed Mark</b>

**SECTION 5 B: ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW & APPRAISAL (OCTOBER .....)**

*To be filled by the Appraisee and the Supervisor*

**(b) Agreed Teaching and Assessment Objectives**

5.1(b) S/N	5.2 (b) Agreed Objective(s)	5.3 (b) Progress made	5.4 (b) Rated Mark		
			Appraisee	Supervisor	Agreed Mark
<b>Overall Performance Mark:</b> <i>This should reflect the overall average performance and achievement of agreed objectives in Section 2b.</i>					

**SECTION 5 C: ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW & APPRAISAL (JUNE .....)**

*To be filled by the Appraisee and the Supervisor*

**5C<sub>1</sub>: List of ongoing Research Projects and consultancies** (refer to sub-section 2C<sub>1</sub>)

S/N	Project Title	Indicate whether this project or consultancy was reported in the last evaluation or not	Remarks on progress status since last evaluation or inception

**5C<sub>2</sub>: List all Publications including unpublished papers since last evaluation (Those not yet used for promotion).** These must be appearing in the updated CV and should at least include those publications emanating from sub-section 2C<sub>2</sub>.

S/N	Authors/ Title of Published accepted or submitted Paper, manuscript etc.	Publishers  (Indicate: - Journal, Year, and Volume Issue No. And Page (s)/Doi	Remarks on current status as Published/Submitted for review/ submitted for Publication etc.

**5C<sub>3</sub>: Thesis or book writing** (whose contents have not been published as paper in the previous or this evaluation)

S/N	Project Title	Indicate whether this thesis/book was reported in the last evaluation or not	Remarks on progress status since last evaluation or inception

**5C<sub>4</sub>: Overall Achievement in Research (consider sub-sections 2C1-2C**

5.1 (c) S/N	5.2 (c) Agreed Objective(s) area	5.3 (c) Progress made	5.4 (c) Rated Mark		
			App-raisee	Supervisor	Agreed Mark
1.	Research grant/projects and consultancy (sub-section 2C <sub>1</sub> )				
2.	Journal Publications published or accepted for publications (sub-section 2C <sub>2</sub> )				
3.	Conference Papers Retrievable from				

	proceedings (sub-section 2C <sub>2</sub> )				
4.	Thesis/book (sub-section 2C <sub>2</sub> )				
5.	Research Reports (sub-section 2C <sub>2</sub> )				
6.	Case Reports (sub-section 2C <sub>2</sub> )				
7.	Research Consultancy report (sub-section 2C <sub>2</sub> )				
8.	Technical notes and book reviews (sub-section 2C <sub>2</sub> )				
9.	Submitted Manuscripts (sub-section 2C <sub>2</sub> )				
<b>Overall Performance Mark:</b> <i>This should reflect the overall average performance and achievement of agreed objectives in Section 2c.</i>					

**SECTION 5 D: ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW & APPRAISAL (OCTOBER .....)**

*To be filled by the Appraisee and the Supervisor*

**(d) Agreed non-research Consultancy/Public service Objectives**

5.1 (d) S/N	5.2 (d) Agreed Objective(s)	5.3(d) Progress made	5.4 (d) Rated Mark		
			Appraisee	Supervisor	Agreed Mark
<b>Overall Performance Mark:</b> <i>This should reflect the overall average performance and achievement of agreed objectives in Section 2d.</i>					

## SECTION 6: PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES

*To be filled by the Appraisee and the Supervisor*

6.1 S/N	6.2 MAIN FACTORS	6.3 QUALITY ATTRIBUTE	6.4 RATED MARK		
			Appraisee	Supervisor	Agreed Mark
1	WORKING RELATIONSHIPS	Ability to work in team [Participate in team-based teaching, multi-disciplinary research, teaming in clinical services, teaming in submission of questions and examination of students during the assessment period]			
		Ability to get on with other staff [Participation in graduation ceremony and other social events in the University during the assessment period]			
		Ability to gain respect from others [Tidiness, respecting others, being role model in professional ethics]			
2	COMMUNICATION AND LISTENING	Ability to express in writing [Submission of scholarly work for publication or as reports including committee reports and teaching notes]			
		Ability to express oneself orally [evidence of oral presentation of reports to a forum, public lectures etc. during the assessment period]			
3	MANAGEMENT LEADERSHIP AND MENTORSHIP	Ability to plan and organize [Organization of committee meetings, teaching schedules, symposia etc. during the assessment period].			
		Ability to initiate and innovate [Evidence of innovative ideas or approach used to achieve agreed departmental action plans]			
4	PERFORMANCE IN TERMS OF QUALITY	Ability to deliver accurate and high quality output timely [Timely performance of roles including marking and submission of results of student's exams; timely processing of results; timely upload of results to SARIS, mentoring of students]			

		Ability to handle extra work [Evidence of participation in committees, community activities; professional association duties; board memberships and other extra curricula/professional duties accomplished during the assessment period]			
		Ability to make right decisions [Evidence of lack of punitive procedures or warnings against performance in teaching, research and consultancy roles from your seniors or other authorities during the assessment period]			
		Ability to apply knowledge abilities to benefit Government and not for personal gains			
		Ability to devote working time exclusively to work related duties eg. Teaching/ Participation in departmental meetings/Availability for consultation			
5	CUSTOMER FOCUS	Ability to respond well to the customer  [Lack of justifiable complaints against ongoing support or services rendered to students or clients as a supervisor, mentor, teacher or professional during the assessment period]			
6	INTEGRITY	Acceptance not to initiate, solicit, receive or accept bribes or any other form of corruption;			
		Ability and willingness to practice zero tolerance against corrupt procurement practices and any other unethical conduct			
		Willingness to promote good ethical practices both within the internal and external environment and continually guide other employees to be accountable for their behaviour at any time;			

		Ability and willingness to avoid all situations that may result in actual or perceived conflict of interest and ensure that all issues of conflict of interest are disclosed and resolved in an efficient and transparent manner			
		Ability and willingness to promote transparency and efficient at all levels within the University and contribution to implementation of internal controls system to ensure good governance and institutionalize the values of ethics, integrity, accountability and transparency within the University;			
		Ability and willingness to accept goods and services requested by him/her that adhere to national and international standards			
		Ability to provide anonymous channels of communication to ensure the rights of suppliers, customers and employees are protected and avail for on-going promotions and publications of ethical business practices			
		Willingness to ensure fair competitive practices are an integral part of the way we conduct our business including transparency in all business transactions and good corporate governance			
		Ability and willingness to refrain from engaging in business with parties who have demonstrated unethical practices of any kind			
		Willingness to support the development of an audit and certification program against corruption and participate in the implementation of tools and measures created in order to ensure transparency, efficiency and ethical business practices			



7.1. COMMENTS BY APPRAISEE (if any):

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Name of Appraisee**

**Signature**

**Date**

7.2. COMMENTS BY OBSERVER (if any):

---

---

---

**Name of Observer ----- Signature -----**

**Date**

**SECTION 8: COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY SUPERVISOR ON EMPLOYEE REWARDS/DEVELOPMENTAL MEASURES/SANCTIONS**

**8.1. COMMENTS BY SUPERVISOR/HoD**

---

---

---

**8.2. RECOMMENDATIONS BY SUPERVISOR ON EMPLOYEE REWARDS/ DEVELOPMENTAL MEASURES/SANCTIONS**

The supervisor/Head of Department will recommend the most appropriate reward, developmental measures or sanctions against the appraisee in accordance to the level of agreed performance targets.

---

---

---

**Name of Supervisor**

**Signature**

**Date**



**8.5. DECISION/RECOMMENDATIONS BY APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE**

---

---

---

---

**8.6. DECISION BY THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL**

---

---

---

---

**VICE CHANCELLOR - Signature** ----- **Date**-----

**NOTES ON HOW TO FILL THIS FORM:**

**Section 2: Performance Agreement:** This section deals with expected achievements in terms of concrete outputs that will be delivered at the end of the year under review. The section includes the following:

- 2.2. **Individual Agreed Objectives:** Key responsibilities related to the position. They are derived from the University Strategic Plan, The Annual Action Plan of the Unit and Job Description of the staff. The objectives should be **SMART** i.e. Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Time bound.
- 2.3. **Performance Targets/Outputs:** These refer to targets, results or activities/tasks that you will perform in contribution to achieving your set objectives.
- 2.4. **Performance Criteria/Indicators//Means of Verification:** These are measurements and evidence for the quality, quantity or approaches used in achieving the objectives or targets/outputs.
- 2.5. **Agreed Resources:** Means financial, human, or physical resources required to achieve the objectives or targets/outputs that have been budgeted for in the implementing year.

Sections 3 and 4 of this Form shall be filled by the Appraisee in consultation with the Supervisor and sections 5-6 in the presence of a third party if necessary.

Please note that appraisals that are rated as 1 are the best performers and appraisals rated as 5 are the worst performers.

**APPENDIX TWO**

**ASSESSMENT FORMS A – F**

# ST AUGUSTINE UNIVERSITY OF TANZANIA



## FORM A

### ACADEMIC PROMOTION APPLICATION FORM

*[To be filled in triplicate by the candidate seeking academic title promotion]*

*(The candidate should read the guidelines for recruitment and promotion before filling in Form - A)*

1. Name of applicant .....
2. Current academic rank .....
3. Academic rank applied for .....
4. Date of last promotion .....
5. Name of institution that promoted the applicant  
.....

6. Post-Secondary Education Academic Qualifications:

SN	ACADEMIC QUALIFICATION [E.g. BA Ed., BBA, LLB, MA (Kisw), PhD (Linguistics)]	INSTITUTION	YEAR OBTAINED
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			

7. University Teaching Experience:

SN	NAME OF INSTITUTION	DATE OF EMPLOYMENT	
		FROM	TO
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			

8. Scholarly works [*List only those after last promotion and should follow this order – books, journal papers, unpublished research reports, published presentations or proceedings of conferences and book reviews*]

SN	TITLE	TYPE [e.g. book, journal article etc.]	PUBLISHER [Include ISBN or ISSN number]	YEAR
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				

9. Administrative Duties and Special Assignments

SN	POSITION/ASSIGNMENT	INSTITUTION	DURATION	
			FROM	TO
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				

10. Consultancy Work

SN	TITLE	CLIENT	DATE COMPLETED
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

11. Position/Occasional Papers, Manuals or Compendia

SN	TITLE	TYPE [e.g. position paper, manual etc.]	DATE COMPLETED
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			

12. Supervision Experience

SN	LEVEL	INSTITUTION	DURATION	
			FROM	TO
1.	Undergraduate			
2.	Masters			
3.	PhD			

13. Declaration

I ..... declare with certainty  
that the information given above is correct.

Signature ..... Date .....

---

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

14. This is to confirm that the application forms for academic promotion were received dully  
filled in.

Name .....

Title .....

Signature ..... Date .....

# ST AUGUSTINE UNIVERSITY OF TANZANIA



## FORM B

### ACADEMIC ASSESSORS APPOINTMENT FORM

*[To be filled in by the person handling the application process]*

*(The person handling the process should read the guidelines for recruitment and promotion before filling in Form - B)*

1. Name of the applicant .....
2. Academic rank(s) applied for .....
3. Proposed Names of Academic Assessors:

SN	NAME	ACADEMIC RANK	INSTITUTION	AREA OF EXPERTISE
1.				
2.				
3.				

Name .....

Title .....

Signature .....

Date .....

4. Endorsement by DVCAA/DPA [*Only for promotions to the rank of Associate Professor and Above*]  
.....  
.....  
.....

Name ..... Title .....

Signature ..... Date .....



# ST AUGUSTINE UNIVERSITY OF TANZANIA



## FORM D

### COMMUNITY SERVICE ASSESSMENT FORM – MANUALS AND COMPENDIA

*[To be filled in by the person doing the assessment]*

*(The assessor should refer to the Guidelines for Recruitment and Promotion on the assessment and scoring of scholarly works)*

4. Name of the Applicant .....

5. Academic Rank applied for .....

6. Assessment:

TYPE OF WORK [i.e. manual or compendia]	NO. OF AUTHORS	TITLE	SCORE

Name of Assessor ..... Academic Rank .....

Signature ..... Date .....

# ST AUGUSTINE UNIVERSITY OF TANZANIA



## FORM E

### COMMUNITY SERVICE ASSESSMENT FORM - Assessment of Administrative Duties, Consultancies, and Position & Occasional Papers

*[To be filled in by the person doing the assessment]*

*(The assessor should refer to the Guidelines for Recruitment and Promotion on the assessment and scoring of scholarly works)*

7. Name of the Applicant .....

8. Academic Rank applied for .....

#### 9. Assessment

##### a. Administrative Duties and Special Assignments

SN	Nature of Duties	Institution	Time Frame		No. of Years	Score	Total Score
			From	To			
1.							
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
6.							

##### 3.2 Consultancies

S/N	Title of Consultancy	Client	Level of Consultancy	Score	Total Score
1.					

2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					

**3.3 Position and Occasional Papers**

SN	Title	Intended Audience	Score	Total
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				

Name of Assessor .....

Administrative Title/Academic Rank .....

Signature ..... Date .....

# ST AUGUSTINE UNIVERSITY OF TANZANIA



## FORM F

### COMMUNITY SERVICE ASSESSMENT FORM - Assessment of Administrative Duties, Consultancies, and Position & Occasional Papers

*[To be filled in by the person doing the assessment]*

*(The assessor should refer to the Guidelines for Recruitment and Promotion on the assessment and scoring of scholarly works)*

1. Name of the Applicant .....
2. Academic Rank applied for .....
3. **Assessment**

#### a. Administrative Duties and Special Assignments

SN	Nature of Duties	Institution	Time Frame		No. of Years	Score	Total Score
			From	To			
1.							
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
6.							

#### 3.2 Consultancies

S/N	Title of Consultancy	Client	Level of Consultancy	Score	Total Score
1.					

2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					

**3.3 Position and Occasional Papers**

<b>SN</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Intended Audience</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Total</b>
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				

Name of Assessor .....

Administrative Title/Academic Rank .....

Signature ..... Date .....

# “Appendix III”

## ST. AUGUSTINE UNIVERSITY OF TANZANIA



### AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION AGREEMENT FORM

**Section 1.** Please provide the current title of the publication (Book, Journal Article, News Paper, etc.)

--

**Section 2:** Please list all the authors in the order shown on your published work and indicate each author’s contribution to the work in the following area:

S/N	Author Name	Research Conception/Design	Data Acquisition	Data Analysis and Interpretation	Preparation of The Work	Final Approval
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						

NB: Please use additional sheet if there are more than 5 authors and also indicate additional contributions.

**Section 3: Declaration of agreement. All authors must Sign this declaration:**

By signing this declaration, authors agree to the authorship shown in **section 2** and authorize the Corresponding Author to use the publication for related activities.

S/N	Authors Name	Signature	Date
1			
2			
3			

4			
5			

NB: Please Use the additional sheet if there are more than 5 authors

Name of the Corresponding author & Signature.....

.....

Date.....

Approved at its 67<sup>th</sup> meeting of the University Council held on 27<sup>th</sup> August 2021 at Lavoie Centre



*Flavian M. Kassala*

Rt. Reverend Flavian Kassala

Chairperson of the University Council