

EMPLOYMENT AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMET OF ACADEMIC STAFF

Article 1: Purpose and Scope

Pursuant to the Statute of UBT, the Regulation is aimed at regulating the criteria and conditions for academic staff employment and promotion.

Article 2: Academic Staff Categories

The College's academic staff consists of:

- (a) professors;
- (b) associate professors;
- (c) lecturers;
- (d) teaching assistants;
- (e) visiting academic staff;
- (f) and other academic staff, as shall be determined by the Research Department

Article 3: Appointment Procedure

The academic staffs at College are appointed as determined in the following procedure:

the Academic Council after having consulted the financial possibilities with the Rector, demands to open a call for applications for a given academic position;

the Rector can either proceed the demand of the Academic Council, or dismiss it, if financial complications are observed;

if the Rector dismisses the Academic Board's demand, the Governing Body can intervene and decide upon the case;

after the Rector opens the call for applications for an academic position, the Rector gathers all the relevant data from every application and along with the dean of the department of study, where the concerned academic staff will be positioned, selects three of the best candidatures and proposes them to the Academic Council.

The Academic Council then appoints one of the three candidates

If there have not been found at least three candidatures, the Rector might decide to reopen the call and repeat it unless at least three candidates apply.

Article 4: Tenure

The Academic Board shall determine the length of service allowed for the academic staff, and the retiring rules, having been bound to the positive Law.

The exact tenure for an academic staff appointment shall be minimum three years.

Article 4: Dismissal

The academic staff at College can be dismissed from the Academic Council only. The procedure and manner of dismissal shall be determined by the Academic Council.

Article 5: Disciplinary Procedure

The academic staff at College Disciplinary Procedure is handled by the Ethics Committee. The violations of academic integrity and misconduct are specified in the Regulation of Academic Staff Code of Conduct and Academic Integrity

Article 6: Promotion

The College shall promote its academic staff when specific conditions under the Statute have been fulfilled.

The academic promotion is depended upon the following criterions:

(1) Promotion to the rank of professor:

- (a) the candidate should have spent at least six years in teaching and/or research;
- (b) the candidate should have published a minimum of 15 original academic papers and/or books in his field of focus - where at least five of them have been individually authored by the candidate;
- (c) the candidate should have at least six academic papers published during the work at College;
- (d) the candidate should have had an academic record of not less than 65% during his/her university teaching period;

(e) the candidate should have addressed theses in at least five international scientific conferences, in his fields of study.

(2) Promotion to the rank of associate professor:

- (a) the candidate should have spent four years in university teaching and/or research;
- (b) the candidate should have published at least 10 academic papers and/or books in his field of focus – where at least three of them have been individually authored by the candidate;
- (c) the candidate should have at least four academic papers published during the work at College;
- (d) the candidate should have had an academic record of not less than 65% during his/her university teaching period;
- (e) the candidate should have addressed theses in at least four international scientific conferences, in his fields of interest.

(3) Promotion to the rank of lecturer:

- (a) the candidate should have spent at least three years in academic teaching and/or research;
- (b) the candidate should have published at least 7 academic papers and/or books in his field of focus – where at least three of them have been individually authored by the candidate;
- (c) the candidate should be a promising academician whose research capacity ensures a credible academic perspective for the College;
- (d) the candidate should have addressed theses in at least three international scientific conferences, in his fields of interest.

(4) Promotion to the rank of teaching assistant:

- (a) the candidate should have a credible academic record;
- (b) the candidate should have dealt with academic research, and should have published at least three papers;
- (c) the candidate should be a promising academician whose research potential guarantees a safe academic route for his/her career.

For the purposes of this Statute and academic promotion criteria, publication of papers and/or books, shall be considered undertaken if:

- (a) the publication has been a peer-reviewed work;
- (b) the publication has been published by a credible house; and

(c) the publication has been published in an international scholars' journal or edition.

For being promoted as a professor, an associate professor and a lecturer, the candidates should have obtained a PhD degree. Such an obligation can be surpassed if a strong background in technocracy or research has been witnessed.

Visiting academic staff shall be promoted by using domestic the criteria determined either by this Statute or by the Research Department Charter. In such cases, the word 'visiting' is added to the title that the candidate is promoted with.

The Academic Council may decide to recognize one's academic title, granted by another university or research institution, without needing to apply the promotion criterions set forth by this Statute.

Article 7: Promotion Procedure

The promotion of academic staff is a sole power of the Academic Council.

The Academic Council shall decide on promotion when inquired so by:

- (a) the Deans of study;
- (b) the Research Department; and
- (c) a group of at least 4 academic staff;

The Academic Council may ex-officio initiate the academic promotion.

The Academic Council Committee on Staff Selection, Promotion and Assessment of three distinguished academicians for making a review of the academic background of the proposed candidate. After making the review, the panel instructs the Academic Council on the either the acceptability or the refusal of the candidature, whereas the Academic Council makes a confirmation of the proposed decision.

Article 8: Staff Workload

The Rector must ensure that mechanisms for the allocation of workloads are approved and implemented in Faculties and are made available to the staff.

Deans must ensure that staff members are allocated workloads through a mechanism that adheres to the following principles:

- (i) The mechanism is comprehensive, transparent, takes account of work requirements and contributes to the efficient and effective application of resources.
- (ii) All academic staff have the right to and should, where appropriate, seek research funds in support of their research.
- (iii) The requirement to undertake research is a career expectation and over time will be balanced as appropriate with the other obligations of academic staff including significant administrative responsibilities.
- (iv) Nothing in this policy is to be construed to prevent Heads of Departments from allocating teaching and other responsibilities in the light of the research record of academic staff.
- (v) The workload is equitable, reasonable and safe

The allocation of work must be made in consultation with the staff members and, wherever possible, the Deans must take the duties into consideration that staff members skills and experience. All reasonable attempts must be made to reach agreement with staff on their workloads.

The allocation of the work must recognise the position of the employee within a research – teaching nexus. It must take into consideration employees’ administration, research, service to their professional discipline and service to the wider community. It must consider all aspects of teaching including:

- (i) Course coordination
- (ii) Lectures
- (iii) Tutorials
- (iv) Organisation and teaching of performances and workshops
- (v) Field trips
- (vi) The organisation of internships and practicums
- (vii) Marking loads
- (viii) Student supervision

Where staffs are required to complete postgraduate qualifications needed for their job an appropriate adjustment in the allocation of workloads will usually be made.

The Deans must ensure that as part of the annual Development Planning Process, a staff members’ current and proposed workload is reviewed.

Information about the workload allocation for each member of staff must be held on a file within their school so that it can be used as a source of information for promotion applications, if required.

Mechanisms for allocating workload must be reviewed from time to time

In the event of any arising problem, it must be dealt in accordance with the specifications in the Employment Agreement.

Article 8: Performance evaluation of Academic Staff

The Year-End Review is a faculty report that creates a record of faculty productivity in the areas of research, teaching, service and administration

Heads of Departments are responsible for performing the initial staff performance evaluation using a point-based numerical assessment of distribution of efforts in line with the performance criteria set in the Regulation

Deans draw information on staff Teaching Performance from the Quality Management Council

Information on Staff Research Productivity is drawn from the Research Department

Heads of Departments in their evaluation process shall consider staff undertakings as part of Staff Development Plan

Heads of Department in their evaluation process shall consider staff self-evaluation

The initial evaluation should be sent to Staff Member for comments and discussion

Staff Evaluation Report should be sent to the Academic Council Committee for Staff Selection, Promotion and Assessment and the Dean

Disagreements between line managers should be mediated by the Academic Council

Staff members can appeal the initial evaluation stating contrary evidence