



Personnel Affairs

ASIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

POLICY AND PROCEDURE STATEMENT

| | | | |
|--------------|------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Reference | PA | Issued By | PRESIDENT |
| Section | 1 | Responsible Officer | VPAA |
| Serial No. | 2-5 | Date Issued | 14 June 2006 |
| No. of Pages | 7 | Date Revised | 12 September 2012 |

TITLE: **FACULTY EVALUATION CRITERIA**

I. PURPOSE

1. To set forth the evaluation criteria for faculty evaluation and the conditions and qualifications for appointment and promotion to the various ranks.
2. The evaluation process at AIT serves the purposes of advising the Institute on the suitability of candidates for promotion and contract renewal and of providing feedback to the candidate on his/her performance in research, pedagogy, and service. The Institute uses the evaluation process to encourage and reward academic excellence and to rectify mediocrity and marginal contribution in a fair and constructive manner.

II. CONDITIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

A. Lecturer

1. A faculty member is appointed to the rank of Lecturer if he/she possesses a doctoral degree with professional knowledge and two years' experience in the related field. He/she should have good communication skills in English both in written and spoken. A candidate for this rank must be creative with an ability to adapt to a multi-culture setting in order to handle students of different nationalities.
2. A Lecturer is appointed in order to participate in the educational and research programs of the Institute. A Lecturer will be expected to teach, advise students and serve as a member or chairperson of master degree student program committees. A Lecturer may also serve as a member of a doctoral program committee, but not as a chair.
3. A Lecturer must serve at least two years in the rank of Lecturer before he/she is considered for the rank of Assistant Professor. He/She will be evaluated by the Faculty Evaluation Panel and will be required to give a seminar.

B. Professorial Ranks

1. An earned doctoral degree from a reputable institution is required for all professorial ranks.
2. The three ranks can be thought of as a continuum of performance from potential to actual – potential at the Assistant Professor level to actual at the Professor level.

3. Assistant Professor

- i. A member of faculty is appointed to the rank of Assistant Professor if there is promise of his/her development toward the rank of Associate Professor. A strong academic record should be present and there should be a clear indication that he/she has the aptitudes of a successful faculty member and will grow in stature and eventually qualify for the rank of Associate Professor. A candidate for this rank must have at least, two years of teaching/research experience and must show promise of successful research and scholarship. At least two research papers in refereed international journals, including publications resulting from his/her doctoral dissertation, may be accepted as evidence of such promise.
- ii. A faculty member may not serve more than eight years at the rank of Assistant Professor.

4. Associate Professor

An Associate Professor should demonstrate mature and independent scholarship. Research and pedagogy should indicate creativity, significance and effectiveness. It should be emphasized that in all cases the candidate for promotion must have publications in internationally recognized refereed journals of high stature or have published one or more textbooks with a leading press. The required number of publications shall be a function of their quality and significance.

5. Professor

The rank of Professor at AIT is given only to those having made significant internationally recognized contributions in research, pedagogy, or their profession and who have demonstrated leadership in the Institute, their profession, or their field. Candidates to this rank must demonstrate that their research, pedagogical, or professional contributions have had a significant impact on the advancement of knowledge. Isolated contributions are not sufficient; rather candidates must show evidence of significant sustained contribution.

III. EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Candidates for promotion and contract renewal are evaluated in the three broad areas of research, pedagogy, and service. To be considered for promotion, a faculty member must demonstrate above average competence and professional accomplishments in all three areas and must excel in at least one of pedagogy, research, or service to the candidate's profession.
2. In all three areas, AIT attaches great significance to the ability to co-operate. This includes the capacity to work jointly with colleagues. In this regard, it is important for faculty members to be present on campus for a sufficient amount of time each week to allow for interaction with colleagues. A faculty member may also show ability to cooperate in interaction with the public and private sectors.
3. In addition, the financial well-being of the Institute demands that each faculty member contributes sufficiently to the generation of revenue. This is primarily in the form of tuition from teaching and overhead from sponsored projects, including research, training, and consulting.

A. Research

In general, quality is more important than quantity, although there must be sufficient quantity to provide evidence of a significant level of scholarly productivity.

Several factors serve as measures of the quality of a scholarly record.

- a) The impact of research can be measured by the number of citations to a candidate's published work.
- b) The quality of the journals in which the individual publishes can be measured by the impact factors of the journals. For books the quality of the publisher and particularly the popularity as indicated by the number of editors/reprints is important.
- c) An important measure of the significance of research comes in the form of comments from external evaluators who are internationally recognized scholars in the candidates' field. External evaluators play a key role by providing a degree of objectivity, independent of any institutional, political, or financial factors, and expert assessment of the significance and impact of a faculty member's work.
- d) Outside funding of research from prestigious foundations and institutes can be viewed as a significant part of the research record, depending on the relative size of the grant and the significance of the questions posed.

- e) The composition of the portfolio of published works also matters. A collection of good, but unconnected articles, may not produce the same sense of impact that a set of articles advancing a coherent line of scholarship would. It is not unprecedented, though, for faculty to shift scholarly areas of focus. The personal statement provided by the candidate is, therefore, a very important guide to the significance of each scholarly piece and their connection to each other.
- f) Another issue is the connection of published work to the dissertation. Highly regarded articles from the dissertation do count, but not as much as highly regarded articles reflecting scholarship beyond the dissertation.
- g) The scholarly record should provide clear evidence of independent thinking and research. Thus, although many junior scholars continue to do some collaborative work with a former Ph.D. or postdoctoral advisor, it is important to establish a record of growing independence from former advisors.
- h) Invitations to talk at other universities and prestigious events add to the scholarly record but generally play a relatively minor role independent of other measures of the scholarly record.
- i) AIT values the ability to collaborate, so coauthored articles are an important factor. It is, however, necessary to identify the contributions of the candidate to these articles. A significant portion of the overall research record should include articles and works to which the candidate has made the primary conceptual contributions.

B. Pedagogy

Pedagogy includes teaching/learning, student research supervision, pedagogical development, and publications of a pedagogical nature.

The following factors are considered in evaluation of pedagogical performance:

- a) Teaching/learning effectiveness. In the area of teaching/learning, the candidate should demonstrate mastery of knowledge in the areas taught, competency in organization and presentation of course materials, conscientiousness and fairness in relationships with students, skill in instruction, and commitment to developing better approaches to teaching/learning.
- b) Teaching load. This includes the number of courses taught and their enrollments.

- c) Student research. The number and quality of student research study projects, theses, and dissertations supervised.
- d) Student course evaluations. At a minimum, candidates are expected to have numeric scores above 3.0 on the typical 5-point scale. Special interest is placed on evaluations of the instructor's contribution to the class, the overall quality of the class, and, especially, the amount students learned.
- e) Peer teaching evaluations. It is best if the file includes peer reviews from several different faculty colleagues. Especially in cases of interdisciplinary courses, it may be useful to have peer reviews by faculty in different disciplines.
- f) Courses co-taught with other instructors from either within or outside AIT.
- g) Mentoring record. A very important part of our teaching/learning responsibilities takes place outside of any specific course. The advising of students is a significant contribution to the teaching/learning mission of the Institute.
- h) Initiation and participation in curriculum development (e.g. new courses, new programs, flexible degree programs).
- i) Demonstrated effectiveness in the development and use of innovative methods in teaching/learning.
- j) Publications of a pedagogical nature (e.g. textbooks, articles on pedagogical techniques).
- k) Formal personal pedagogical development. This includes participation in workshops and short courses on pedagogy.

C. Service

Communities thrive when all members contribute to the common good. Thus we expect that candidates will have been involved in the life of the Institute, of the local and regional community, and of their professional associations.

- a) Professional Service. Impact on and acceptance in the profession as measured by dissemination in scholarly and professional journals. Leadership in policy and program development in professional organizations. Participation in organizational responses to policy, practice, or structural issues, which affect the field. Holding significant elective or appointed offices. Receipt of awards or citations for professional contributions. Organization of training courses, conferences, seminars, and workshops.

- b) Community Service. Serving on program committees. Consulting activities. Refereeing of journal articles, books, grant proposals, etc. Serving as external examiner.
 - c) Institute Service. Committee service. Administrative service. Promotion and marketing.
- D. Personal Statement. The personal statement is a self-reflection by a faculty member of his/her work. The reflective statement should indicate what the faculty member thinks of his/her most important accomplishments and the significance of the accomplishments in achieving Field of Study, School, institutional, and/or professional goals. The faculty member may organize his/her reflective statement under these categories: pedagogy, research, and service and outreach, and indicate time spent on each activity and specify which activity or activities he/she has excelled. The faculty member should also explain how he/she integrated pedagogy, research, and service and outreach to achieve synergy and balance. The faculty member may illustrate how his/her one activity has benefited other activity/activities; for example, how research has benefited pedagogy and teaching/learning and vice versa. The faculty member may state how the earlier feedback from the Faculty Evaluation Panel/President helped him/her to improve quality of his/her work. The faculty member should indicate a plan of his/her future portfolio of activities and the expected impact.

The personal statement should not exceed two pages in length.

IV. CRITERIA FOR CONTRACT RENEWAL

Contract renewal requires a continued level of performance consistent with that required for promotion to the faculty member's current rank. In addition, each faculty member is expected to have generated sufficient revenue over the previous contract period to at least equal his/her salary cost over that period. This includes revenue from teaching and overhead from sponsored projects, including research, training, and consulting.

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | | |
| Modification History: | 1 st Revision | 20 June 2012 |
| | Reviewed By: | AIT Management Team (12 September 2012, 20 June 2012, 13 June 2012, 16 May 2012) Academic Senate (25 July 2012) |
| | 2 nd Revision | |
| Related Policies | PA-1-1-1 – Employment of Faculty: General Work Regulations PA-1-2-1 – Procedure for Recruitment and Appointment of Direct-Hire Faculty PA-1-2-2 – Procedure for Evaluation of Faculty for Promotion PA-1-2-3 – Procedure for Evaluation of Faculty for Contract Renewal | |
| Keywords | | |
| Rationale for Revisions: | (20 June 2012 / 13 June 2012 / 16 May 2012, AITMT) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discontinue the position of Instructor. • Developed criteria for the rank of Lecturer linked with the professorial ranks as a continuum of performance. • Required a more comprehensive personal statement. | |
| | | |



Personnel Affairs

ASIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

POLICY AND PROCEDURE STATEMENT

| | | | |
|--------------|------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Reference | PA | Issued By | PRESIDENT |
| Section | 1 | Responsible Officer | VPAA |
| Serial No. | 2-2 | Date Issued | 14 June 2006 |
| No. of Pages | 6 | Date Revised | 13 June 2012 |

TITLE: **PROCEDURE FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY FOR PROMOTION**

I. PURPOSE

To set forth the procedures for evaluation of faculty for promotion.

II. PROCEDURE

1. Twice per year the Faculty Evaluation Panel (FEP) (*see PA-1-2-4 for the panel's Terms of Reference*) issues a call for applications for promotion to all faculty members.
2. The processing of each promotion case is initiated within the School in which the faculty member holds his/her primary appointment. Faculty members, including School Deans and/or equivalent positions, wishing to be considered for promotion must submit a letter and all required documentation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA), with a copy of the letter sent to the concerned School Dean, within four weeks of the call for applications.
3. All promotion cases within the School are handled by a standing School Promotions Committee consisting of all faculty members holding the rank of Professor with primary appointment in that School. The committee is chaired by the Dean.
4. When a School does not have sufficient number of professors, the School Promotions Committee will be supplemented with professors from outside the School/Institute.
5. The faculty members of the evaluated faculty member's thematic area (including faculty members familiar with the academic contribution of the evaluated faculty) are requested to provide their assessment of the candidate and the Dean collects and summarizes the individual assessments for presentation to the Promotions Committee.
6. The School conducts an assessment to determine whether the strengths of the case warrant soliciting external evaluations. The School Promotions Committee shall meet and issue a recommendation within four months after

receiving the complete required documentation from the faculty members wishing to be considered for promotion. A positive recommendation requires a positive vote from a simple majority of the committee members present.

- i) Upon positive recommendation, the case, with all current documentation, is transmitted to the VPAA in order to obtain external evaluations. The School Promotions Committee is responsible for the organization, accuracy and completeness of all materials submitted.
 - ii) Upon negative recommendation, the Dean communicates the result to the candidate, along with specific recommendations that will help the candidate progress towards promotion.
7. The promotion cases of School Deans and/or equivalent positions are handled by the VPAA in consultation with a faculty member of Professor rank of the evaluated Dean's thematic area or an external expert familiar with the academic field of the evaluated Dean (replacing the standing School Promotions Committee).
 8. The promotion cases of Associate Professors in the School, where the Dean is in the rank of Associate Professor and where there is only one Professor or none, will be handled by the VPAA in consultation with the School Professor or a faculty member of the evaluated faculty member's thematic area or an external expert familiar with the academic field of the evaluated faculty member.
 9. Upon receiving a positive recommendation as per the procedure laid down in points 2. to 8. above for promotion cases to the rank of Professor, the VPAA will solicit written evaluations from external experts. *(See Section IV and Annex 1 below for specification of the number of evaluations required and the content of the letter soliciting the evaluations.)*
 10. Once all external letters of evaluation are received, the VPAA schedules the cases for promotion to the rank of Professor to be considered at the next available FEP meeting and informs the School Dean, as well as the School's representative for the case. Cases for promotion to the rank of Professor shall be heard only by the FEP members holding the rank of Professor.
 11. Upon receiving a positive recommendation from the School for cases for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the VPAA schedules the case to be considered at the next available FEP meeting and informs the School Dean, as well as the School's representative for the case.
 12. At the hearing, the case is presented to the FEP by the chosen representative. After a period of discussion with the representative, the FEP goes into closed session, debates the merits of the case, and votes on the case. A case must receive a positive vote from two-thirds of the committee members present and eligible to vote on that case in order to pass. The FEP writes a summary of its recommendation, discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the case and justifying its decision. In the case of a split vote, a report prepared by the

panel members holding a minority point of view may also be included. The FEP shall issue a recommendation within two months after receiving the School Promotions Committee's recommendation.

- i) In the case of a negative recommendation, the VPAA communicates the result to the candidate along with specific recommendations that will help the candidate progress towards promotion, with copies furnished to the School Dean and the President.
 - ii) In the case of a positive recommendation, the panel's recommendation along with all case documents are transmitted to the President for his/her consideration, with a copy furnished to the School Dean.
13. In the case of negative action by the President, the VPAA and School Dean are informed by the President's Office. The President's Office issues a letter informing the candidate along with specific recommendations that will help move the candidate closer to promotion.
 14. In the case of positive action by the President for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the President's Office informs the VPAA and the School Dean and issues a letter to the candidate.
 15. In the case of positive action by the President for promotion to the rank of Professor, the President's decision along with all case documents are transmitted to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees for their consideration.
 16. In the case of positive action by the Executive Committee, the President's Office informs the VPAA and the School Dean and issues a letter to the candidate.
 17. In the case of negative action by the Executive Committee, the VPAA and School Dean are informed by the President's Office. The President's Office sends a letter informing the candidate along with specific recommendations that will help the candidate progress towards promotion.

III. COMMUNICATION WITH THE CANDIDATE AND CAMPUS COMMUNITY

1. In the case of negative recommendation or action at any point in the promotion process, the Dean shall provide the candidate with a summary of the institute and/or School decision and with specific recommendations that will help move the faculty member closer to promotion. The recommendations should point out areas of strength, identify areas requiring further development, and recommend strategies for achieving the needed improvement.
2. In the case of negative recommendation or action at any point in the promotion process for a School Dean, the VPAA shall provide the Dean with a summary of the institute and/or external experts' decision and with specific

recommendations that will help move the Dean closer to promotion. The recommendations should point out areas of strength, identify areas requiring further development, and recommend strategies for achieving the needed improvement.

3. In the case of conclusive positive action on a promotion case, the candidate's curriculum vitae, as submitted for evaluation, shall be posted on the FEP web page. CVs will be Internet-published, while the anonymous external evaluations will be Intranet-published.

IV. EXTERNAL EVALUATION

1. External evaluations will not be solicited for Assistant Professors considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. (*See Section V on Appeals below.*)
2. For promotion or appointment to the rank of Professor, letters from at least five external evaluators are required.
3. The choice of external evaluators and all communication with them is the responsibility of the VPAA.
4. The packet sent to the external evaluators should include the candidate's curriculum vitae in the standard format (*see PA-1-2-6 Format for the Promotion and Contract Renewal Document*), copies of selected publications, and the standard cover letter (*Annex 1 below*).

V. APPEALS

Faculty candidates who feel that their case was not given fair treatment have the right to appeal the decision. Appeals must be made in writing within 30 days of notification of the decision. In the appeals hearing, all concerned parties (Faculty Evaluation Panel; School Promotions Committee) should have representation.

1. Appeal of a negative decision at the School level is made to the VPAA who shall schedule the case to be considered by the FEP.
2. Appeal of a negative decision by the FEP is made to the President.

In the case of an appeal, external evaluations from at least three external evaluators may be solicited for Assistant Professors considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

VI. RE-APPLICATIONS

1. In case of internal rejection (either by the Dean/School Promotions Committee or by the VPAA/Faculty Evaluations Panel), the applicant can only resubmit his/her application after a lapse of one year from the date of rejection.
2. In case of negative recommendations by external reviewers, the applicant can resubmit his/her application after a lapse of two years from the date of rejection.

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| Modification History: | 1 st Revision | 27 July 2006 |
| | Reviewed By: | AIT Management Team (13 June 2012, 16 May 2012, 18 April 2012) Academic Senate (25 April 2012) VPAA; Decision Meeting |
| | 2 nd Revision | 23 August 2006 |
| | 3 rd Revision | 19 January 2007 |
| | 4 th Revision | 6 July 2011 (AITMT) |
| | 5 th Revision | 13 June 2012 |
| Related Policies | PA-1-1-1 – Employment of Faculty: General Work Regulations PA-1-2-4 – Institute Faculty Evaluation Panel Terms of Reference PA-1-2-5 – Faculty Evaluation Guidelines PA-1-2-6 – Format for the Promotion and Contract Renewal Document | |
| Keywords | | |
| Rationale for Revisions: | <p><u>(13 June 2012 / 16 May 2012, AITMT)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised evaluation process: when School Deans are considered for promotion; and when a School does not have sufficient number of Professors. • Revised the cover letter to external evaluators <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment and refinement of procedures <p><u>(6 July 2011, AITMT)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New School management structure (<i>with effect from 1 September 2011</i>). • Extension of application period. • Nomination of qualified faculty. • School's full assessment at the onset. • No external evaluations for Assistant Professors considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor (but may be solicited in the case of appeals). • Representation in appeals hearing. <p><u>(7 June 2011, AITMT)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeframe for School Promotions Committee and Faculty Evaluation Panel's issuance of recommendations. • Publication of CVs and external evaluations. • Re-submission of applications. | |

Annex 1

COVER LETTER TO EXTERNAL EVALUATORS

Dear Professor _____ :

Dr. _____ is being considered for promotion to professor in the _____ program in the School of _____. The institute faculty evaluation panel seeks your confidential evaluation of the materials Dr. _____ has submitted for consideration, and your conclusion as to whether these materials establish a record of (a) research, scholarship, and professional activities, (b) pedagogical qualifications, and (c) service that warrants promotion to this rank at an institution of AIT's caliber. I am forwarding to you the materials submitted for review. Please use these materials as the basis for your evaluation and conclusion. Please note that this is a request for evaluation, not a request for endorsement or recommendation. As such, the use of superlatives without analysis or mention of specific indicators that support such assessments will not be helpful in our deliberations. We would particularly value your assessment of the quality and originality of Dr. _____'s work and the impact it has had on the field. A copy of our criteria for promotion is enclosed to aid you in your assessment.

In your response, we also ask that you indicate the nature and length of your acquaintance with Dr. _____ .

We highly regard your support, and request you to provide us with a brief resume for our record and further reference.

External reviews are an integral and critical part of the review process for promotion at AIT. We recognize the burden this request entails and sincerely thank you for your willingness to undertake such a time-consuming task.

We would appreciate receiving your review at your earliest convenience, and if possible by _____ (date).

Sincerely,

Vice President for Academic Affairs

Enclosures: Institute criteria for promotion
Institute procedure for promotion
materials forwarded for review