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## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

| AHRMC-AC | Administration Human Resource Management Committee |
| :--- | :--- |
| GPA | Grade Point Average |
| HSS | Harmonized Scheme of Service |
| MUHAS | Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences |
| MUST | Mbeya University of Science and Technology |
| OUT | Open University of Tanzania |
| PSRPC | Postgraduate Studies, Research and Publication Committee |
| SUA | Sokoine University of Agriculture |
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## PREAMBLE AND CITATION

## Preamble/Definitions

Academic Staff: means is a University or a Constituent staff designated as either:
(i) Professor or Research Professor;
(ii) Associate Professor or Associate Research Professor;
(iii) Senior Lecturer or Senior Research Fellow;
(iv) Lecturer or Research Fellow;
(v) Assistant Lecturer or Assistant Research Fellow;
(vi) Tutorial Assistant;
(vii) Library Professor or Associate Library Professor;
(viii) Senior Librarian; or
(ix) Librarian or Assistant Librarian.

Assessor: means a person appointed by the Head of Department to assess publications of an academic staff for promotion purposes. The assessor can either be internal or external.

External Assessment: A publication assessment conducted by a member of staff who is not working with MUST.

Internal Assessment: A publication assessment conducted by a member of staff working with MUST.

International Journal: means one with an International Editorial Board, an International classification index and internationally retrievable.

Refereed Journals: shall include recognized and reputable journals.
Refereed Proceedings: means conference papers that have been published and have an ISBN/ISSN number or available online.

Retrievable Journal Paper: means a published paper that can be found and made available or accessible online.

Unit means measurement used to grade papers and other publications.
University means Mbeya University of Science and Technology.

## Citation

This Guideline is cited as The Mbeya University of Science and Technology Guidelines for Assessing Academic Staff Performance 2021 and shall come into force on the day of its approval by the Senate of Mbeya University of Science and Technology.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Historical Background of Mbeya University of Science and Technology

Mbeya University of Science and Technology (MUST) is a result of two successive transformations. The first involved the transformation of the then Mbeya Technical College (MTC) which was established in the 1986 to Mbeya Institute of Science and Technology (MIST) in 2005. MTC was offering four Full Technician Certificate programmes in the fields of Civil, Mechanical, and Electrical Engineering as well as Architecture. The second, involved transformation of MIST to Mbeya University of Science and Technology (MUST) through a Charter of Incorporation by the President of the United Republic of Tanzania as stipulated in Section 25 of the Universities Act No. 7 of 2005 and Article 3-(1) of the Mbeya University of Science and Technology Charter (2013) through the MUST Charter 2013. All these transformations are responses by the government to increase the number of technical experts who are responsive to the various human resource requirements. Up to this end, several programmes for Diploma, Bachelor and postgraduate studies are being offere.

### 1.2 Vision

The Vision of Mbeya University of Science and Technology is to become the leading centre of excellence for knowledge, skills and applied education in Science and Technology.

### 1.3 Mission

The Mission of Mbeya University of Science and Technology is to develop academically, technologically and socially competent students, staff and other stakeholders who will be responsive to the broader needs and challenges of the society specified by:
a) Facilitating appropriate tuition, practical training and support according to the needs of students and other customers.
b) Encouraging staff commitment to quality education and services including research, consultancy and innovation.
c) Fostering lifelong learning, honesty and responsibility.
d) Promoting an environment conducive to human development.
e) Promoting effective entrepreneurship and usage of appropriate technology that meet national and international needs, standards, skills and practical oriented training, research and consultancy.

### 1.4 Rationale for Review of the Guidelines for Assessing Academic Staff Performance

Since the development of the Guideline in 2015 and its implementation it was noted that there are issues that need to be addressed in the Guideline. The issues include emphasis on single authored paper which does mentor young researchers, limit collaborations and team work. The current Guidelines has little consideration on how other universities in the country promote their academic staff. The need to emphasise on the retrievability of the publications online and/or issuance of ISBN/ISSN reference. Issues on combination of publications required more elaboration to enable the smooth implementation of the Guidelines. Such issues have been found to create a bottleneck on staff promotion. In addition, the Guidelines was developed six (6) years ago and need to be reviewed as per procedures.

## 2 BENCHMARKING WITH OTHER UNIVERSITIES

In the process of revising the Guideline, related policies and guidelines from other similar institutions were consulted. The details are provided below.

University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM): The UDSM's Guideline was developed in 2016 and has set minimum points for promotion which increases with the rank from 2 up to 7 points from publications. It also recognizes promotion of PhD students who have good academic progress and have 1 point from publication. In addition, minimum limit of points contributed from journal publications and maximum points from any other publications have been set. Points for coauthored papers are shared among authors. The grading suggest that Excellent (A) and Very Good ( $\mathrm{B}+$ ) have maximum point and Good (B)
has $50 \%$ of the maximum point, while the rest is 0 and is regarded as poor. Requirements from teaching have been set and the maximum is 2 points. Diversification is limited to maximum $50 \%$ of the journals from one journal.

Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA): The promotion guideline for SUA is called "Up the ladder: Criteria and Conditions for Employment and Promotion of Academic Members of Staff," was developed in 2016. SUA recognizes both in service and new employment for various levels. It emphases on diversification of publications and limit it to $35 \%, 40 \%$ and $45 \%$ for Senior Lecturer, Associate Professor and Professor. Points from co-authored papers are shared among the authors. The grading suggests that Excellent (A), Very Good ( $\mathrm{B}+$ ) and Good (B) have maximum points, while $50 \%$ of the maximum point regarded as Satisfactory (C) and is awarded $50 \%$.

## Open University of Tanzania (OUT)

The OUT's Guideline has set minimum point of promotion which increase as you up the ranks from 1 up to 16 points from publications. Papers published in refereed journals shall not be subjected to any evaluation. In addition, minimum limit of points contribution from journal publications and co-authored papers for teaching and research staff have been set. Points from co-authored papers are shared among the authors. The grading suggest that Excellent (A) and Very Good ( $B+$ ) have maximum points and Good (B) has $50 \%$ of the maximum points, while the rest is 0 and is regarded as poor.

## Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences (MUHAS)

The MUHAS's Guideline was developed in 2009. In addition to other publications, it recognizes PhD thesis (Monograph) and research reports and have been given 1 and 0.5 points respectively. MUHAS has
set minimum points of promotion which increase with the ranks from 3 to 6 points from publications. In addition, scholarly grants contribute to promotion of staff. In addition, minimum limit of points contributed from journal publications and grants is $50 \%, 60 \%$ and $60 \%$ for Senior Lecturer, Associate Professor and Professor respectively. For other publication a maximum points have been set. Points for co-authored papers are shared among the authors. The grading suggest that Excellent (A) and Very Good ( $\mathrm{B}+$ ) have maximum points and Good (B) has $50 \%$ of the maximum points, while the rest is 0 . Requirements from teaching have been set and the maximum is $15 \%$ of the minimum points is required. Diversification is limited to minimum $50 \%$ of the journals from one journal.

## Harmonised Scheme of Service (HSS)

Salient features in the HSS include minimum qualifications required for appointment, working experience, career progression and responsibilities to be performed by each rank in the carder. The integral responsibilities for promotion include teaching, research, consultancy and community outreach services. Based on seniority, the academic staff recognised include Professor or Research Professor or Library Professor, Associate Professor or Associate Research Professor or Associate Library Professor, Senior Lecturer or Senior Research or Senior Librarian Fellow, Lecturer or Research Fellow or Librarian, Assistant Lecturer or Assistant Research Fellow or Assistant Librarian and Tutorial Assistant.

The HSS has provided entry level for each academic carder has defined the include minimum GPAs (Bachelor GPA is 3.8 and Masters GPA is 4.0), points from publications (Professor 6 points, Associate Professor 6 points, Senior Lecturer 3, Lecturer 2 points), points from teaching accumulated in three years of teaching (Professor 3 points, Associate

Professor 3 points, Senior Lecturer 2, Lecturer 1 points). In addition, the maximum points awarded for each academic publication has been set with a minimum being zero.

The treatment of academic staff is in accordance to HSS, the Public Service Act, the Universities' Act and Charter, Financial Regulations and Staff Regulations of the respective Universities and Constituent Colleges.

## 3 ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC PUBLICATIONS

### 3.1 Assessment of individual publications

### 3.1.1 Publications in journals

a) Journal papers should be awarded 0-1.0 points.
b) Papers should be published in internationally recognized journals and retrievable.

### 3.1.2 Conference papers retrievable from proceedings

a) Only papers published and retrievable from refereed proceedings should be considered for promotion.
b) The papers should be evaluated like any other publication
c) The published papers should be awarded 0-0.5 points.

### 3.1.3 Consultancy reports

a) Consultancy reports registered by colleges should be considered for promotion to all ranks.
b) A consultancy report shall carry 0-0.5 points

### 3.1.4 Co-authored publications

The weight of co-authored publications should be shared equally among all contributors.

### 3.1.5 Book/book chapters/book review

a) Where authors produce a research based scholarly book on a particular subject matter, it should be evaluated and awarded 06.0 points (shared by authors according to their contribution).
b) Where authors contribute chapters (in the form of research papers) to such a book, each chapter should be evaluated as a paper worth 0-1.0 points.
c) Dictionaries (General and Subject) should be evaluated as books and awarded $0-6.0$ points.
d) Book review that has been recognized by a recognized publisher and has been published in a peer review journal and awarded.00.5 .

### 3.1.6 Dictionaries (Subject and general)

Where a dictionary is approved by a recognized book publisher:
a) A maximum score for an individual's contribution to a dictionary (subject \& general) with an ISBN No. and warded 0-6.
b) A letter in a Dictionary and awarded 0-1.0.
c) Points for Multi-Authored letters in a Dictionary shall be shared by authors equally

### 3.1.7 Patents

Patented material and awarded 0-6 points.
Case study/Extension material
a) A case report appearing in the referenced journal and awarded 00.5 .
b) Extension material including extension publication and awarded 0-0.5

### 3.1.8 Clinical/Community services

Effectiveness of community/clinical service delivery. Guidelines for "Effectiveness of community/clinical service delivery shall be specified by TCU in consultation with relevant professional body and awarded 0-1/

### 3.1.9 Dissertations/Theses/Research Reports/Technical Notes <br> Should not be considered

### 3.1.10 Grading system

a) The letter grade system should be used.
b) For the purpose of determining the points of a publication, the letter grade awarded for "overall quality" of the paper should be used.
c) The following points of publications should be assigned to the letter grades;

Table 1: Conversion of Letter Grade to Points of Publications

| Letter <br> Grade | Qualitative <br> Evaluation <br> of the <br> Publication | Journal | Conference <br> Papers | Chapters <br> in a Book | Consultancy Reports | Books |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Excellent | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 |  |  |
| B+ | Very Good | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 6.0 |
| B | Good | 0 |  | 5 | 0.5 | 6.0 |
| C | Sa | 0. |  | 0.5 | 0.25 | 3.0 |
| D | Poor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Poor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

### 3.1.11 Summary of points for each publication

Table 2: Summary of Assessment of Publications

| S/N | Types of <br> Publication | Conditions for Acceptance | No. of <br> Points |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Conference | Should be published | $0-0.5$ |


| S/N | Types of Publication | Conditions for Acceptance | No. Points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Papers |  |  |
| 2 | Consultancy Reports | Should be registered and evaluated like publication | 0-0.5 |
| 3 | Journal <br> Articles | Should be published in peer review, recognized and international journals. | 0-1.0 |
| 4 | A Book | Scholarly and research-based on a particular subject | 0-6.0 |
| 5 | Chapters in an Edited Book | Each chapter to be evaluated | 0-1.0 |
| 6 | Dictionaries (Subject and general) | Dictionary approved by a recognized book publisher: |  |
|  |  | A maximum score for an individual's contribution to a dictionary (subject \& general) with an ISBN No. | 0-6 |
|  |  | A letter in a Dictionary | 0-1.0 |
|  |  | Points for Multi-Authored letters in a Dictionary shall be shared by authors equally |  |
| 7 | Co-authored Papers (journal articles/book chapters) | Points to be shared equally by authors of a co-authored paper. | 0-1.0 |
| 8 | Book Reviews | Book review that has been recognized by a recognized publisher and has been published in a peer review journal. | 0-0.5 |
| 9 | Case Report | A case report appearing in the referenced journal | 0-0.5 |
| 10 | Patents | Patented material | 0-6 |
| 11 | Extension <br> Material | Extension material including extension publication | 0-0.5 |
| 12 | Teaching Effectiveness | Department and Quality Assurance committees should be used in the assessing teaching effectiveness. | 0-3 |


| S/N | Types of <br> Publication | Conditions for Acceptance | No. of <br> Points |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13 | Clinical/Comm <br> unity services | Effectiveness of community/clinical <br> service delivery. Guidelines for <br> "Effectiveness of community/clinical <br> service delivery shall be specified by <br> TCU in consultation with relevant <br> professional body | $0-1$ |
| 14 | Dissertations/T <br> heses | Should not be considered | N.A |
| 15 | Research <br> Reports 1 | Should not be considered. | N.A |
| 16 | Technical <br> Notes | Should not be considered | N.A |

### 3.2 Minimum points from publications and teaching for promotion

 The minimum points from publications and teaching experience for various academic ranks.
### 3.2.1 Tutorial Assistant/Research Assistant/Library Assistant

First Degree at First or Upper Second Division with a GPA of 3.8 or above plus interview

### 3.2.2 Tutorial Assistant/Research Assistant /Library Assistant to Assistant Lecturer/Assistant Researcher/Assistant Librarian

Masters with a B+ performance at a GPA of 4.0 and above, potentially good academically. Should be interviewed if he/she is to be employed directly as Assistant Lecturer.

### 3.2.3 Assistant Lecturer/Assistant Researcher/Assistant Librarian to Lecturer/Researcher/Librarian

[^0]Promotion from Assistant Lecturer to Lecturer requires the possession of a PhD or an Assistant Lecturer with 2 points from publications and 1 point from teaching for three years. The total number is 3 points.

OR
For a staff pursuing PhD whose academic progress is good as evidenced by report from the respective University. With 1 points from publications and 1 point from teaching for three years. The total number is 2 points.

### 3.2.4 Lecturer/Researcher/Librarian to Senior Lecturer/Senior Researcher/Senior Librarian

Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer for a PhD holder requires 3 points from publications and 2 point from teaching. The total number is 5 point. Promotion of a Lecturer to Senior Lecturer who is a holder of MMED/MDent requires 5 points from publications and 2 point from teaching for 3 years. The total number of points is 5 .

### 3.2.5 Senior Lecturer/Senior Researcher/Senior Librarian to Associate Professor/Associate Research Professor/Associate Library Professor

Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Associate Professor requires 6 points from publications and 3 point from teaching for a period of 3 years. The total number of point is 9 .

### 3.2.6 Associate Professor/Associate Research Professor /Associate Library Professor to Professor/Research Professor /Library Professor

Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor requires 6 points from publications and 3 point from teaching for a period of 3 years. The total number of point is 9 .

### 3.2.7 Other pertinent issues to consider

(i) Papers that are published as a requirement for the award of either PhD or Masters shall not count in promotion.
(ii) For promotion to the position of Lecturer or Senior Lecturer, only internal assessment is required and when there is no expert in the field, external assessment is required.
(iii) For promotion to the position of Associate Professor or Professor, both internal and external assessments are required and when there is no expert in the field, two (2) external assessments are required.
(iv) Academic members of staff should, as far as possible, diversify the journals in which they publish their articles. Except for the few disciplines that may have highly specialized or limited journal titles, not more than $45 \%, 40 \%, 35 \%$ of the minimum promotion points from papers considered for promotion to Full Professor, Associate Professor, Senior Lecturer rank respectively, should come from one journal title, whether for a professorial or a nonprofessorial rank.

In any case, Department would have to make a special case to the Appointments Committee for any divergence from this rule to be considered.
(v) Promotion from Assistant Lecturer to Lecturer should diversify the journals in which they publish their articles.

### 3.3 Balance between various types of publications

Table 3 show the balance between journal papers, books, conference papers, research reports, consultancy reports, and book chapters for promotion to various ranks of academic staff. Any combination of the
components fulfilling the criteria in Table 3 should be $100 \%$ or more but not less.

Table 3: Balance between various types of publications

| Type of publication | Assistant <br> Lecturer <br> to <br> Lecturer | Lecturer <br> to Senior <br> Lecturer | Senior <br> Lecturer to <br> Associate <br> Professor | Associate <br> Professor <br> to <br> Professor |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Journal papers | $100 \%$ | Min. 35\% | Min. 40\% | Min. 45\% |
| Book, patents | 0 | Max. 25\% | Max. 30\% | Max. 30\% |
| Chapters of a book; <br> published conference <br> papers, book review, <br> Case Report | 0 | Max. 30\% | Max. 20\% | Max. $15 \%$ |
| Consultancy reports; <br> extension materials | 0 | Max. 10\% | Max. $10 \%$ | Max. $10 \%$ |
| Minimum Total <br> Publication Points | $1 / 2^{*}$ | 3 | 6 | 6 |
| Minimum Teaching <br> Effectiveness Points | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Minimum Total Points <br> Required | $1 / 3$ | 5 | 9 | 9 |

* For academic staff pursuing PhD and have published the minimum points required is 1 and an Assistant Lecturer who have published, the minimum points is 2 .


## 4 FILLING OF STAFF EVALUATION FORM

(i) Filling of the evaluation form is part of the conditions of service that is accepted and signed by each staff member at the time of recruitment.
(ii) Each academic member of staff is obliged to complete and submit evaluation forms so as to allow evaluation of the member's performance during the year in terms of efficiency and effectiveness in carrying out his/her duties and responsibilities.
a. If a member does not submit the evaluation form without acceptable reasons for the year under review, he/she will be served with a written warning.
b. If non-submission of the evaluation form is repeated in the subsequent year, the staff member concerned will be served with a stern written warning letter.
c. If this occurs in a third consecutive year, the staff member will be required to seek alternative employment.
(iii) The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic Research and Consultancy), Principals, Deans, Directors and Heads of Department should ensure that each staff member gets the evaluation form in good time.

## 5 STAFF WHO PUBLISH WHILE ON LEAVE OF ABSENCE

University staff members who have been away for some time shall be eligible for promotion only after a minimum of one year of service upon the resume of work and total number of years of service should sum up to a minimum of three years of services at the rank

## 6 SUBMISSION ORIGINAL CERTIFICATES AND COPIES OF DISSERTATIONS

(i) A staff member returning from study leave is required to submit his/her original degree certificate for verification and copy of his/her dissertation/thesis within one year after completion of studies.
(ii)A staff member who fails to submit his/her original degree certificate and copy of her/his dissertation/thesis within the specified period without acceptable reason shall be considered to have failed to
complete the programme. Such a staff shall be liable for recategorization to non-academic cadre.
(iii) Awards from foreign institutions must be evaluated for recognition by either TCU.
(iv) Certificates from unaccredited universities shall not be recognized.

## 7 ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

(i) The assessment of publications submitted by academic members of staff at the Mbeya University of Science and Technology is carried out on the assumption that the academic member of staff whose publication(s) is or are subjected to assessment observed all the rules against academic dishonesty.
(ii) Where evidence that established a case for academic dishonesty on the part of the academic member of staff is tendered to the Mbeya University of Science and Technology authority, either before, during or after the assessment, the University shall have the power to commence disciplinary proceedings against the individual academic member of staff.
(iii) Proof of academic dishonest shall render the publication(s) submitted invalid, regardless of whatever disciplinary measures were taken against the academic member of staff in question.
(iv) Acts of academic dishonesty include but are not limited to;
(a) Plagiarism, and
(b)The acquisition and use, without acknowledgment, of academic materials belonging to someone else.
(v) Any other form of dishonest that may be determined by the University.

## 8 PROFESSORIAL INAUGURAL LECTURES

Professors are expected to give Professorial Inaugural Lectures in their fields of specialization within two years of promotion. A professor will select a topic for his/her Professorial Inaugural Lecture in consultation with the Deputy Vice Chancellor Academic Research and Consultancy who shall assist when a need for assistance arises.

## 9 PROCEDURE FOR EVALUATING ACADEMIC STAFF

### 9.1 Academic Staff

An academic staff seeking promotion should submit to the Head of Department a bounded Academic Promotion Application Set which is composed of:
(i) Application letter addressed to the respective Head of Department;
(ii) An updated Curriculum Vitae with all publication referenced;
(iii) All publications and referred in the Curriculum Vitae,
(iv) Letter of last promotion

The publications should show:
(i) Authorship (indicate all authors for co-authored works)
(ii) Title
(iii) Publisher and Place
(iv) Year of publication
(v) For a book, number of pages; for a journal article, page number, e.g. p 12-21
(vi) For works that are yet to be published but have been accepted for publication, requirements in sections (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) above apply. In addition, a letter of acceptance by the publisher must be submitted.

### 9.2 Head of Department

(i) The Head of Department in consultation with the Department Evaluation Team sends the submitted publications, together with the CV and the promotion criteria, to an assessor.
(ii) The Head of Department is required to ensure that the information in 9.1 above is complete before the publications are sent to the assessor.
(iii) For promotion to the ranks up to Senior Lecturer the assessment is done internally by an academician with a rank equal or above that being aspired
(iv) For promotion to the ranks of Associate Professor/Full Professor the assessment is done both internally and externally by an academician of a rank of equal or above that being aspired.

### 9.3 Assessment of publications

Assessors are required to submit the following information on each publication:
(i) Assessment of the publication in relation to:
(a) Coverage of subject matter
(b) Originality
(c) Contribution to knowledge
(d)Relevance of academic discipline
(e) Relevance of individual's own specialization in an academic discipline
(f) Presentation
(g) Overall quality
(ii) For each aspect (a) (i-vii) above, a grade should be given according to system shown below. For the overall quality of the publication (a) (i-vii)) above), the grade should reflect the average. In this regard, the definitions of the letters are:

| A | - | Excellent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| B+ | - | Very Good |
| B | - | Good |
| C | - | Satisfactory |
| D | - | Poor |

### 9.4 Overall Assessment of the Author

(i) The assessor should provide an overall assessment of the author by indicating the following:
(a) Whether the quality of the publications assessed in general reflect the author's current academic rank (Yes/ No)
(b) Whether the quality of the publications assessed merit promotion of the author to the next academic rank (Yes/ No)
(c) Any other comments, suggestions, or recommendations.
(ii) The assessor's name, academic qualification, title, address and signature must be submitted to the Head of Department, together with the assessment report.
(iii)Where the internal and external reviewers of a publication differ substantially, another external reviewer should be used for arbitration. Eventually, review reports of the two assessors which are somehow similar to each other shall be considered.

### 9.5 Assessment by the Department

(i) After receiving the assessor's report, the Departmental Evaluation Team is required to go through the Assessment Form One (Overall Assessment) (Appendix A) and Assessment Form Two (For each publication) (Appendix B), Summary of assessment (Appendix C), Analysis (Appendix D) and submit its own recommendation on the assessment to the respective College Board.
(ii) The Departmental Evaluation Team should not forward to the College Board any assessment reports that are incomplete or does not meet the minimum requirements.
(iii)The Departmental Staff Review Committee should on the basis of the assessment, weight every publication according to the guidelines for assessment of academic performance.

### 9.6 College Board

After receiving the report from the Department, the College Board will discuss and write a report to the Postgraduate Studies, Research and Publication Committee.

### 9.7 Postgraduate Studies, Research and Publication Committee

After receiving the report from the College Board, the Postgraduate Studies, Research and Publication Committee (PSRPC) will discuss and write a report to the Administration, Human Resource Management Committee for Academic Staff (AHRMC-AC).

### 9.8 Administration, Human Resource Management Committee for Academic Staff

After receiving the report form Postgraduate Studies, Research and Publication Committee the HRMC-AC will discuss and:
(a) Approve promotion of staff up to the rank of Senior Lecturer

## OR

(b) Recommend to the MUST Council the promotion of Associate Professor or Professor.

## 10 REVIEW OF GUIDELINES

The Guidelines shall be reviewed after every three (3) years or when deemed necessary.
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APPENDIX A
OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PUBLICATIONS
1.0 Name of Staff (Author):
$\qquad$
2.0 Overall Quality of All Publications
2.1 Is the quality of publications assessed in general reflects the author's academic rank of Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Associate Professor/ Professor?
Yes/No
2.2 Is this quality of publications assessed in general merit promotion of the author to Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Associate Professor/ Professor (If other Attributes for promotion have been qualified)?
Yes/No
(Support your answer with a statement)
3.0 Any other Comments
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Assessor's ParticularsName:
$\qquad$Academic Qualification:
$\qquad$Designation:
$\qquad$Address:
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$Signature:Date:
$\qquad$

## APPENDIX B

EVALUATION OF PUBLICATIONS FOR STAFF PROMOTION

1. NAME OF STAFF:

$\qquad$
2. DETAILS OF PUBLICATION
Name of Author
Title of Publication:
$\qquad$Other Details:
$\qquad$
For Journal/Conference Proceedings
Name of Journal:
$\qquad$
For Books/Teaching Manuscript
Name of Publisher
Edition: Year: Page:
For Consultancy Reports
Owner of Report:
Registration number: Year: Pages:
3. SUMMARY OF MAJOR POINTS IN THE PUBLICATION
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
4. ORIGINALITY OF PUBLICATION

## 5. CONTRIBUTION TO THE ADVANCEMENT OF KNOWLEDGE

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## 6. GRADING

Put $\checkmark$ on appropriate column

| S/N | Attribute | GRADE (Please Tick) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| o |  |  |  |  |  |  | AR | A |
| :---: |

Name of Reviewer: Signed: $\qquad$

## For Departmental use only

## 7. COMMENTS BY DEPARTMENTAL ACADEMIC STAFF REVIEW COMMITTEE

7.1 General Comments based on Reviewer's Report
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
7.2 Award of Units of Publication

Based on the above comments, this paper/book/report is awarded .....................Units of Publication.

The author's contribution is $\qquad$ Unit(s)

Name of Chairman
Signed
Date
APPENDIX C: SUMMARY OF EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL PUBLICATIONS

| S/N | No. as in CV | Title of Publication | Authors | Assessment |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | External <br> Reviewer | Internal Reviewer | Department Points | Staff <br> Share |
| A: Journal Papers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S/N | No. as in CV | Title of Publication | Authors | Assessment |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | External <br> Reviewer | Internal Reviewer | Department Points | Staff <br> Share |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Subtotal 2 <br> C. Consultancy Reports  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Subtotal 3 |  |  |  |  |


| (Add rows depending of the type of publications (Section 3.1 and <br> Table 2)) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Grand total |  |  |  |

APPENDIX D: ANALYSIS

| Publication (P) |  | Criteria | Condition | Actual | Validity |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Journal papers | Journal papers | Minimum....\% |  |  |  |
|  | Max papers in the same journal ( $(35 \%=1.05$ points), ( $40 \%=2.4$ points), ( $45 \%=2.7$ points) for Senior Lecturer, Associate Professor and Professor) |  |  |  |  |
| Conference paper |  | Maximum....\% |  |  |  |
| Consultancy reports |  |  |  |  |  |
| Books |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Add rows depending of the type of publications (Section 3.1 and Table 2)) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching (T) | No. of years | Minimum: 3 |  |  | 3 |
| Overall Performance (OP) |  |  |  |  |  |


| $\mathrm{OP}=\mathrm{T}+\mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{T}=$ contribution of teaching, $\mathrm{P}=$ contribution of publication |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{OP}=\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$ |

Postgraduate Studies, Research and Publication Committee's Recommendations

Council's Recommendations:


## APPROVAL

According to the $19^{\text {th }}$ AHRMC meeting of Mbeya University of Science and Technology held on $25^{\text {th }}$ August, 2021 item of agenda, 8,Paper No. 4 AHRMC -AC 19, this Guidelines For Assessing Academic Staff Performance has been read and approved.



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Research findings should be publishes (journal or conference paper or book) and be considered for promotion.

