THE UNIVERSITY OF DAR ES SALAAM

GUIDELINES FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC STAFF PERFORMANCE

Revised Edition, February 11, 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

UNIVERSITY OF DAR ES SALAAM

GUIDELINES FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC STAFF PERFORMANCE

1.   CRITERIA FOR THE PROMOTION OF ACADEMIC STAFF

1.1   Criteria for the Promotion of Academic Staff (See Appendix A).

2.   GUIDELINES FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC WORK

2.1   Guidelines for the assessment of individual publications and related papers (Appendix B)

(i)   Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and theses can be converted into books, which can be counted for promotion, provided that significant material has been added to the dissertation/thesis and the resulting book has been subjected to a rigorous review process by the publisher.

(ii)   Research Reports

Research reports should not be considered for promotion.

(iii)   Conference Papers Retrievable from Proceedings

   (a)   Only papers retrievable from referred proceedings should be considered for promotion.

   (b)   The papers should be evaluated by two assessors. If the evaluations are positive, the paper should be accepted for promotion.

   (c)   The published paper is to be awarded 0 – 0.5 points.

(iv)   Editorship of a Book and Book Reviews

Editorship of a book should not be awarded points. However, a review of a book that has been approved by a recognised publisher and which has been published in a recognised peer reviewed journal may be awarded 0 – 0.5 points.

(v)   Consultancy Reports

   (a)   Consultancy reports registered by Colleges/Schools/Institutes should be considered for promotion to all ranks.

   (b)   Registered Consultancy reports should be evaluated by two reviewers.

   (c)   Consultancy reports should be awarded 0 – 0.5 points.

(vi)   Case Notes and Case Reports

A Case Note or a Case Report which has been published in a recognised peer reviewed journal may be awarded 0 – 0.5 points.

(vii) Extension Material
Registered Extension Material shall be reviewed in the same manner as Consultancy Reports and awarded 0 – 0.5 points.

(viii) Co-authored Papers

  (a) There should be consistency in all academic units in awarding authors of co-authored papers.

  (b) Points awarded to the co-authored papers should be shared equally among all the authors.

  (c) A minimum of three (3) points from papers in which the candidate is the lead author should be required for promotion to professorial ranks.

(ix) Publications in Referred Journals

  (a) The terms "recognised", "local", "international" and "referred" journals should be defined in accordance with the guidelines approved by the Senate.

  (b) An international journal is one with an international Editorial Board, an international Classification Index and is internationally retrievable.

  (c) Only papers published in international journals as defined in (b) above should be considered for promotion to professorial ranks.

  (d) Journal papers should be awarded 0 – 1.0 point.

(x) Books

  (a) Where authors produce a scholarly book with an ISBN number in the relevant specialty, it should be evaluated as a book and awarded 0 – 6.0 points (shared equally by all the authors if the book is multi-authored).

  (b) Where authors produce a book with an ISBN number for lower levels of education (e.g. secondary or college) and the book has been approved by the responsible Ministry, it should be evaluated as a book and awarded 0 – 0.5 points (shared equally by all the authors if the book is multi-authored).

  (c) Where authors contribute chapters to a scholarly book in the relevant speciality as outlined in (a) above, each chapter should be evaluated as a paper worth 0 – 1.0 points provided the total points awarded to the whole book do not exceed 6.0.

  (d) Dictionaries, both Subject and General, approved by a recognised book publisher and with an ISBN number should be evaluated as books and awarded 0 – 6.0 points (shared equally by all the authors if the dictionary is multi-authored).

  (e) Where authors contribute letters to a dictionary as outlined in (d) above, each letter should be evaluated as a chapter in a book Worth 0 – 1.0 point provided the total points awarded to the whole dictionary do not exceed 6.0.

(xi) Patents

Intellectual Property (IP) material in the relevant speciality registered by a duly recognized national or international Patent Office should be evaluated and awarded 0 – 6.0 points (shared equally by all patent holders if the patent is held by more than one individual).

(xii) Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching effectiveness should be evaluated by College/Institute/Department Quality Assurance Committees using guidelines issued by the Deputy Vice Chancellor - Academic and approved by Senate and awarded 0 – 2.0 points accumulated over 3 consecutive years.

(xiii) Balance between Publications and Teaching

Teaching effectiveness and publications should be evaluated separately and awarded points and weights as indicated in Tables 1 and 2 below. In order to merit promotion, the candidate should attain at least the minimum number of points required for both teaching and publications separately.

(xiv) Grading Systems

    (a)   The letter grade system should be used.

    (b)   For the purpose of determining points, the letter grade awarded for "overall quality" of the paper/book/patent/report should be used.

    (c)   The following points of publications should be assigned to the letter grades:

Table 1: Conversion of Letter Grades to Points for Publications

Letter Grade	Qualitative Evaluation of the Publication	Journal Papers	Chapters in a Book	Consultancy Reports	Scholarly Books & Patents	Books for Lower levels, Published Book Reviews, Conference Papers, Case Reports & Extension Material
A	Excellent	1.0	1.0	0.5	6	0.5
B+	Very Good	1.0	1.0	0.5	5	0.5
B	Good	0.5	0.5	0.25	3	0.25
C	Poor	0	0	0	0	0
D	Very Poor	0	0	0	0	0

2.2 Guidelines for the balance of papers in referred journals and those in proceedings

The balance of publications as shown in Section 2.3 (Tables 2 and 3) is as follows:

    (i)   Promotion from Assistant Lecturer/Assistant Librarian to Lecturer/Librarian requires the possession of a PhD. For members of the academic staff who are clinicians, promotion to Lecturer requires the possession of an MMed or MDent.

    (ii)   In addition to the other requirements specified in these Guidelines, promotion to Senior Lecturer/Senior Librarian and higher ranks requires the possession of a PhD except for academic staff who are clinicians for which possession of an MMed/MDent will be sufficient.

(iii)   Journal papers from diversified sources should contribute at least 35% for promotion to Senior Lecturer/Senior Librarian, 40% for promotion to Associate Professor and 45% for promotion to Professor.

(iv)   A scholarly book (or books) in the relevant speciality will be considered for promotion to the ranks of Senior Lecturer and above, as long as the book is reviewed and vetted by a respected senior academic in the relevant field/discipline. It should also be published by an internationally acclaimed (well-established, well-renowned) publishing house with a track record of professionally milled books and an in-house board of professional editors and advisors.

(v)   Patented material in the relevant speciality registered by a duly recognised Patent Office will be considered for promotion to the ranks of Senior Lecturer and above, as long as the patent is reviewed and vetted by a respected senior academic in the relevant field/discipline.

(vi)   The contribution of Consultancy reports and published Extension material should be limited to a maximum 10% for promotion to Professorial and Senior Lecturer/Senior Librarian positions.

(vii)   The contribution of Chapters in a book, Conference papers, Letters in a dictionary, published Case Reports and published Book reviews should be limited to a maximum of 30% for promotion to the position of Senior Lecturer/Senior Librarian, 20% for promotion to Associate Professor and 15% for promotion to Professor.

(viii)   The contribution of Books and Patents should be limited to a maximum of 25% for promotion to the position of Senior Lecturer/Senior Librarian and 30% for promotion to professorial ranks.

(ix)   Academic members of staff should, as far as possible, diversify the journals in which they publish their articles. Not more than two articles in the same issue of a journal shall be considered. Further, not more than 50% of journal points considered for promotion to any rank should come from one journal title, whether for professorial or non-professorial ranks.

(x)   For purposes of these Guidelines, Librarians are only those involved in students' training programmes leading to a degree offered by the University.

2.3.   Balance between various types of scholarly works

The balance between the various types of publications and patents required for promotion to various ranks of the academic staff is as indicated in Table 2 below.

Table 2:   Maximum and minimum weights permissible for promotion to various ranks of academic staff

Type of Publication	Lecturer to Senior Lecturer	Senior Lecturer to Associate Professor	Associate Professor to Professor
Journal papers	Min. 35%	Min. 40%	Min. 45%
Books; Patents	Max. 25%	Max. 30%	Max. 30%
Chapters of a Book; Published Conference Papers; Case Reports; Book Reviews	Max. 30%	Max. 20%	Max. 15%
Consultancy Reports; Extension Materials	Max. 10%	Max. 10%	Max. 10%

Minimum Total Publication Points	3	6	7
Minimum Teaching Effectiveness Points	2	2	2
Minimum Total Points Required	5	8	9

Table 3: Summary of Guidelines for Assessment of Academic Work

Types of Paper/Publication	Conditions for Acceptance	No. of Points
Dissertations/Theses	Can be converted into books which can be counted for promotion, provided that significant material has been added to the dissertation/thesis and the resulting book has been subjected to a rigorous review process by the publisher.	N.A.
Research Reports	Should not be considered	N.A.
Conference Papers	Should be retrievable from referred proceedings	0–0.5
Consultancy Reports	Should be registered and approved by College/Institute/School, and must be passed by two reviewers.	0–0.5
Technical Notes	Not to be considered	N.A.
Teaching	Quality Teaching should be a prerequisite for promotion of teaching staff	0–2.0
Published Book Reviews	To be evaluated	0-0.5
Journal Articles	Should be published in referred journals. The definition of recognized local, international and referred Journals should be as per the guidelines provided by the Senate.	0–1.0
Scholarly Books	A scholarly book with an ISBN number in the relevant speciality should be evaluated	0–6.0
Chapters in a Book	Each chapter to be evaluated	0–1.0
Lower level Books	A book with an ISBN number for lower levels of education (e.g. secondary or college) which has been approved by the responsible Ministry should be Evaluated	0–0.5
Case Reports	Case Reports published in recognised refereed journals should be evaluated	0–0.5
Subject and General Dictionaries	A dictionary approved by a recognised book publisher should be evaluated as a book	0-6.0
Letters in Dictionaries	Each letter in a dictionary should be evaluated as a chapter in a book	0 -1.0
Co-authored Papers	Points awarded to any co-authored publication to be shared equally by all the authors	0-1.0
Extension Materials	Published Extension Materials should be evaluated as Consultancy Reports	0–0.5
Editorship and Book Reviews	Editorship of a book should not be evaluated. However, a review of a book that has been approved by a recognised publisher and which has been published in a recognised peer reviewed journal may be evaluated	0–0.5
Patent	Patented material registered by a duly recognised Patent Office should be evaluated and the points shared equally by all patent holders.	0–6.0

3. ELIGIBILITY FOR ACADEMIC DUTY

An academic member of staff is required to have an academic qualification at least one level higher than the level he/she is allowed to teach/train. Notwithstanding the purpose of this paragraph, for PhD training, the academic staff is required to have a PhD and at least two years post PhD academic work experience.

4. STAFF WHO DO NOT FILL IN AND RETURN OPEN PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND APPRAISAL (OPRAS) FORMS

(i) Filling in of the OPRAS Form should be made part of the conditions of service, to be accepted and signed by each staff member each year.

(ii) Measures against staff members who do not submit the OPRAS form. Each academic member of staff is obliged to complete and submit the OPRAS Form 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 OPRAS Form without acceptable reasons for the year under review, he/she will be served with a written warning

    (b) If non-submission of the OPRAS Form is repeated in the subsequent year, the staff member concerned will be served with a stern written warning.

    (c) If this occurs in a third consecutive year, the staff member shall be subjected to disciplinary measures.

(iii) The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic), Principals, Deans, Directors and Heads of Department should ensure that each staff member gets the OPRAS Form in good time.

5. STAFF MEMBERS WHO PUBLISH WHILE NOT IN THE SERVICE OF THE UNIVERITY OF DAR ES SALAAM

(a) Staff members who join the services of the University after attaining any academic rank at other academic institutions, both public and private, shall have all their publications assessed afresh in accordance with the University of Dar es Salaam assessment criteria in order to determine their appropriate academic rank at the University.

(b) Staff members who for various reasons cease to work for the University and later apply to rejoin the University will be treated like any other person seeking University employment for the first time. Their publications and other activity records will be evaluated afresh.

(c) Staff members still employed by the University but who have been away for some time shall be eligible for promotion only after a minimum of one year of service to the University since the date of reporting back. However, the requirement of serving for a minimum of three years at one rank shall be maintained.

(d) Publications emerging from full-time research should be considered in the same way as any other publications of the staff member in question. Full

time research in this context refers to research work carried out by person who is engaged exclusively or primarily in conducting research and publishing.

6. REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT ORIGINAL CERTIFICATES AND COPIES OF DISSERATIONS AND THESES

(i)   A staff member returning from study leave is required to submit her/his original degree certificate 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 and transcript within the specified period and without reasonable grounds shall be considered to have failed to complete the programme and therefore liable for re-categorisation or to be returned to The President's Office-Public Service Management and Good Governance (UTUMISHI).

(iii)   Certificates from unaccredited universities shall not be recognised.

7. STAFF AVAILABILITY FOR CONSULTATION BY STUDENTS OR LACK THEREOF

(i)   Each staff member is required to display clearly on his/her office door the times when he/she is available for consultation by students, indicating specific times during the day for each subject. Each staff member should adhere to his/her consultation timetable.

(ii)   Heads of Department or Directors of Institutes where there are no departmental heads should warn a non-complying member in writing if non-conformity persists.

(iii)   Should warnings by a Head of Department of Institute Director fail to induce change, then the employer should revert to the scheme of service and invoke it, treating the non-complying member in the same way as someone who absents himself/herself from duty without permission.

8. ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

8.1   The assessment of publications submitted by academic members of staff at the University of Dar es Salaam is carried out on the assumption that the academic member of staff whose publication(s) is or are subject to assessment observed all the rules against academic dishonesty.

8.2   Where evidence that establishes a case for academic dishonesty on the part of the academic member of staff is tendered to the University of Dar es Salaam 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.

8.3   Proof of academic dishonesty shall render the publication(s) submitted invalid, regardless of whatever disciplinary measures were taken against the academic member of staff in question.

8.4   Acts of academic dishonesty include but are not limited to:

(a)   Plagiarism, or
(b)   The acquisition and use, without acknowledgement, of academic materials belonging to someone else.

8.5   The term "plagiarism" includes, but is not limited to, a deliberate or negligent use by paraphrase or direct quotation of the published or unpublished work of another person without full and clear acknowledgement.

APPENDIX A

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION OF ACADEMIC STAFF

NO.	Position	Qualifications
1.	Tutorial Assistant	First Degree at First or Upper Second Division with a GPA of 3.8 or above.
2.	Tutorial Assistant to Assistant Lecturer	Masters Degree with a B+ performance or GPA of 4.0 and above, potentially good academically.
3.	Assistant Lecturer /Assistant Librarian to Lecturer/Librarian	(a) Promotion from Assistant Lecturer/Assistant Librarian to Lecturer/Librarian requires possession of a PhD or MMed/MDent for Assistant Lecturers who are also clinicians.
4.	Lecturer/Librarian to Senior Lecturer/Senior Librarian	(a) Promotion from Lecturer/Librarian to Senior Lecturer/Senior Librarian requires a PhD, a minimum of three years since the last promotion, at least 3 points from publications and 2 points from teaching. (b) For academic staff who are clinicians, promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer requires possession of a PhD or MMed/MDent, a minimum of three years since the last promotion, at least 3 points from publications and 2 points from teaching.
5.	Senior Lecturer/ /Senior Librarian to Associate Professor/Associate Library Professor	Candidates should have: (a) A minimum of three years since last promotion (b) At least 6.0 points from publications since last promotion, of which 3.0 at least points should be from lead authored publications and two points from teaching. (c) Papers should be in international journals only.
6.	Associate Professor/Associate Library Professor to Professor/Library Professor	Candidates should have: (a) A minimum of three years since last promotion (b) At least 7.0 points from publications since last promotion, of which at least 3.0 points should be from lead authored publications and 2.0 points from teaching. (c) Papers should be in international journals only.

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC STAFF

1.   EVALUATION TEAM

1.1   Every College/School/Institute/Department/should form an evaluation team for evaluating publications, research, consultancy and other materials submitted by authors for the purpose of promotion.

1.2   An evaluation team shall comprise senior members of academic staff. Independent assessors outside the College/School/Institute/Department may be used where necessary. Colleges/Schools/Departments/Institutes that have insufficient number of senior staff should co-opt such staff from other units of similar disciplines to be members of their evaluation teams.

1.3   Staff on leave of absence without pay will not be reviewed.

2.   ASSESSMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

2.1   Guidelines for the assessment of academic staff performance should be followed.

2.2   In recommending promotions, criteria for the promotion of academic staff to corresponding positions as stipulated in Appendix A (this Appendix) should be followed.

2.3   Professors shall give Professorial Inaugural Lectures in their fields of specialisation within three years of promotion to that rank. A professor due to deliver his/her Professorial Inaugural Lecture shall select the topic in consultation with the relevant Principal/Dean/Director and submit the same to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research) for approval. A professor who fails to deliver the Professorial Inaugural lecture shall be dealt with in accordance with the relevant university policies

3.   ASSESSMENT OF PUBLICATIONS BY PRINCIPALS/ DEANS/DIRECTORS AND HEADS OF DEPARTMENT

Assessment of the performance of Principals, Deans, Directors and Heads of Department shall be done by the same evaluation teams that assess other members of staff in respective Colleges/Schools/Institutes. The University administration shall assist where the need for assistance from outside the respective unit arises.

APPENDIX B

PROCEDURES FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC STAFF PUBLICATIONS

The following procedures should be followed in assessing staff members' publications for the purpose of promotion:

1.   Submission of Publications

A member of staff seeking promotion may, at any time of the year, submit to the Head of Department his/her published works together with an updated CV. The following information should be given for every publication submitted:

(i)   Authorship (indicate all authors for co-authored works)

(ii)   Title

(iii)   Publisher and Place

(iv)   Year and month of publication (indicate whether before or after the last promotion, using a star for publications after the last promotion)

(v)   For a book, number of pages; for a journal article, page number, e.g. p. 12-21

(vi)   For works that are not yet 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 Further, evidence should be provided that such works will be published within before the end of the OPRAS year of appraisal.

(vii)   A declaration that all publications in the submission have complied with the University policies on academic dishonesty.

2.   Vetting of Media of Publication

(a)   The University Publication Committee (UPAC) in the Office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor - Research shall be responsible for vetting the media of publication for publications and any other materials submitted for promotion purposes.

(b)   The staff concerned shall submit the publications through the Research Management Information System (RMIS) to the Deputy Vice Chancellor Research for purposes of vetting the media of publication.

(c)   The Deputy Vice Chancellor Research shall cause the University Publication Committee (UPAC) to review the publications submitted in order to determine if they have been published in qualifying media, in accordance with the relevant University policies.

(d)   After the review, the UPAC shall prepare and submit a report to the Senate Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee indicating if each and every publication submitted meets the relevant criteria

(e)   The Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee shall review the report and make appropriate recommendations to the Senate for approval.

(f)　　After obtaining the Senate approval, the Deputy Vice Chancellor Research shall transmit the report to the Head of Department and the staff concern, through the relevant Principal/Dean/Director for further action.

3.　　Appointment of Assessors

The Head of Department should identify a suitable assessor and send to him/her, through the relevant Principal/Dean Director, the submitted publications, together with the CV of the candidate and the promotion criteria. Both the Head and the Principal/Dean/Director are required to ensure that the information in Section 1 above is complete before the publications are sent to the assessor(s).

(i)　　For promotion to the ranks of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer the assessment is done internally by an academician with a rank above that of the individual being assessed. The Assessor must be proposed by the Head of Department and approved by the Deputy Vice Chancellor- Academic.

(ii)　　For promotion to the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor the assessment is done both internally and externally by an academician of the rank of Associate Professor and Professor respectively. The external assessor should be an academic of any nationality, from a reputable higher education academic institution outside Tanzania and should not have a close working/social relationship with the candidate and must be approved by the Deputy Vice Chancellor - Academic.

The assessor(s) should be at least one rank higher than that of the person being reviewed who is actively publishing in the broad discipline of the academic member of staff whose publications are to be reviewed.

4　　Substantive Assessment of Publications

Assessors are required to submit the following information on each publication:

Assessment of the publication in relation to:
(i)　　Coverage of subject matter
(ii)　　Originality
(iii)　　Contribution to knowledge
(iv)　　Relevance to academic discipline
(v)　　Relevance to individual's own specialisation in an academic discipline
(vi)　　Presentation
(vii)　　Overall quality

For each aspect (i) to (vii) above, a grade should be given according to the grading system shown below. For the overall quality of the publication (vii) above, the grade should reflect the average of a (i) to a (vi) above.

A　　-　　Excellent
B+　　-　　Very Good
B　　-　　Good
C　　-　　Poor
D　　-　　Very Poor

5. Overall Assessment of the Author

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.

6. Assessment by the Department and College/School/Directorate

(a) The assessment report must be submitted to the Head of Department together with the assessors' name, academic qualification, title, address and signature.

(b) After receiving the assessor's report, the Head of Department should cause the Departmental Staff Review Committee, composed of the Head of Department and at least three members of staff of the rank of Senior Lecturer and above.

(c) A Department which does not have adequate number of staff with the requisite seniority or expertise may coopt qualified staff from other Departments within the University.

(d) The Departmental Staff Review Committee shall review the assessment report and make its own recommendations to the College/School/Institute Staff Review Committee. However, the Committee shall not have powers to increase or decrease the grade awarded.

(e) Where the assessment has been done by internal and external reviewers, and the grades awarded by the two differ, the grade awarded by the external reviewer should be adopted.

(f) Where the grades awarded by internal and external reviewers differ by more than two grades, another external reviewer should be used for arbitration.

(g) The Departmental Staff Review Committee should not consider and forward to the College/School/Institute Staff Review Committee any assessment reports that are incomplete.

(h) The Departmental Staff Review Committee should, on the basis of the assessment, weight every contribution according to the guidelines for assessment of academic staff performance.

(i) The College/School/Directorate Staff Review Committee shall review the report of the Department and make recommendation to the College Board, which in turn will make final recommendation to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic).

7 Final Assessment and Approval

(a) On receipt of the assessment report from the College/School/Institute, the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) shall go through the substantive review of the publications and make recommendation to the Senate for final approval

(b) If the assessment report is received after the OPRAS year of appraisal has ended, any works that were received for assessment on the basis of letters of acceptance for publication and which are still not published shall not be considered for promotion purposes.