



UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION

COMMISSION CIRCULAR NO. 11/2019

No. 20, Ward Place,
Colombo 07

November 08, 2019

Vice Chancellors of Universities
Rectors of Campuses
Directors of Institutes

AMENDMENTS TO THE SCHEMES OF RECRUITMENT/PROMOTION FOR THE POST OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR/PROFESSOR

1. Your reference is invited to the following Commission Circulars, Establishments Circular Letters and provisions of the Establishments Code of the UGC and HEIs:
 - (a) Schemes of Recruitment/Promotion for Associate Professor/Professor given in Commission Circular No. 916 of 30.09.2009 as amended by Establishments Circular Letter No. 04/2010 of 19.03.2010
 - (b) Commission Circular No. 926 of 08.07.2010 on UGC Nominees appointed to serve on Selection Boards.
 - (c) Commission Circular No. 04/2014 of 01.04.2014 on Schemes of Recruitment/Promotion for Associate Professor, Professor & Senior Professor.
 - (d) Paragraph 4 of the Commission Circular No. 06/2014 of 05.06.2014 on the Composition of Selection Committees for the post of Senior Professor and the post of Professor or Librarian in Institutes.
 - (e) Establishments Circular Letter No. 02/2011 of 14.02.2011 on the selection procedure for appointment to the post of Associate Professor/Professor.
 - (f) Paragraph 6 (2) of the Appendix III of the Establishments Code of the UGC and Higher Educational Institutions.
2. The Commission noted the following deficiencies, ambiguities and uncertainties in the Commission Circulars and Establishments Circular Letters on the Schemes of Recruitment/Promotion, Selection Procedure, and the role of the UGC nominees appointed to the Selection Committees, for the post of Associate Professor/Professor:
 - (a) Requesting the applicants to submit a self-assessment and making it available by some Higher Educational Institutions to the External Subject Experts/Members of the Panel and the Selection Committee hinder independent evaluation of the candidate's contributions.
 - (b) While recognizing the need for awarding marks to the citations of the works of the candidates by others, the spirit of awarding credit to citations is not stated in the Circulars. Thereby leading to uncertainties in awarding relevant points.

- (c) With the increasing menace of predatory publications and plagiarism, it has become necessary to ensure that such publications are not evaluated. Hence, a mechanism for filtering out, as far as possible, publications in predatory journals and plagiarism has to be introduced.
 - (d) Experience shows that the many External Subject Experts ignore, and even violate, the instructions of the Marking Scheme in awarding marks. As a result, a practice has developed among External Subject Experts to take the candidate's self-assessment as the guide for awarding marks.
 - (e) The role of the members of the Selection Committee is not precisely stated in the Circulars referred to above. Thus, in practice, the role of the Selection Committee members is reduced to that of endorsing the reports of the External Subject Experts and the Panel, even when they had deviated from the guidelines for method of evaluation as stipulated in the Circulars. This situation has worsened with the issuance of Establishments Circular Letter No. 02/2011 of 14.02.2011.
 - (f) Commission Circular No. 926 does not define the role of the Commission nominees who participate at such a Selection Committee.
 - (g) Participation of the referees of applicants in the evaluation and selection process and the appointment of the same person/s for both the Evaluation Panel and the Selection Committee have been noticed in some cases.
3. The Commission at its 1020th meeting held on 24.10.2019, having considered the issues that have arisen and the representations made by senior academics appointed as UGC nominees to Selection Committees, decided to rescind Establishments Circular Letters No. 04/2010 of 19.03.2010 and 02/2011 of 14.02.2011 and the Commission Circular No. 04/2014 of 01.04.2014, and make the amendments listed below in paragraph 4 to the Annex I of Commission Circular No. 916 of 30.09.2009, in order to rectify the above deficiencies that have been identified.
4. (A) **Substitute the following under the title "Post and Salary Code: Associate Professor (All Faculties)":**

Qualifications

Internal Applicants - (i) A Senior Lecturer (Grade I/II) in the relevant subject

And

- (ii) (a) a Ph.D./Doctoral degree in the relevant field or MD and Board Certification by the Postgraduate Institute of Medicine for Medical/Dental disciplines.

Or

- (b) Ten (10) publications in indexed journals and/or refereed/peer-reviewed journals; of which, a minimum of five (5) in indexed journals.

And

- (iii) At least the minimum marks laid down in the Marking Scheme for Associate Professorship.

External Applicants - (i) A person with the minimum academic qualifications required for the post of Senior Lecturer Grade II (by open advertisement) in the relevant field of study, given in post no. 4 or 6 of Commission Circular No. 721.

And

(ii) (a) a Ph.D./Doctoral degree in the relevant field or MD and Board Certification by the Postgraduate Institute of Medicine for Medical/Dental disciplines.

Or

(b) Ten (10) publications in indexed journals and/or refereed/peer-reviewed journals; of which, a minimum of five (5) in indexed journals.

And

(iii) At least the minimum marks laid down in the Marking Scheme for Associate Professorship.

Method of Application

An application for a merit promotion or recruitment should be accompanied by –

- (a) the Curriculum Vitae of the applicant.
- (b) a list of the applicant's contribution to:
 - (i) Teaching and Academic Development
 - (ii) Dissemination of Knowledge, and University and National Development under the titles and subtitles of Sections 1 and 3 of the Marking Scheme.
- (c) three copies of each research publication and scholarly work by the applicant pertaining to Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the Marking Scheme.
- (d) evidence for substantive citation of the applicant's work by others.
- (e) titles of three (03) outstanding research papers/publications by the applicant.
- (f) a list of Creative Works and Patents in the relevant field by the applicant, with evidence.

Note: The applicant shall not submit a self-evaluation.

- (g) a declaration that each publication claimed for appointment/promotion is
 - (i) free of plagiarism,
 - (ii) free of self-plagiarism,
 - (iii) not a salami publication,
 - (iv) free of duplication of content,
 - (v) not published in a predatory journal or by a predatory publisher, and
 - (vi) relevant to the field of study in which the appointment/promotion is sought.

- (h) for each co-authored publication, if any, a statement of the applicant on his/her share of the contribution to the work.

- (i) for each journal publication, evidence for the following:
 - (i) the journal is refereed.
 - (ii) the article has been published in the said journal.
 - (iii) the journal has been published at least two issues per year during the preceding three years.
 - (iv) the journal is non-predatory.

Note 1: Predatory publishing is an exploitative open access publishing business model that involves charging publication fees to authors without proper editorial and publishing procedures and scientific standards and merit associated with legitimate academic journals. Predatory publishing includes many open-access journals.

Note 2: Plagiarism refers to stealing the data, ideas, and text from published or unpublished work of another author/s and passing them off as one's own as well as presenting, as new and original, an idea or work derived from an existing source, without due acknowledgment.

Note 3: Self-plagiarism refers to the use of one's own previous work in another publication without declaring with citation that has been used previously by the author himself/herself. A republished text without reference to its earlier appearance, or incorporation in a new publication of the work already published by the same author without citing the source, are examples of self-plagiarism. Plagiarism may constitute infringement of the copyright laws.

Note 4: Salami publication is another form of self-plagiarism that comprises data fragmentation in multiple publications. It occurs when an author or authors break into parts different aspects of a study in order to publish them in more than one publication without declaring the re-use of material.

Note 5: Evidence for the material published are refereed/peer reviewed should include, for instance, (a) all the relevant correspondence between the journal's editor/s and the author/s, and, (b) copies of the initial, non-refereed versions of the relevant articles submitted to the journal.

These documents shall be sent to the Vice Chancellor by each applicant with a covering letter applying for the position/promotion, affirming their authenticity.

Method of Screening Applications

Screening Committee:

All valid applications for appointment/promotion shall be submitted to a Screening Committee.

The Screening Committee shall consist of one nominee of the Commission (out of the two nominees of the Commission for the Selection Committee) and one Senior Professor/Professor nominated by the Senate (out of the two nominees of the Senate for the Selection Committee), who are experts in the broad subject area of the professorship applied by the applicant(s), and the Dean of the relevant Faculty.

If the Dean is an applicant, the Senate shall appoint the same person who has already been appointed to the Selection Committee in place of the Dean.

The mandate and main tasks of the Screening Committee are:

- (a) to scrutinize the application(s) and check whether each applicant has listed his/her work/publications etc under the appropriate sections of the Marking Scheme.
- (b) to check whether each publication claimed for appointment/promotion
 - (i) is genuine and authentic,
 - (ii) is free of plagiarism,
 - (iii) is free of self-plagiarism,
 - (iv) is free of other form of fraudulent research or publication practice such as salami publication,
 - (v) is free of duplication of content,
 - (vi) is not published in a predatory journal or by a predatory publisher,
 - (vii) is in a reputed journal or by a reputed publisher,
 - (viii) has been properly and satisfactorily peer reviewed and subsequently revised according to suggestions by the reviewers.
 - (ix) is relevant to the field of study in which the appointment is sought.
- (c) to verify the applicant's contribution for each co-authored publication.
- (d) to check the following for each journal publication to ensure that:
 - (i) the journal is refereed,
 - (ii) the article has been published in the said journal,
 - (iii) the journal has been published at least two issues per year during the preceding three years,
 - (iv) the journal is non-predatory and,
 - (v) the applicant's claims are authentic.
- (e) to check the correctness of the information and to determine whether the Educational Activities and Dissemination of Knowledge & Contribution to University and National Development (***Sections 1, 3.2 and 3.3 of the Marking Scheme***) are listed under the appropriate sections of the Marking Scheme.

Meetings of the Screening Committee with each applicant shall be arranged by the Vice Chancellor to enable the Screening Committee to check and determine whether

- (i) the information given in the application(s) are listed under the appropriate sections/sub-sections of the Marking Scheme, and
- (ii) their correctness with regard to (a) to (e) above.

The Screening Committee shall prepare a report on the contents of each applicant's application and send it to the Vice Chancellor. If an applicant does not agree with any of the observations/comments made by the Screening Committee in its report, it shall be mentioned in the report of the Screening Committee with reasons.

Method of Evaluation

The Senate shall appoint two (02) External Subject Experts in the relevant field from outside the Higher Educational Institution concerned to evaluate the applicant's contributions to Research and Creative Work (**Sections 2 and 3.1 of the marking Scheme**). Both External Subject Experts shall be Senior Professors/Professors of a University in Sri Lanka or a recognized University abroad or an expert who has held professorial rank (excluding Associate/Assistant Professor rank) at a recognized University or a professional of equivalent outstanding eminence from outside the University System.

The External Subject Experts should not have been teachers/supervisors of the applicant at postgraduate level or referees of the applicant mentioned in the curriculum vitae. Nor shall they have been co-authors of papers or books with the applicant or previously at the university concerned in any capacity such as teacher or other staff member, or visiting staff.

The External Subject Experts should assess the research and creative work of the applicant based on the papers, and other documents submitted by the applicant and they should award independent marks based on the Marking Scheme. The External Subject Experts are required to comment on the quality, impact of the research on the discipline, profession, industry and the wider community based on the papers, publications, reports and other documents submitted by the applicant, with special reference to the three (3) outstanding papers as claimed by the applicant. The same Panel and External Subject Experts shall serve for all applicants whenever possible. At all stages of the evaluation, the experts shall strictly adhere to the guidelines provided in the Marking Scheme.

The Senate shall appoint a Panel of three (3) Senior Professors/Professors with specialty in the relevant field and the Dean of the relevant Faculty to evaluate the Educational Activities and Dissemination of Knowledge & Contribution to University and National Development (**Sections 1, 3.2 and 3.3 of the Marking Scheme**). Whenever possible this Panel should include at least one person from outside the Institution and one from within the Institution, but outside the Faculty. The Panel Members shall not have been referees of the applicant(s) mentioned in the curriculum vitae and the External Subject Experts shall not be appointed to the Panel. The Dean of the Faculty shall chair the Panel. However, if the Dean of a Faculty is the applicant, an additional Senior Professor/Professor shall be appointed to the Panel and a

suitable Chairman shall be elected in his/her place by the members of the Panel. Where the relevant Department Head is not an applicant and is not appointed to the Panel, he/she shall be an observer.

This Senate appointed Panel while allocating marks should submit a report to the Selection Committee on the applicant's teaching ability, service to the University, profession, industry, national development, community etc., and leadership qualities. The Panel shall request each applicant to make a presentation on a topic of current interest related to his/her discipline and chosen by the applicant to assess the teaching and overall communication abilities of the applicant.

The Vice-Chancellor shall announce the candidature of all applicants to the academic community of the University. The publications and other supporting documents of each applicant shall be made available through the relevant Dean for a period of 30 days and shall be open to written comments addressed to the Selection Committee through the Vice Chancellor from Senior Professors, Professors, Associate Professors and Heads of Departments of the relevant Faculty.

Where the selection and obtainment of the approval of the Governing Authority cannot be completed within the validity period of one and half years' limit, as mentioned in Commission Circular No. 846 of 14.07.2004 and Establishments Circular Letter No. 13/2008 of 18.12.2008, for advertised professorial posts, steps shall be taken immediately upon the expiry of the validity period to re-advertise the post. Assessments made under previous advertisements may be continued but the final selection cannot be made until all applicants, both past and new, have been assessed.

Processing of application(s):

- a) The Establishments Division of the University shall handle the processing of applications.
- b) The Vice Chancellor shall announce the candidature of all applicants to the academic community of the University. Publications and other supporting documents of each applicant shall be made accessible through the relevant Dean for a period of 30 days and shall be open to written comments from Senior Professors, Professors, Associate Professors and Heads of Departments of the relevant Faculty, addressed to the Selection Committee through the Vice-Chancellor.
- c) The Establishments Division of the University shall take action to process the application(s) by taking the following sequence of actions:
 - (i) Take appropriate action for the Senate to appoint two (02) External Subject Experts in the relevant field from outside the Higher Educational Institution concerned to evaluate the applicant's contributions to Research and Creative Work (**Sections 2 and 3.1 of the Marking Scheme**).

- (ii) Take appropriate action for the Senate to appoint three (3) Senior Professors/Professors with specialty in the relevant field to serve as members of a Panel to evaluate the Educational Activities and Dissemination of Knowledge & Contribution to University and National Development **(Sections 1, 3.2 and 3.3 of the Marking Scheme)**.
- (iii) Take appropriate action to request the Senate of the University to nominate two Senior Professors/Professors to the Selection Committee. Of whom, at least one shall be an expert in the broad subject area of the professorship applied by the applicant(s). Such two Senior Professors/Professors could be nominated by the Senate, either from among its members or from other universities coming under the purview of the Commission.
- (iv) Take appropriate action to get two nominees of the University Council, who were appointed to the Council by the Commission, to the Selection Committee.
- (v) Take appropriate action to get two nominees appointed by the Commission to the Selection Committee.
- (vi) Take appropriate action to send the detailed report submitted by the applicant with respect to Institutional Development **(Section 1.6 of the Marking Scheme)** to the Dean of the Faculty concerned for the observations and approval of the Faculty Board.
- (vii) Make arrangements for a meeting of the Screening Committee for it to carry out the mandate and prepare its report(s) on the content of the application(s).
- (viii) Take appropriate action to send the documents submitted by the applicant(s) along with the report(s) of the Screening Committee to the two External Subject Experts to assess the research and creative work of the applicant(s) based on the papers, and other documents submitted by each of them and allocate marks based on the Marking Scheme. **The External Subject Experts shall be specifically requested to take note of the report(s) of the Screening Committee when allocating marks.**
- (ix) Take appropriate action to convene a meeting of the Panel to evaluate the Educational Activities and Dissemination of Knowledge & Contribution to University and National Development **(Sections 1, 3.2 and 3.3 of the Marking Scheme)**. The list and the documents submitted by the applicant(s) along with the report(s) of the Screening Committee shall be sent to the members of the Panel. **The Panel members shall be specifically requested to take note of the report(s) of the Screening Committee when allocating marks.** The Panel should send their marks and comments to the Vice-Chancellor.

- (x) Take appropriate action to convene a meeting of the Selection Committee after the reports of the External Subject Experts and the Panel are received. All documents relating to the application(s), including the report(s) of the Screening Committee, the External Subject Experts and the Panel shall be made available to all members of the Selection Committee by the Vice-Chancellor of the University concerned at least **two weeks before** the Selection Committee meeting.

Method of Selection

applicants with the required qualifications shall be requested to appear before a Selection Committee.

Composition of the Selection Committee:

The Selection Committee in Universities shall consist of the following members:

- (a) The Principal Executive Officer, who shall be the Chairman
- (b) Two nominees appointed by the Commission. Of whom, at least one shall be an expert in the broad subject area of the professorship applied by the applicant(s).
- (c) Two nominees of the University Council, who are Commission appointed members of the Council.
- (d) The Dean of the relevant Faculty
- (e) The Head of the relevant Department
- (f) Two Senior Professors/Professors nominated by the Senate. Of whom, at least one shall be an expert in the broad subject area of the professorship applied by the applicant(s). Such two Senior Professors/Professors could be nominated by the Senate, either from among its members or from other universities coming under the purview of the Commission.

The Selection Committee in Institutes shall consist of the following members:

- (a) Vice Chancellor of the University to which the Institute is affiliated, who shall be the Chairman
- (b) Director of the Institute
- (c) Two nominees appointed by the Commission. Of whom, at least one shall be an expert in the broader subject area of the professorship applied by the applicant(s)
- (d) Two nominees of the University Council, who are Commission appointed members of the Council

- (e) The Dean of a relevant Faculty of the University to which the Institute is affiliated, nominated by the Senate
- (f) Two Senior Professors/Professors nominated by the Senate. Of whom, at least one shall be an expert in the broad subject area of the professorship applied by the applicant(s). Such two Senior Professors/Professors could be nominated by the Senate either, from among its members or from another university coming under the purview of the Commission.

Provided:

- Where the Head of the Department of Study concerned is himself/herself an applicant for the post, or where the Department of Study has no permanent Head, the Senate shall appoint from among its members a person with knowledge of the subject of study concerned in lieu of such Head of Department.
- Where the applicant is a Dean, such Dean shall withdraw from all relevant meetings of the Senate. The Senate shall appoint another suitable person to the Selection Committee in place of such Dean.
- Where the Director of an Institute is an applicant, such Director shall withdraw from all relevant meetings of the Senate. The Senate shall appoint another suitable person to the Selection Committee in place of such Director.
- Where the Vice-Chancellor is an applicant, such Vice Chancellor shall withdraw from all relevant meetings of the Senate and the Council and these bodies shall decide on matters under their purview under a *pro tem* chairman appointed for the relevant meeting. A Chairman of the Selection Committee from outside the Institution concerned shall be nominated by the Commission in addition to the two nominees of the Commission.

Other than ex-officio members, the Selection Committee members should not be referees of the applicant mentioned in the curriculum vitae. Also, the External Subject Experts and Panel members shall not be appointed to the Selection Committee.

The powers, functions and responsibilities of the UGC nominees at the Selection Committee:

The mandate and main task of the UGC nominees is to ensure that the procedures specified in the relevant Commission Circulars and the Marking Scheme are properly, diligently, fairly and without bias or prejudice adhered to by the Panel members, External Subject Experts and the Selection Committee. The Commission shall inform in writing its nominees to the Selection Committee of their mandate, powers, and responsibilities, drawing their attention to the relevant sections of the Commission Circulars.

All documents relating to the application(s), including all the publications, shall be made available to the UGC nominees by the Vice-Chancellor of the University concerned at least two weeks before the Selection Committee meeting.

After the Selection Committee meeting, the two Commission nominees shall, either jointly or separately, send their observations to the Council through the Vice-Chancellor with copies to the Commission.

The powers, functions and responsibilities of the Selection Committee:

- (a) Every applicant shall appear before the Selection Committee and make a presentation on his/her main area of research or creative work. Audio visual, multimedia facilities etc. may be provided for the presentation. This may be followed by a discussion with the Selection Committee. The Selection Committee shall arrive at a score on a scale of 10 for an applicant's presentation skills, and quality of content of the presentation.
- (b) The Selection Committee shall examine all the relevant documents (application(s), Reports of the Screening Committee, the External Subject Experts and the Panel) relating to the evaluation process of the application(s) submitted by the applicant(s), and see whether the External Subject Experts and the Panel have properly followed the Marking Scheme and have not violated any of its provisions, by demonstrating bias, prejudice or non-adherence to the provisions of the Marking Scheme. The members of the Screening Committee (who are also members of the Selection Committee) shall assist the Selection Committee in this exercise.
- (c) The Selection Committee has authority to adjust the marks awarded by the External Subject Experts and the Panel, if the External Subject Experts or the Panel have not properly followed the marking scheme or violated any of its provisions, by demonstrating bias, prejudice or non-adherence to the provisions of the Marking Scheme. Such adjustment of Marks should be explained and communicated to the Council in an annexure to the recommendation of the Selection Committee.
- (d) The Selection Committee has authority to adjust the marks awarded for a publication by the External Subject Expert(s) under the following circumstance(s):
 - (i) There are doubts about the genuineness and authenticity of the publication submitted.
 - (ii) The publication is not in a reputed journal/not published by a reputed publisher but the External Subject Expert(s) has (have) considered it as a publication in a reputed journal/by a reputed publisher in awarding marks.
 - (iii) The publication is by a predatory publisher which the External Subject Expert(s) has (have) not taken note of.

- (iv) The publication has not been properly and satisfactorily peer-reviewed, but the External Subject Expert(s) has (have) taken it as properly peer-reviewed.
 - (v) The publication is not of relevance to the field of study of the applicant, but the External Subject Expert(s) has (have) awarded marks as if it is in the relevant field.
 - (vi) There is evidence of plagiarism including self-plagiarism, which the External Subject Expert(s) is (are) not aware of or have ignored.
 - (vii) There is any other form of fraudulent research or publication practice such as salami publication which has not been taken into account by the External Subject Expert(s).
- (e) The Screening Committee's views shall be given due consideration by the Selection Committee in adjusting marks for any of the reasons given in (c) and (d) above.
- (f) After adjusting the marks awarded by the External Subject Experts and the Panel (if the necessity arises for reasons listed in (c) and (d) above), the total marks obtained by each applicant for Sections 1, 2, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, and the marks obtained by each applicant for Section 2.1.1 for which there is a requirement of minimum marks, should be computed.

For Sections 2 and 3.1, the total marks awarded by the two External Subject Experts to each applicant should be calculated separately using the marks adjusted by the Selection Committee.

For Section 2.1.1, for which there is a requirement of minimum marks, the marks awarded by the two External Subject Experts to each applicant for this section should be calculated separately using the marks adjusted by the Selection Committee.

- (g) The overall marks obtained by an applicant for Sections 2 and 3.1 (taken together) shall be the average of the (adjusted or non-adjusted, as the case may be) total marks given by the two External Subject Experts for these Sections (taken together) provided that such (adjusted or non-adjusted, as the case may be) total marks do **not** deviate by more than twenty percent from the average of the two (adjusted or non-adjusted, as the case may be) total marks for these Sections (taken together).

The overall marks obtained by an applicant for Section 2.1.1, for which there is a requirement of minimum marks, shall be the average of the (adjusted or non-adjusted, as the case may be) total marks given by the two External Subject Experts for this section, provided that such (adjusted or non-adjusted, as the case may be) total marks awarded by the two External Subject Experts do **not** deviate by more than twenty percent from the average of the (adjusted or non-adjusted, as the case may be) total marks for this Section.

- (h) An applicant qualifies for appointment/ merit promotion if he/she obtains,
- (i) the required minimum marks for each section of evaluation (Sections 1, 2 and 3),
 - (ii) the minimum twelve (12) marks required for Section 2.1.1 of the Marking Scheme, and
 - (iii) the required minimum overall total marks for the relevant appointment/ merit promotion,
- as specified in Section 4 of the Marking Scheme.
- (i) If the (adjusted or non-adjusted, as the case may be) marks awarded by the two External Subject Experts deviate from the average for any of Sections 2 and 3.1 and/or for Section 2.1.1 by more than twenty percent, then the Selection Committee shall request the Chairman of the Selection Committee (the Vice-Chancellor) to arrange a discussion (in person or electronic) between the two External Subject Experts with a view to reach consensus on the marks awarded by them for the Sections concerned, and subject to adjustments made by the Selection Committee.
- (j) If the External Subject Experts reach agreement on the marks for the components of Sections 2 and 3.1 and the revised marks (subject to adjustment) for any of Sections 2 and 3.1 and/or for Section 2.1.1 do not differ by more than twenty percent, the applicant shall qualify for appointment/merit promotion if he/she satisfies all three conditions stipulated in (h) above.
- (k) If the two External Subject Experts fail to reach consensus, the Selection Committee shall request the Senate to nominate a third External Subject Expert. The third External Subject Expert should be notified why the material is referred to the third External Subject Expert and asked to exercise considered and objective judgment strictly in accordance with the Marking Scheme.
- (l) When the third External Subject Expert's assessment is obtained, the Selection Committee shall meet again to consider the marks awarded by the third External Subject Expert and make adjustments to the marks awarded by the third External Subject Expert if the necessity arises for reasons listed in (c) and (d) above.

Of the three sets of (adjusted or non-adjusted, as the case may be) marks available, the average of the two (adjusted or non-adjusted as the case may be) marks that has the least difference should be taken as the marks for Sections 2 and 3.1 and for Section 2.1.1.

The applicant qualifies for appointment/merit promotion if he/she satisfies the three conditions stipulated in (h) above.

- (m) Appointment on merit promotion may be made on '**personal-to-the-holder**' basis. However, such condition need not be mentioned in the Letter of Appointment, as it refers to utilization of combined cadre and reversion back to the recruitment cadre for the posts of Lecturer (Probationary)/Lecturer (Unconfirmed)/Senior Lecturer Gr. II/Senior Lecturer Gr. I upon retirement or any other mode of cessation of employment of the appointee.

- (n) For advertised (cadre) positions, if more than one applicant qualifies for appointment satisfying the conditions listed in (h) above, final selection shall be made by the Selection Committee from among those qualified for appointment, based on
- (i) the total marks determined by the Selection Committee for Sections 1,2 and 3 of the Marking Scheme for the qualified contestants and
 - (ii) the marks awarded by the Selection Committee for the presentations made by them,
- with 90% weight for the total marks obtained from the Marking Scheme (**90 being assigned to the applicant with the highest overall total marks and the other applicants' marks being scaled accordingly**) and 10% for the assessment of presentation skills by the Selection Committee.
- (o) An applicant whose application for merit promotion is rejected by the Selection Committee could apply again for merit promotion only after the expiry of two (2) years from the date of his/her earlier application.

(B) Substitute the following under the title “Post and Salary Code: Professor (All Faculties)”:

Qualifications

1) Application for Promotion (Internal)

- (i) A Senior Lecturer (Grade I/II)/Associate Professor in the relevant subject

And

- (ii) (a) a Ph.D./Doctoral degree in the relevant field or MD and Board Certification by the Postgraduate Institute of Medicine for Medical/Dental disciplines.

Or

- (b) Fifteen (15) publications in indexed journals and/or refereed/peer-reviewed journals; of which, a minimum of eight (8) in indexed journals.

And

- (iii) At least the minimum marks laid down in the Marking Scheme for Professor (Merit).

2) Applications for Advertised Posts (Internal and External)

- (i) A person with the minimum academic qualifications required for the post of Senior Lecturer Grade II (by open advertisement) in the relevant field of study, given in post no. 4 or 6 of Commission Circular No. 721.

And

- (ii) Fifteen (15) years experience after obtaining the qualifications for Lecturer (Probationary) post as laid down in Commission Circular No. 721.

And

- (iii) (a) a Ph.D./Doctoral degree in the relevant field or MD and Board Certification by the Postgraduate Institute of Medicine for Medical/Dental disciplines.

Or

- (b) Fifteen (15) publications in indexed journals and/or refereed/peer-reviewed journals; of which, a minimum of eight (8) in indexed journals.

And

- (iv) At least the minimum marks laid down in the Marking Scheme for Professor (Cadre/Advertised).

Method of Application

An application for a merit promotion or recruitment should be accompanied by –

- (a) the Curriculum Vitae of the applicant.
- (b) a list of the applicant's contribution to:
 - (i) Teaching and Academic Development
 - (ii) Dissemination of Knowledge, and University and National Development under the titles and subtitles of Sections 1 and 3 of the Marking Scheme.
- (c) three copies of each research publication and scholarly work by the applicant pertaining to Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the Marking Scheme.
- (d) evidence for substantive citation of the applicant's work by others.

- (e) titles of five (05) outstanding research papers/publications by the applicant.
- (f) a list of Creative Works and Patents in the relevant field by the applicant, with evidence.

Note: The applicant shall not submit a self-evaluation.

- (g) a declaration that each publication claimed for appointment/promotion is
 - (i) free of plagiarism,
 - (ii) free of self-plagiarism,
 - (iii) not a salami publication,
 - (iv) free of duplication of content,
 - (v) not published in a predatory journal or by a predatory publisher, and
 - (vi) relevant to the field of study in which the appointment/promotion is sought.
- (h) for each co-authored publication, if any, a statement of the applicant on his/her share of the contribution to the work.
- (i) for each journal publication, evidence for the following:
 - (i) the journal is refereed.
 - (ii) the article has been published in the said journal.
 - (iii) the journal has been published at least two issues per year during the preceding three years.
 - (iv) the journal is non-predatory.

Note 1: Predatory publishing is an exploitative open access publishing business model that involves charging publication fees to authors without proper editorial and publishing procedures and scientific standards and merit associated with legitimate academic journals. Predatory publishing includes many open-access journals.

Note 2: Plagiarism refers to stealing the data, ideas, and text from published or unpublished work of another author/s and passing them off as one's own as well as presenting, as new and original, an idea or work derived from an existing source, without due acknowledgment.

Note 3: Self-plagiarism refers to the use of one's own previous work in another publication without declaring with citation that has been used previously by the author himself/herself. A republished text without reference to its earlier appearance, or incorporation in a new publication of the work already published by the same author without citing the source, are examples of self-plagiarism. Plagiarism may constitute infringement of the copyright laws.

Note 4: Salami publication is another form of self-plagiarism that comprises data fragmentation in multiple publications. It occurs when an author or authors break into parts different aspects of a study in order to publish them in more than one publication without declaring the re-use of material.

Note 5: Evidence for the material published are refereed/peer reviewed should include, for instance, (a) all the relevant correspondence between the journal's editor/s and the author/s, and, (b) copies of the initial, non-refereed versions of the relevant articles submitted to the journal.

These documents shall be sent to the Vice Chancellor by each applicant with a covering letter applying for the position/promotion, affirming their authenticity.

Method of Screening Application(s)

Exactly as specified for the post of Associate Professor.

Method of Evaluation

Exactly the same as for Associate Professor except that the External Subject Experts will have 5 papers instead of 3 to address as defined in subsection (e) under Method of Application.

Processing of Application(s):

Exactly as specified for the post of Associate Professor.

Method of Selection

Exactly as specified for the post of Associate Professor, except that the required threshold marks are different as given in the table at the end under Section 4.

(C) Replace the “Section 1.6 – Institutional Development” of the Marking Scheme by the following:

A detailed report prepared by the applicant regarding his/her share of the contribution under the following sub-headings should be approved by the relevant Faculty Board and submitted for evaluation by the Panel:

- (i) Planning, organizing & structuring of courses to make them attractive and useful
- (ii) Innovations in content, delivery, teaching & assessment
- (iii) Creative use of new technology in teaching
- (iv) Exposure of students to society, community & industry
- (v) Evidence of incorporating students' feedback
- (vi) Evidence of improvements made in response to peer evaluation and student feedback
- (vii) Development of course material, prepared and made accessible in print/audio-visual mode

(D) Add the following under Note 1 of Section 2.0 of the Marking Scheme:

Co-authored articles:

For co-authored articles by two contributors, up to a maximum of 75% of the Marks entitled for the paper shall be awarded to the applicant, subject to the extent of contribution by the applicant. See Note below under Multiple authorship.

Multiple authorship:

- (i) In the case of multiple authorship of articles, if the applicant is the first /principal/correspondent author, he/she may claim, with evidence, up to 75% of the marks awarded to that paper.
- (ii) If the applicant is one of the other authors, he/she may claim, with evidence, up to 30% of the total Marks awarded for the article concerned based on the contribution of the applicant.

(E) Replace Note 1 under Section 2.1.1 of the Making Scheme by the following:

Note 1: Indexed journals:

Indexed journals for the purpose of Section 2.1 are as listed under one of the following categories:

- (i) Science Citation Index Expanded (™) (Web of Science) (Clarivate Analytics)
- (ii) www.scopus.com (Elsevier publishers)
- (iii) www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/m/pubmed (PubMed, MEDLINE)
- (iv) Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI) (Clarivate Analytics)
- (v) Social Sciences Citation Index® (Web of Science) (Clarivate Analytics)
- (vi) Arts and Humanities Citation Index® (Web of Science) (Clarivate Analytics)
- (vii) Library and Information Science Abstracts (LISA)
- (viii) Library, Information Science and Technology Abstracts (LISTA)
- (ix) Education Resource Information Centre (ERIC)
- (x) Engineering Index

(F) Replace the Note 2 under Section 2.1.1 of the Marking Scheme by the following:

Note 2: Publications in Refereed non-indexed journals/Faculty level journals (other than university/institutional/Faculty level journals):

Applicants are required to complete a questionnaire for each non-indexed journal in which he/she has published and give evidence for the following:

- (i) the journal is refereed;
- (ii) the article has been published in the said journal;
- (iii) the journal has been published at least two issues per year during the preceding three years;
- (iv) the journal is non-predatory.

Note: Predatory publishing is an exploitative open access publishing business model that involves charging publication fees to authors without proper editorial and publishing procedures associated with legitimate academic journals. Predatory publishing includes many open-access journals.

(G) Add the following Notes (Notes 3, and 4) under Section 2.1.1 of the Marking Scheme:

Note 3: Publications in Non-refereed journals:

No Marks shall be awarded for publications in non-refereed journals

Note 4: Publications in Online journals:

- (i) Applicant must produce evidence that
 - (a) the journal is refereed
 - (b) the journal has a record of continuity for at least two years for journals published by academic/research institutions and at least five years for journals published by any other publishers.
- (ii) When allocating Marks, evaluators are expected to exercise considered judgment on the quality of the article in all aspects and evidence of the peer review process of each article. Evidence for the material published are refereed/peer-reviewed should include, for instance, (a) all the relevant correspondence between the journal's editor/s and the author/s, and, (b) copies of the initial, non-refereed versions of the relevant articles submitted to the journal.

An applicant should produce evidence of citation of the online article in higher ranking journals as further evidence of quality.

(H) Add the following Note under Section 2.1.2 of the Marking Scheme:

Note: The same paper/abstract shall not be considered under more than one of the above three categories.

(I) Add the following Notes under Section 2.1.3 of the Marking Scheme:

Note 1: Marks shall be awarded for **substantive citations** only. No Marks shall be awarded for **self-citations, nominal citations** in literature review, footnotes/ endnotes, and similar instances, and citations in the work of students and co-authors.

The applicant should provide evidence for substantive citation of his/her work by others.

Note 2: **Substantive citation** refers to citation of the work of an applicant subjecting it to discussion or critique, referring to data, analysis, models, formula, conclusion etc.

Note 3: **Nominal citation** refers to reference to the work of an applicant without subjecting it to discussion.

(J) Add the following Notes under Section 2.2.1 of the Marking Scheme:

Note 1: Reputed non-predatory international/local Publishers:

Applicants should provide evidence that each book has been published by a reputed non-predatory international/local publisher.

The applicant should provide evidence relating to the publication process of refereeing, revising after refereeing, copy editing and indexing.

Note 2: Other Publishers (publishers not covered by Note 1)

For these publishers applicant should provide evidence on:

- (a) the availability of the work at book sellers or from the publishers
- (b) the number of copies of the book printed
- (c) the ISBN number of the book
- (d) the number of titles published by the publisher and their standard
- (e) The credentials of the publisher with evidence of other academic publications by the publisher and the duration of existence of the publisher

Note 3: Evaluators should exercise caution in allocating Marks for each work taking into account the quality and standard of the content as well as reputation of the publisher.

5. Accordingly, the amended Annex I of the Commission Circular No. 916 is given as **Annex I to this Circular**.
6. Please note that the Establishments Circular Letters No. 04/2010 of 19.03.2010 and 02/2011 of 14.02.2011, and Commission Circular No. 04/2014 of 01.04.2014 are hereby rescinded without prejudice to any action taken so far based on those Circulars/Circular Letters.
7. Further, the Paragraph 6 (2) of the Appendix III of the Establishments Code of the UGC and Higher Educational Institutions and Paragraph 4 of Commission Circular No. 06/2014 of 05.06.2014 are amended without prejudice to the actions taken so far based on such Circular provisions.
8. The provisions of this Circular will be effective from 11.11.2019.
9. Please take action accordingly and bring this to the notice of the academic staff concerned.



Professor Mohan de Silva
Chairman

Copies:

1. Secretary/ Ministry of City Planning, Water Supply and Higher Education
2. Chairman's Office/UGC
3. Vice-Chairman/UGC
4. Members of the UGC
5. Secretary/ UGC
6. Registrars of Universities
7. Deans of Faculties
8. Accountant/UGC
9. Bursars of Universities
10. Librarians/SAL/AL of the Higher Educational Institutions/ Institutes
11. Deputy Registrars/ Snr. Asst. Registrars/ Asst. Registrars of Campuses/Institutes
12. Deputy Bursars/ Snr. Asst. Bursars/Asst. Bursars of Campuses/Institutes
13. Internal Auditor/UGC
14. Govt. Audit Superintendents of Universities
15. Deputy Int. Auditors/ Snr. Asst. Int. Auditors/Asst. Int. Auditors of HEIs
16. Secretaries of Trade Unions
17. Auditor-General

UGC/HR/2/3/106(XI)