

Common Reasons for Returning Academic Promotion Applications

To expedite the processing of academic promotion applications and to avoid delays caused by recurring remarks, the Secretariat of the Scientific Council at Qassim University has prepared this list highlighting the main reasons for returning promotion applications. We kindly request all stakeholders to review this list to ensure quality and efficiency in processing applications.

Responsible Party	Type of Error	Examples / Issues
Faculty Member	Promotion Duration	Submitting the application before completing the minimum time-in-rank requirement.
	Research	Exceeding the number of units allocated to each category of scholarly output (e.g., review articles, case reports, conference publications, etc.).
		First affiliation not listed as Qassim University.
		Incorrect affiliation format.
		A publication dated prior to the previous promotion decision.
		Duplicate research included.
		Unofficial acceptance letters.
		Conditional acceptance letters.
		Research published in unrecognized conferences.
		Exceeding the specified number of units in a single publishing outlet.
		Research links provided are incorrect or non-functional.
		Submitting new research not listed in the form and the scientific committee report.
		Accidentally uploading the same paper in place of another intended paper.
Academic Department	Files and Attachments	Failure to send research output to the Scientific Council.
	Promotion Form	Incomplete data on activities and training courses.
		Failure to complete all required data.
	Signatures	Failure to sign the plagiarism declaration.
		Failure of the department chair to sign the form/report.
	Applicant's Specialization	Discrepancy in the general or specific specialization between the application form, the scientific committee report, and the minutes of the department and college Councils.
College	Data	Discrepancy in the general or specific specialization compared to the previous appointment/promotion decision.
		Incorrect dates included in the minutes.
	Signatures	Failure to include the average teaching load.
		Failure of the dean to sign the form.
	Meeting Minutes	Inconsistency between the minutes of the department and college councils.
Departmental Scientific Committee	Compliance with Circulars	The reference number and date of the University President's approval of the College Council minutes are not included.
	Data	Failure of the college representative to sign the form.
		Incorrect verification codes for publication outlets.
	Research	Order of publications inconsistent with what is listed in the form.
		Acceptance of research not in compliance with the Scientific Council's regulations.
	Attachments	Failure to use the updated version of the report.
		Required number of reviewers not complete.
		Email addresses are incorrect or not official (non-institutional).
	Reviewers	Absence of phone numbers.
		Conflict of interest (e.g., collaboration between reviewer and applicant, reviewer is from the same university the applicant graduated from).
		More than one reviewer from the same department.
		Lack of geographical diversity among reviewers.
		Selecting reviewers from countries with political or financial instability.
		Repetition of the same reviewers across multiple promotion files.
		Reviewers' specializations do not match the applicant's specialization.
		Reviewer is employed by a company (non-academic).