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Introduction

The purpose of this “Faculty Handbook” is to describe the roles, expectations and obligations of faculty, and standards of performance.

In addition to describing the academic responsibilities of faculty, this handbook explains the procedures and criteria utilized in annual reviews, contract renewals and promotions, procedures for addressing violations, filing grievances for faculty, and policies on external activities related to research, teaching, and potential conflicts of interest. Equally important, this handbook is a guide to identify ways for faculty development, support and recognition of outstanding performance.

At Koç University, ‘Faculty’ members may generally be in one of the following categories:

1) Academic & Research Faculty (Professoriate) are appointed typically as a result of Faculty Searches described in Appendix A.9., and their appointments and promotions are presented to the University Executive Council and ultimately approved by the Board of Trustees. Such Faculty are responsible for both research and teaching and are typically appointed for 3-year (Assistant Professors) or 5-year terms (Associate Professors and Full Professors), renewable based on the evaluation of the research scholarship productivity.

2) Full-time Instructors or Lecturers, whose appointments are proposed by the Dean/Director and approved by the President, typically serve for 1-year or 2-year terms, which are extended upon recommendation of the Dean/Director, based on the teaching needs, as approved by the President.

3) Full-time Researchers, whose appointments are proposed by the Dean(s) or by the Office of Vice President for Research and Development (VPRD) and approved by the President, typically serve for 1-year, 2-year, or 3-year terms, which are extended upon recommendation of the Dean, based on the research needs of the university or individual Professoriate in the relevant College(s) or research centers. The title of Research Assistant Professor can be given to qualified researchers upon recommendation of the Dean, based on the research needs of the university or the Professoriate in the relevant College(s) or research centers, presented to the Executive Council, and approved by the President. The titles of Research Associate Professor and Research Professor can also be given in exceptional cases.

4) Part-time instructors or Lecturers, whose appointments are proposed by the Dean(s) and approved by the President, typically serve for durations less than a full year, and can be re-hired upon recommendation of the Dean, based on the teaching needs in the relevant Department(s) as approved by the President.

In the following, the term ‘Faculty’ is used in default to refer to the Professoriate, with the applicability of the particular discussion to Instructors, Lecturers and other categories explicitly stated when needed.
Other faculty categories specifically used in School of Medicine, such as Clinical Faculty, and the procedures related to evaluation and contract renewal of these faculty members are covered in School of Medicine Faculty Handbook.
I. Academic Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty

Academic responsibilities of faculty generally consist of teaching, scholarly research and service. Depending on the nature of the appointment as indicated in the individual contract, faculty may be exempted from the research or teaching responsibilities. Service and/or additional teaching is typically a substitute for research obligation for instructors as indicated by their contractual agreement with the University and as deemed appropriate by the appropriate Deans and the President. Professoriate who hold administrative positions may be partially exempted from their responsibilities as deemed appropriate by the appropriate Deans and the President. All full time faculty have the responsibility of rendering a work load of a minimum of 40 hours per week. The annual vacation time of a faculty member is a maximum of one month. All vacations are subject to prior approval by the Deans or the President.

It goes without saying that the standards of academic performance expected from faculty members can differ from one institution to another depending on the mission of the institution. At its founding, the Board of Trustees of Koç University promulgated very explicitly that the mission of Koç University was to develop a “Center of Excellence” for teaching and research by widely accepted international norms. Consistent with this aspiration, the Vehbi Koç Foundation has been asked to commit to the University the financial resources required to accomplish its mission. In view of this vision, the mission of Koç University is to become a premier ‘research university’ in the country, region and the world, along the lines of the ‘research university’ concept, initially articulated and established by Wilhelm von Humbolt during the founding of the University of Berlin in 1810.

Koç University aims to undertake a multiplicity of endeavors in company with a singularity of purpose. Seeking excellence requires application of demanding standards of performance in two of the foremost activities of the University: teaching and research scholarship. Koç University expects its faculty members to excel in both of these mutually complementary academic endeavors. Annual performance evaluations take into account the annual teaching and research records on an almost equal basis. In contrast, renewal and promotion decisions are based on cumulative performance and quality of demonstrated research scholarship carries a higher weight than teaching.

I. 1. Teaching

In order to fulfill its educational mission, Koç University depends on its faculty members who are dedicated to excellence in teaching. Teaching includes advising and mentorship in addition to classroom instruction. Seeking excellence in teaching requires setting the right standards, acceptance and ownership of the educational values by teachers and students, effective performance monitoring and continuous improvement of teaching strategies. Faculty members are expected to strive continuously to improve their teaching effectiveness at all levels.

Teaching has a myriad of components in addition to class instruction as described below:
**Instruction:** Faculty are assigned to teach classes by the appropriate Dean. The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) endorses the totality of the course assignments for the university. Faculty in the Colleges/Schools and Departments, as well as the Deans are responsible for ensuring that the content of their classes is appropriate to each course, as officially described in the catalogue, and achieves the coverage indicated by that description.

Faculty are responsible for confining classroom discussion to subjects related to the topics of concern in the particular course. Faculty are responsible for maintaining an environment appropriate to academic endeavor in the classroom and respect the dignity of the students as individuals.

Faculty are responsible for holding their classes at the times/places scheduled by the Registrar. Changes to announced class times and places are authorized only by the Registrar upon the request by the appropriate Dean. Members of the faculty should not contact the Registrar directly.

Each faculty member has the responsibility to make a detailed course syllabus available to students before the registration period. The syllabus is expected to contain information on the course content, resources such as textbook and readers’ criteria for evaluation of performance, make-up policy and academic integrity.

Faculty members are expected to hold the classes as scheduled. In case, faculty members need to cancel or reschedule a class due to an excuse, they should notify their Deans in advance and make the necessary arrangements to teach the required contact hours for each course.

**Teaching responsibilities:** The teaching obligation of research faculty (i.e., Professoriate) consists of four courses of three credits each in the academic year. In a regular semester, a three-credit course meets three contact hours (total of 150 minutes of scheduled instruction) per week for the 14 weeks of a semester.

The teaching obligation of faculty members who do not have research responsibility (i.e., Instructors or Lecturers) typically consists of ten courses of three credits each in a year, typically 4 courses in Fall and Spring semesters and 2 courses in the summer. These normal loads may be increased or decreased by the recommendation of the Dean and approval of the President.

In programs where the workload includes other activities, then the workload can be set in terms of total hours in the contract. In the School of Nursing, 6 hours/week Clinical Practice in the undergraduate program is considered as a three-credit regular course.

In the English Language Center, over the course of the academic year, an instructor’s teaching load will be no more than twenty classroom teaching hours per week and five hours per week of student contact time, which may consist of student conferences or tutorials, exam preparation and proctoring, as well as other ELC-related instructional activities.
Faculty and Course Evaluation Policy and Procedures: Faculty/Course evaluation of the effectiveness of teaching by students serves two related, but distinctly separate objectives. The first relates directly to the individual efforts of the faculty member to teach effectively and provides feedback to the faculty member to allow him/her to improve his/her teaching. The second objective pertains to administrative decisions regarding annual evaluations. Course evaluation form is provided in Appendix A.1.

Grading, Examination and Grade Reporting: Faculty announces grading and make-up policies at the beginning of classes for each course. The grading system in use at the University is described in the current regulations available online. Each faculty member is expected to select appropriate times for periodic examinations that are necessary or desirable during the course of the semester. Exceptions to the general rules are possible, but in the orderly manner described below:

- If examinations are to be given at times other than the regular class period, these times must be published in the course syllabus distributed to the students during the first week of classes.
- Whenever extreme circumstances make deviation from the announced schedule necessary, students must be notified well in advance.

Faculty members report grades on official on-line report sheets at times announced by the Registrar and a hard copy is presented to the Dean/Director. A faculty member who cannot meet the deadline, must notify his/her Dean and file “Incomplete” grades with the authorization of the Dean. The “Incomplete” grade has to be replaced with a letter grade by the deadline announced in the Academic Calendar.

Final exams may only be cancelled with the approval of the relevant Dean. The method of assessment that replaces the final exam must be determined in consultation with the Dean.

Final exam date and hour cannot be changed without the approval of the Faculty Executive Council; these exams cannot be given before the last day of classes. The Registrar should not be contacted by faculty members to select final examination slots. All requests should be channeled via the Office of the Dean.

Each faculty member is responsible for administering the examination of his/her course. Under extenuating circumstances such as illness or the need to be out of town as authorized by the Dean/Director, faculty members may ask for help from another faculty member; however, the responsibility of administering the exam should never be left to a teaching or administrative assistant.

Meeting the deadlines for entering course grades so the grade reports can be issued on a timely basis, is considered an essential duty for all faculty members.

Assigned grades can be changed upon noticing an error. The students are allowed to see their exam papers and may request a re-evaluation of their paper within one week of being informed of their grade. Similarly, within one week of the assignment of the semester grade, a student may request a re-evaluation of the semester grade. Beyond these deadlines, neither the faculty member, nor the student may request a
grade change under normal circumstances. An exception is a clear-cut calculation error that can be corrected without the deadline restriction. ELC students may request a re-evaluation of their final grades within three days after the announcement of the final grade in order to complete the re-evaluation before the following KUEPE exam.

**Office Hours:** Faculty members are expected to keep regularly scheduled office (or laboratory) hours each week during which time students may confer with them. The number of hours scheduled should reflect the teaching load and class enrolment of the faculty member; typically, for a 3-unit Lecture course with 10+ students, 6 hours of availability distributed throughout the week are recommended and expected. The scheduling of Office Hours should be flexible enough to provide reasonable access to students who may have class conflicts and should also be reasonably distributed through the week. For example, office hours during most common class periods may disadvantage those students who attend other classes during that hour.

In the ELC program, instructors are expected to keep 5 scheduled office hours per week.

**Academic Advising:** Advising is an integral part of the teaching responsibilities of faculty members. Faculty members are responsible for knowing academic rules and regulations; University and college requirements and procedures, which apply to their advisees, as well as with the service and support departments of the University so as to be able to refer students to these services. Advisers should schedule additional advising time during registration to help their advisees to complete their registration successfully.

**Attendance at Commencement:** All professoriate faculty members are expected to be present and take part in the Academic Commencement, unless specifically excused by their Dean. The wearing of appropriate academic regalia is required at such functions.

**I. 2. Scholarly Research Activities**

Faculty members in research track positions (Professoriate) have the responsibility to engage in and to produce scholarly research work that is published in internationally reputable research journals and books. The expected standards for and the evaluation of this work is discussed in detail in the following sections.

**I. 3. University Service**

Faculty members have the responsibility to work in committees assigned by the appropriate Dean, VPAA, VPRD or the President. The University does make a special effort to exempt its especially junior faculty members from intensive service assignments such as committee work, but often such service may nevertheless be required in order to trigger interdisciplinary connectivity, to enrich the experience/understanding of the breadth of the university activities by the faculty members and to benefit from particular/unique expertise of the faculty members.
II. Annual Evaluation for Faculty Members
The objective of the annual evaluation process is to assess performance of the full-time faculty members in terms of their contributions and achievements in research and scholarly work, teaching, and service both to the University and society at large. An equally important objective of the process is to provide advice/guidance for to the faculty members for their long-term professional development.

Evaluations of part-time instructors and lecturers are conducted upon completion of their teaching assignment by their Deans/Directors. A favorable evaluation is not necessarily a basis for continuation of employment. Such individuals may be re-hired upon recommendation of the Dean, based on the teaching needs in the relevant Department(s), and by the approval of the President.

II.1. Overall Procedure for Annual Performance Evaluations
This section describes the overall procedure and timetable for annual evaluation of full-time faculty members, applicable to both research faculty (Professoriate) and Full-time Instructors and Lecturers.

Dean/Director sends a letter about two weeks before the first day of the academic year to faculty members asking them to fill out the web-based Annual Activities Form. This letter from the Dean also contains information explaining the basis for evaluations. An example of a letter and the template for the evaluation form are presented respectively in Appendices A.2.1 and A.3.

ELC Instructors use the ELC Self-Evaluation form given in Appendix A.3.1.

The Annual Activities Form covers the period (September 1 through August 31) of the preceding academic year; however, faculty members are strongly encouraged to update the form during the year as relevant information becomes available. This form also contains a section where faculty member presents a self-evaluation for his/her performance in the preceding academic year, and his/her projects for the current academic year.

The procedure is carried out along the following steps:

- Faculty member fills out the web-based form and submits it by September 1. Dean/Director communicates with the faculty member regarding his/her evaluation by the second week of November. This evaluation is a tool for recognition of achievements, and, equally importantly, a tool for professional development as it allows the identification of areas and ways of improvement that faculty member could focus on.
- The evaluation of the Dean/Director is accompanied by a letter specifying a deadline until the third week of November by which the faculty member may respond if he/she has a difference of opinion. The faculty member whose opinion differs from the one expressed by the Dean/Director can also ask for a meeting and may present his/her differences both verbally and in writing. The Dean/Director may also request a one to one meeting, at his/her discretion, in order to discuss the performance, ways of improving the performance, recognition and rewards.
Dean/Director presents his/her final evaluation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) within the first week of December.

VPAA submits his/her recommendation, including the evaluation of the Dean/Director and his/her own comments, to the President by the end of December.

President makes the final decision, if deemed necessary, in consultation with the Dean/Director, by the second week of January, and the faculty member is notified in writing of the final performance evaluation.

Dean/Director can call upon the faculty member at his/her discretion at any time to discuss the final performance evaluation; the faculty member can also request a meeting for such a discussion.

The above described timeline can be summarized as follows:

- September 1: Faculty member submits the annual report;
- Second week of November: Dean/Director presents his/her evaluation to the faculty member;
- Third week of November: Faculty member presents his/her views to Dean/Director;
- First week of December: Dean/Director presents his/her finalized evaluation to VPAA;
- Fourth week of December: VPAA submits his/her recommendation to President;
- Second week of January: President finalizes the evaluation decisions.

The annual evaluation of full-time faculty in different tracks (Academic & Research Faculty (Professoriate), Full-time Instructors or Lecturers and Full-time Researchers) varies depending on the expectations of the university from faculty members who are in different tracks.

The annual evaluation of the Academic and Research Faculty (Professoriate) is based on teaching effectiveness, research, scholarly activity, and university and professional service.

The annual evaluation of Full-time Instructors is based on teaching effectiveness and university and professional service. Full-time Instructors and Lecturers are not required to fill in the part of the Annual Evaluation form related to research activities. If the contracts of Full-time Instructors and Lecturers also include research, they must fill in the parts of the Annual Evaluation form related to research activities and their annual evaluation also incorporates research performance with an appropriate weight corresponding to their research activities during the year.

The annual evaluation of Full-time Researchers is based on research and scholarly activity, and university and professional service. Full-time Researchers are not required to fill in the part of the Annual Evaluation form related to research activities. If the contracts of Full-time Researchers also include teaching, they must fill in the parts of the Annual Evaluation form related to teaching activities and their annual evaluation also incorporates teaching effectiveness with an appropriate weight corresponding to their teaching responsibility during the year.
The annual evaluation of faculty results in one of the following qualitative descriptors: “Outstanding,” “Exceeds (Above) Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” “Below Expectations,” “Unsatisfactory.”

The qualitative descriptor “Meets Expectations” should be interpreted as the performance that meets expectations of that faculty member in a given academic year. The expectations from Professoriate faculty are conducting research that leads high-impact publications, successful teaching and service.

Normally, faculty members on the first year of their appointment and faculty members who are on paid or unpaid leave are not evaluated, and receive a performance indicated by a “No Evaluation” descriptor, but their salary adjustment is based on a “Meets Expectations” assessment.

Faculty members who are on sabbatical leave can be evaluated based on the research performance only upon the recommendation of his/her Dean.

Faculty members with contracts less than three years are only evaluated at the end of their contract term for renewal. Their annual salary adjustments are also based on the “Meets Expectations” standing while their performance is indicated by the descriptor “No Evaluation.”

II.2. Policies and Guidance for Annual Performance Evaluation of Academic & Research Track Faculty (Professoriate)

This section describes the policies and guidance for annual performance evaluation for Academic & Research faculty members, i.e., the Professoriate.

In line with Koç University’s mission, the overall annual performance evaluation of the Academic & Research faculty member (Professoriate) is based on an average of his/her teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly activity, and university and professional service. The relative weight of each evaluation category reflects the expectations of the university from faculty members who are in different stages of their academic careers. The academic area of the faculty member, his/her academic seniority, his/her teaching and research progress over the years, and service responsibilities provide a basis for the evaluation decisions. For example, in the evaluation of junior faculty members with minimal service responsibilities, “Outstanding” is reserved for those who have excelled in both research and teaching during that year by receiving an “Outstanding” in one category and “Exceeds Expectations” or “Outstanding” in the other category. Similarly, to receive “Exceeds Expectations” the necessary condition is to have “Exceed Expectations and above” marks in one category and “Meets Expectations and above” marks in the other category. These considerations are summarized for all categories in the performance matrix given in Appendix 6a.

Koç University has a defined mission of excellence in teaching, research, and service to the university and society. Standards of performance expected from faculty members have to be consistent with the mission of the university, and these standards are expected to advance as the University progresses towards accomplishing its mission of becoming a globally recognized Center of Excellence in teaching and research.
The following presents the framework for annual evaluations that is basically valid for all forms of evaluations and promotions. There is no quantitative formula suggested or used for such evaluations. Clear understanding of the terms of reference is expected to eliminate miscommunications and unproductive judgmental discussions.

**Meaning of the annual evaluation report:** The evaluation assesses the academic achievements of an individual within the report period. The annual evaluation report refrains from assessing the overall scholarly value of an individual. Consequently, even the greatest scholar can have a deficient year, and vice versa. The rationale for this limitation is to encourage continued productivity. The scholarly establishments of a faculty member are established over a time frame longer than a year. The cumulative establishments and standing of a faculty member are assessed at the time of the initial contract offer, subsequent contract renewals and promotions. At the same time, the expectations of annual productivity from a junior and senior faculty member may be different.

**Scope of the evaluation report:** The evaluation report accounts for finalized work, i.e., measures output within the report period. Finalized work in research consists of published and accepted work in written and presentation format. In teaching, finalized work consists of courses taught, advising provided, teaching material produced, such as lecture notes and textbooks, and student evaluations received. These definitions naturally exclude submitted work, preparations and work in progress.

The rationale for evaluating only the output consists of the following arguments.

- The impact of scholarly activity only comes from finalized work;
- Ongoing work is an unreliable indicator of achievement due to the uncertainties in leading to successfully finalized work;
- The evaluation of ongoing work may provide misleading feedback to the faculty;
- Evaluating ongoing work leads to multiple accounting of accomplishment over the years;
- Ongoing work is eventually evaluated in the long term as it gets finalized;
- Evaluation of input (i.e., effort, intention, etc.) gives administrators uncontrolled authority for subjective judgment.

A natural consequence of evaluation of the output is the inability to report on the ongoing efforts and good intentions. Possible frustration should and can be avoided by noting that academic work goes through an investment period before leading to productivity. The investments that are sound eventually lead to finalized work in the long term. The opposite is also true in the sense of receiving high evaluations due to work that is finalized with efforts that were unrewarded in the past.

**II.2.1. Evaluation of Research Work**

Different considerations guide the weights associated with finalized work of different nature.
Impact of Scholarly Research

'Impact' is the criterion that determines the relative importance of the scholarly work. Hence, in general, (i) printed material has a higher value due to its larger and more lasting impact than conference presentations; (ii) In a majority of disciplines, journal articles are given a higher value over other types of printed material. Not all journals carry the same importance. Leading journals typically are more competitive to publish in and have wider readership and influence on the literature. Consistent with Koç University mission to be a Center of Excellence, publications in leading journals carry greater importance. In fields where faculty members are expected to publish their scholarly work in the form of a book, books published by leading book publishers and university presses carry greater importance.

Achievements of primary value

(i) **Journal articles and citations.** The inclusion of a journal into the AHCI, SCI, SSCI and its impact factor are considered as primary criteria of importance for achievement. This category overall carries the highest weight due to its larger impact. Citation is a significant indicator of quality and appreciation of the research work by peers. However, as the level of citations varies from field to field, such differences are recognized in the evaluations. The global averages for publication rates and weight normalized citation scores in different fields are available in various databases (see Appendix A4 for available databases in the Library). Faculty members are expected to publish in high impact journals of their fields. A publication in a leading journal of a field is considered more important than higher number of articles published in journals with lower impact. Collaborative work is encouraged; however, the independent research contributions of the faculty member should be evident and documentable.

(ii) **Significant achievements of rare occurrence.**

*The publication of a book* of a scholarly nature by a prominent publisher leads to a large impact. Editing a book has a lesser weight than authoring one.

*Recognitions* such as a prize or an award, selections to an important board or committee, receiving unusual citations for work spanning a long term lead to a large impact.

*Promotions* (such as from Assistant to Associate Professor) are also seen in this category. These achievements are the result of long term efforts and happen only a few times during the career of a scholar. Consequently, a large weight is given to such achievements. The recognition of accomplishments of this nature is important for faculty to engage in important long-term projects.

In addition, book chapters, conference proceedings both invited and refereed as well as invitations for plenary and keynote addresses may have primary value, particularly in some areas. For example, the acceptance rates of talks in certain conferences can be higher that the acceptance rates for articles in journals in specific fields. Some of these papers become seminal works used as seminar materials for graduate courses and reference papers for basic research. The review of the
originality, editor and publisher reputation, and the stature of other contributors and affiliations may serve as guidance.

Other than these exceptions, refereed book chapters, and conference proceedings, plenary and keynote addresses, conference presentations, and research funding, described in the next section, are considered as other achievements that are of lower impact.

Other Achievements
The classification below, with the exceptions mentioned above, covers the impact of the majority of such contributions.

(i) **Refereed Book Chapters and Conference Proceedings.** The value and impact of these scholarly works exhibit great variability. Stature of the editor and the publisher usually certifies the quality of the contribution. An additional consideration for this ordering is that a select subset of the work of this nature do eventually make it to journals with a greater impact. Conference abstracts are not included in this category of work.

(ii) **Plenary and Keynote Addresses.** These contributions are important achievements, but their impact is not as lasting as printed material. If such addresses lead to printed articles, they may carry a higher value than usual conference proceeding articles. Usually, these kinds of achievements follow extensive publications of high impact in a field.

(iii) **Conference Presentations.** This category has a wide spectrum in value, based on the nature and competitiveness of the conference, its impact as measured sometimes by being refereed or not, invited and contributed, acceptance statistics and the nature of the presentation. The rationale of attribution of a secondary value in general is that the good work eventually does make it to journals and hence does receive the due credit.

(iv) **Research Funding.** Faculty members are supported to acquire research funding through the Research, Project Development and Technology Transfer Directorate. Research funding is necessary to attract and mentor graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, to develop and maintain research infrastructure and to sustain scholarly activities. Research funding also reflects the recognition of the individual’s research by external peers. Amount of funding may vary from field to field. Amount of research funding received is not considered as a criterion used for promotions.

(v) **Patents.** Scientific research may lead to intellectual property in the form of patents. Patents embodying innovative scientific research receive recognition in annual evaluations. However, they should not be viewed as direct substitutes for achievements of primary value such as publishing in leading journals, that form the basis of evaluations for promotions and contract renewals.

II.2.2. Evaluation of Teaching Performance
Good teaching is a necessary requirement. However, even great teaching is not a substitute for the absence or deficiency of research in annual evaluations, contract renewals and promotions.
The syllabi, student evaluations, attendance level to classes taught, student oral communications and the review of the teaching dossiers constitute the bases of the teaching evaluation. Student academic advising is also included in this category. Assessment of performance in this area is one of the most difficult and the value of the student evaluations has its margins of reliability. A multitude of reasons such as class size, area versus required, elective and core courses, as well as the intrinsic nature of the topical content introduce a wide range in the student evaluations in well taught or less well taught courses. Nevertheless, sensitivity to the student comments, asking advice of colleagues or even requesting observance in their classes and sincere self-assessment are possible ways for improvement in teaching. Koç University Center for Learning & Teaching (KOLT) also provides substantial resources and help for faculty members to self-assess and to improve their teaching.

Participation in student activities, serving as adviser to student clubs, etc., are important in facilitating personal development of the students and in contributing to the broadly defined educational mission of the University. Similarly, leadership in curricula or program development, sharing of teaching experiences, etc., are considered very important contributions to the University.

II.2.3. University Service
Concerns about the appraisal of university service provided by faculty in research track (i.e., Professoriate) are legitimate as this category receives a smaller weight compared to research and teaching categories. Service contributions count; however, they cannot be a substitute for great teaching and research productivity for faculty in research track. As the matrix in Appendix 6a depicts, service determines how unequal evaluations in research and teaching are combined in overall evaluation. For example, an “Above Expectations” research performance and a “Meets Expectations” teaching performance can be combined as “Above Expectations” for a faculty member as a result of a successful service performance.

The university administration makes a special effort to not distract junior faculty from their primary functions of providing superior education and delivering excellent scholarly work. However, all faculty members are expected to contribute a form of service, appropriate to their rank and seniority, by being responsive to the needs of the students, the Colleges, the University, and the Society at large.

II.3. Policies and Guidance for Annual Performance Evaluation of Full-time Instructors and Lecturers
The annual evaluation of Full-time Instructors and Lecturers is based on teaching effectiveness and university and professional service. Great service is not a substitute for teaching performance that does not meet expectations in annual evaluations.

II.3.1. Evaluation of Teaching Performance
The expectations from Academic & Research faculty (i.e., Professoriate) in teaching as stated in Section II.2.2 apply to the evaluation of teaching performance of Full-time Instructors and Lecturers.

The syllabi, student evaluations, attendance level to classes taught, student oral communications and the review of the teaching dossiers constitute the basis of the
teaching evaluation. Assessment of performance in this area is one of the hardest and the value of the student evaluations has its margins of reliability. A multitude of reasons such as class size, area versus elective and core courses, the nature of the topics introduces a wide range in the student evaluations in well taught or less well taught courses. However, sensitivity to the student comments, asking advice of colleagues or even requesting observance in their classes and sincere self-assessment are possible ways for improvement in teaching. Koç University Center for Learning & Teaching (KOLT) also provides substantial resources and help for faculty members to self-assess and to improve their teaching.

Participation in student activities, serving as adviser to student clubs, etc., are important in facilitating personal development of the students and in contributing to the broadly defined educational mission of the University. Similarly, leadership in curricula or program development, sharing of teaching experiences, etc., are considered very important contributions to the University.

II.3.2 University Service
Full-time instructors are expected to play a role to improve teaching and learning in all programs, and also contribute to the College and to the University in different projects, committees, and tasks assigned by their Deans/Directors. University service plays an important role in the annual evaluation of Full-time Instructors and Lecturers.

The performance matrix for Full-time Instructors and Lecturers are summarized for all categories in the performance matrix given in Appendix 6b.

The annual evaluation of Full-time Researchers is based on research and scholarly activity, and university and professional service. If the contracts of Full-time Researchers also include teaching, their annual evaluation also incorporates teaching effectiveness with an appropriate weight corresponding to their teaching responsibility during the year.

The policies that set the research expectations for Academic & Research Faculty given in Section II.2.1 apply directly to the research expectations from Full-time Researchers.

Service expectations from Full-Time Researchers is limited. Similar to all faculty members, Full-Time Researchers are expected to contribute a form of service, appropriate to their position. Great service cannot be a substitute for great research productivity for full-time researchers.

The performance matrix for Full-time Researchers are summarized for all categories in the performance matrix given in Appendix 6c.
III. Contract Renewal Procedures for Full-time Faculty Members

III.1 Contract Renewal Procedures for Full-time Academic & Research Faculty Members (Professoriate)

At Koç University, Assistant Professors have employment contracts for up to three year terms and Associate and (full) Professors for up to five year terms. These contracts may be renewed according to the procedures and principles described in the following sections. In highly unusual cases, the Board of Trustees may appoint a faculty member who has contributed in exceptional ways to the realization of the mission of the University for an unlimited duration.

Procedure and Timeline

Dean/Director sends a letter prior to the first week of the academic year to faculty members whose contract is to expire by the end of the academic year, requesting relevant evaluation documents, normally consisting of:

- An updated cv,
- A cumulative version of the annual activities reports,
- Reprints or preprints of articles and books, and
- Teaching and research statement

The material submitted by the faculty should cover the current contract period. An example of a letter is presented in Appendices A.2.2.

Research statement should summarize previous research activities and achievements and discuss research plans and agenda for the coming years.

Teaching statement should summarize the personal views of the faculty member on teaching and teaching approaches used by him/her.

In addition, Deans can ask faculty members to submit a teaching dossier that contains relevant material such as lecture notes, readers, syllabi, sample exams, essays and term projects for courses taught within the current contract period.

Faculty members whose contract is due to end on August 31st of the following year, are expected to submit the above documents, including any additional materials they may judge as complementary, to the Dean's Office by a suitable date around September 1. In the context of the submission of their dossier, faculty members may confidentially request the exclusion of specific senior faculty members from participation in their evaluation process.

Dean/Director can appoint a jury consisting of two or three faculty members (of equal or higher rank) and shares with them the material submitted by the faculty member, requesting the highest possible confidentiality in handling of such material. The members of the jury remain anonymous and their reports are confidential in order to ensure objectivity. The reports of the jury members are not shared with the President, Vice Presidents, and the Board of Trustees and are only used by the Dean/Director in order to form his/her opinion. The jury members may be from other institutions when
needed. The jury members work individually and submit their personal reports to the Dean/Director by September 15.

Dean/Director formulates his/her recommendation in a written report by using his/her own evaluation and the jury reports as needed.

Each individual contract renewal case is subsequently discussed and evaluated extensively at a face-to-face meeting of the relevant Dean/Director with the President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA), and the Vice President for Research and Development (VPRD). Prior to the meeting, the material submitted by the faculty member and the evaluation of the Dean/Director are shared with the President, VPAA and VPRD.

If an unanimous positive decision is reached at the meeting to renew the contract for a specified period of time, the recommendation of the President to renew the contract is presented to the Board of Trustees together with the report of the Dean/Director and the CV of the faculty member.

In cases where an unanimous positive decision cannot be reached at the meeting, President requests Vice Presidents and the Dean/Director to separately submit to him/her their individual written evaluations and recommendations. President subsequently makes a final evaluation based on the material submitted by the faculty member and in consideration of all the reports. The recommendation is then presented to the Board of Trustees for their approval, together with the reports of Vice Presidents, Dean/Director and the CV of the faculty member.

Faculty member is informed about the contract renewal decision at least 6 months prior to the end of his/her contract.

Contract Renewal Procedure timelines can be summarized as follows:

- By September 1: Faculty member submits the renewal material.
- First week of September: Dean/Director forms a Jury.
- By September 15: Jury members present their individual evaluations to the Dean/Director.
- By October 15: The President, VPAA, VPRD, and the Dean/Director meet to discuss and evaluate the contract renewal case.

President then presents the contract renewal recommendations to the Board of Trustees for approval at their next scheduled meeting.

In case of a renewal decision, Dean/Director provides written feedback to the Faculty member summarizing the discussions with the President and Vice Presidents regarding the current performance and expectations for the next contract period.

**Guidance for Contract Renewal Evaluation**

The guidelines used for recommendations and decisions for contract renewals are essentially the same as those for annual evaluations as described in Section II.4. In effect, the contract renewal evaluation is the cumulative output of the annual evaluations. There exists, however, two significant differences in philosophy about
the nature of the annual evaluations and contract renewal evaluations. While annual evaluations pertain to the activities of the report period, renewal evaluations pertain to the assessment of the individual, his/her contribution to the mission of the University and his/her promise for high quality future contributions to the University.

The quality and impact of research scholarship becomes more prominent in the renewal decisions. Although it is possible for a faculty member to receive “Meets Expectations” performance with a research performance that is below expectations complemented with teaching and service performances that are above expectations, the fact that research performance is evaluated below expectations over several years is likely to not lead to a favorable evaluation in the contract renewal process. Furthermore, faculty members are expected to rigorously improve Koç University standards, and sustainment of a “Meets Expectations” research performance over several years may not automatically lead to a favorable evaluation in the contract renewal process.

Equally, the renewal evaluation looks ahead and assesses the overall value and potential of the faculty member for growth, and is thus not confined merely to the accomplishments during the contract period. A special consideration is given to the estimation of the probability of subsequent promotion of Assistant and Associate professors at the end of the contract period, if renewal is to be recommended. In this respect, faculty members must prepare and pursue their plans to receive their Doçent title from the Inter-University Council. Having the Doçent title is taken as a positive point during the renewal evaluation of the candidate.

Not submitting the document for the contract renewal process to the respective Dean in time is considered as a decision on the part of the Faculty Member to not submit to an evaluation and to therefore not seek continued employment by the university after the end of his/her current contract term.

III.2 Contract Extension Procedures for Full-time Instructors, Lecturers, and Researchers

The Full-time Instructors, Lecturers, and Researchers typically serve for 1-year, 2-year, or 3-year terms. These terms can be extended based on the needs of the University. As the University continues its development, its needs also change in time. Therefore, outstanding performance does not guarantee extension of the contract of a full-time Instructor, Lecturer, or Researcher.

The contract extension evaluation for Full-Time Instructors, Lecturers, and Researcher is the evaluation of the cumulative output of the annual evaluations. No additional document is needed from the Full-time Instructor, Lecturer, or Researcher for this evaluation.

At least 6-months prior to the end of the contract of a faculty member, Dean/Director prepares a report that evaluates both the need for extending the contract and also the cumulative performance of the faculty member.

Each individual contract extension case is discussed and evaluated extensively at a face-to-face meeting of the relevant Dean/Director with the President, the VPAA, and
the VPRD. Prior to the meeting, the evaluation of the Dean/Director is shared with the President, VPAA and VPRD.

President subsequently makes a final evaluation based on the cumulative annual report, in consideration of the evaluation of the Dean/Director, and the discussion with the Dean/Director and Vice Presidents.

Faculty member is informed about the contract renewal decision at least 6 months prior to the end of his/her contract.

IV. Promotions for Full-time Academic & Research Faculty: Assistant and Associate Professors

The promotions of Academic & Research Faculty, or the Professoriate are based on scholarly work and teaching. The guidelines used for annual evaluations and those for contract renewals still prevail. In effect, the evaluation for promotions is the cumulative output of the annual and renewal evaluations. There exists, however, an important difference in philosophy about the nature of the promotions with the annual and contract renewal evaluations. While quality is sought at the preceding levels, international recognition as a scholar is a mandatory component for promotions. For the rank of Associate Professor, the applicant must demonstrate an individual research agenda that has also led to significant output as recognized by international peers. This research agenda must establish the ability of the applicant to conduct scholarly work independently as well. For promotions to the rank of Professor, the applicant must show maturity and expertise in a broad enough field accompanied by international recognition. As opposed to the annual evaluation, which assesses the achievements of the faculty member within the report period, the evaluation for promotion judges the scholarship of the individual.

The promotion process for Assistant Professors to the rank of Associate Professor is expected to be initiated before the end of the second contract as an Assistant Professor. Considering the time to receive external letters, the promotion process should start typically 6 months before the 6th year of their appointment as an Assistant Professor (for contract terms that start on September 1, the process should start in February of the previous year).

Associate Professors are also expected to initiate the promotion process to the rank of Professor before the second contract renewal evaluation as an Associate Professor, typically 6 months before the start of their 9th year as their appointment as Associate Professor.

IV. 1. Procedure

A faculty member applies in writing to the Dean/Director when he/she feels ready for consideration for promotion to a higher rank. Dean/Director can also initiate the motion and may notify the faculty member whom he/she thinks has demonstrated scholarship that deserves consideration for promotion to a higher rank. The following are the requirements to be fulfilled before a promotion can be considered.

For promotions to the rank of Associate Professor, obtaining the habilitation (Doçentlik) from the Inter-University Council is a necessity for those eligible for this examination. It is very important that faculty members must prepare and pursue their
plans to receive their Doçent title from the Inter-University Council as soon as possible.

Inter-University Council application procedure for Associate Professorship is available on the VPAA web site. The initiation of this process requires receiving the diploma equivalency. The documents needed to obtain diploma equivalency are given in Appendix A.7. Faculty members can start diploma equivalency process at any time. Since this process takes a long time, faculty members are advised to initiate the process as soon as possible.

When the Dean/Director supports the candidacy of a faculty member for promotion, the faculty member submits the following along with an official letter to be considered for promotion:

- Updated CV,
- Cumulative summary of the annual activities reports,
- Reprints or preprints of articles and books,
- Research and teaching statements
- A teaching dossier
- The names of ten to twelve respected external reviewers who can evaluate his/her academic work.

The research statement should summarize previous research activities and achievements and discuss research plans and agenda for the coming years.

The teaching statement should summarize the personal views of the faculty member on teaching and teaching approaches used by him/her.

The teaching dossier contains relevant material such as lecture notes, readers, syllabi, sample exams, essays and term projects for courses taught within the current contract period. The material submitted by the faculty covers the current contract period.

The outside reviewers are expected to be internationally accomplished scholars who are normally not the PhD advisers or close collaborators of the applicant. The Dean may write to such individuals for additional information to assist in forming his/her decision.

The Dean/Director finalizes a list of external reviewers which may include the names given by the applicant as well as new names of prominent scholars in the field of the applicant. A typical list of external reviewers includes 12 reviewers: six reviewers from the list submitted by the applicant and another six reviewers added by the Dean/Director who may consult other relevant faculty members across the university in formulating his/her as needed. The Dean/Director may in some cases also request additional reports from three Koç University faculty members of a rank higher to that of the applicant.

The recommendation of the Dean/Director to initiate the promotion process and the list of reviewers are first discussed at a promotion-initiation-review meeting of the President, the two Vice Presidents, and the Dean/Director.
When a positive decision is reached to initiate the promotion process, for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the University Executive Council may be asked for a recommendation to the President regarding initiation of the promotion process and the approval of list of reviewers. In some cases, the promotion process and the request for letters of reference may be initiated without requesting such counsel from the University Executive Council. When a positive decision is reached at the meeting of the Dean with the Vice Presidents and the President for promotion to the rank of Professor, the case is brought to the University Executive Council which must officially vote to approve the initiation of the promotion process and the list of reviewers.

The Dean/Director writes a solicitation letter to the finalized external reviewers requesting their opinion on the suitability for the promotion in hand. A sample letter is attached in Appendix A.5. Along with the letter, Dean/Director sends to the reviewers the CV and representative articles of the applicant. Typically, Dean/Director should allow sufficient time for the response of the external reviewers, in order to allow them ample time to carefully make their assessments.

Subsequent to his/her reception of the external letters, the Dean/Director forms his/her own assessment based on the expert opinions of the external reviewers. The Dean/Director presents his/her personal recommendation for or against promotion to the President and the two Vice Presidents in a written report.

The letters and the report of the Dean/Director are subsequently discussed at a meeting of the President, the two Vice Presidents, and the Dean/Director. If sufficient number of letters are not received and/or if a unanimous recommendation for promotion is not evident, the case is not presented to the University Executive Council. Otherwise, the case is taken to the University Executive Council.

For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the Executive Council makes a recommendation to the President regarding promotion. For promotion to the rank of Professor, the Executive Council must officially vote to approve the promotion.

The promotion decision is then subsequently presented to the Board of Trustees for their final approval.

A faculty member is authorized to use his/her new title immediately after the approval by the Board of Trustees.

The contracts of Assistant and Associate Professors who are promoted respectively to the higher rank are renewed for a five-year period starting on the first September 1 following the Board of Trustees decision.

In cases where the application of a faculty member for consideration for promotion is not supported by the Dean/Director, the faculty member may request his/her case to be nevertheless considered at a meeting of the President, the two Vice Presidents, and the Dean/Director.
V. Academic Grievance Procedure

Academic Grievance of Koç University procedure aims to help academic staff and students find solutions to complaints on academic matters.

V.1. Student Grievances

Students are expected to initiate the grievance process within two weeks of an action or decision by an academic staff that in the opinion of the student negatively affects his/her academic performance or career.

Students are expected to first discuss the issue directly with the related academic staff. If that discussion proves to be ineffective, a petition to the administrative Dean of the faculty member can be written within a week of initial discussion with the related faculty member, specifying the incident, the suggested solution and the response of the faculty member. The Dean may choose to discuss the incident with the student and the related faculty member(s) one by one or as a group. Any decision should be shared in written form with both parties within four weeks after receiving the petition.

The student has also the right to object to the decision of the Dean within one week by bringing the matter to the attention of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Vice President is expected to make a decision and communicate it in written format within four weeks after receiving the objection.

In case the related faculty member is also the Dean of the student, the student can write a petition directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs after his/her initial discussion with the Dean.

Objections to Exam Grades

- Student can object to written examination grades within one week of announcement.
- The objection should be made to the related administrative Dean of the faculty member teaching the course.
- The process starts by the re-evaluation of the examination paper by different faculty members appointed by the Dean.
- The exam grade can be revised as a result of the re-evaluation. The new exam grade gets communicated by the Dean to the faculty member teaching the course.
- The letter grade from the exam, as well as the overall course letter grade of the student, is decided by the faculty member teaching the course by taking into account other grades, grading scale, and the distribution of grades within the class.
- The new letter grade is then communicated by the faculty member to the Dean, who then informs the student.

Letter grades can only be revised by the faculty member who has taught the course.

Students receiving the same score from the same exam should be evaluated based on the same grading scale. A consistent grading scale should be applied to all students within the same section.
V.2. Faculty Member Grievances
A faculty member who feels disfavored by the administration, or who believes he/she has been adversely affected by decisions on academic programs should immediately write a petition to the related Dean or Director.

If the complaint is about the Office of the Dean or Director, the petition should be directed to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. If the complaint is about the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs or the Office of the Vice President for Research and Development, then the petition should be directed to the President.

The petition should explain the incident and the case in detail, should provide evidence when possible and all related documents in support of the petition should be shared. The petition should also describe any prior attempts made towards solving the issue, if there is any.

The Office receiving the petition is expected to produce a written report to both parties within thirty days.

The faculty member may object to the decision by bringing the matter to a higher Office. The decision of the President is deemed final.
VI. Policy on External Activities Related to Research and Teaching: Conflict of Commitment and Interest at Koç University

In a modern research university operating in an increasingly complex society, conflicts of commitment and interest are common and practically unavoidable. Therefore, these topics deserve a separate chapter in the faculty handbook.

It is the policy of Koç University that faculty members, in addition to its officers, staff and others acting on its behalf, have the obligation to avoid ethical, legal, financial, or other conflicts of interest and to ensure that their activities and interests do not conflict with their obligations to the institution or jeopardize its welfare. Koç University faculty owe their primary professional allegiance to the University, and their primary commitment of time and intellectual energies should be directed towards the education, research and scholarship programs of the institution. Therefore, it is the intention of this policy to increase the awareness of faculty, staff and students to the potential for conflicts of interest and commitment and to establish procedures whereby such conflicts may be avoided or properly managed.

In order to ensure effective administration and adherence to this policy, faculty members and academic research staff are urged to read the document in its entirety, in order to fully understand the spirit of this policy, and must annually submit a brief statement acknowledging in writing their knowledge of the policy and disclosing their outside activities and interests, including financial interests, that might give rise to conflicts.

For the sake of clarification and elimination of misunderstandings in the future, the definitions of conflicts of commitment and interest as perceived by the University and its administration are as follows:

**Conflict of Commitment:** Conflicts of commitment usually involve issues of time allocation. Attempts of faculty to balance University responsibilities with external activities - such as consulting, public service or pro bono work - can result in conflicts regarding allocation of time and energies. Whenever an individual's outside consulting activities exceed the permitted limits (normally one day per week), or whenever a full-time faculty member's primary professional loyalty is not to Koç University, a conflict of commitment exists.

**Conflict of Interest:** A conflict of interest occurs when there is a divergence between the private interests of an individual and his/her professional obligations to the University, such that an independent observer might reasonably question whether the professional actions or decisions of the individual are or may be determined by considerations of personal gain, financial or otherwise. Conflicts of interest can arise naturally from the engagement of an individual with the world outside the University, and the mere existence of a conflict of interest does not necessarily imply wrongdoing on the part of anyone. When conflicts of interest do arise, however, they must be recognized, disclosed and either eliminated or properly managed.
VI.1 Fundamental Principles: Conflict of Commitment and Interest

As conflicts of commitment usually involve time allocation on the part of faculty, it is the understanding of Koç University that faculty is expected to maintain a significant physical presence on campus throughout the academic year, to be accessible to students and staff, and to be available to interact with the colleagues at Koç University. This presence is a requirement of being on full-time appointment unless the Dean, VPAA and the President have granted specific prior approval for extended or frequent absences from campus.

Although Koç University encourages faculty to become involved in the transfer of knowledge from the University into industry, such outside professional activities are considered to be a privilege and not a right and must not detract from the full-time obligation of the faculty member to his/her University duties. When any outside activity detracts from the conduct of University duties, a conflict of commitment likely to result. Even activities such as pro bono work, government service in the public interest, and any outside employment unrelated to the University responsibilities of the faculty member should be managed properly so that they do not take precedence over the primary commitment of the faculty member to the University.

Inevitably, outside professional activities may generate conflicts of interest regardless of the time involved, as they are common and practically unavoidable in a modern research university. At Koç University, conflicts of interest can arise out of the fact that a mission of the University is to promote public good by fostering the transfer of knowledge gained through University research and scholarship to the private sector. Two important means of accomplishing this mission include faculty consulting and the commercialization of technologies/methodologies/knowledge derived from faculty research. It is appropriate that faculty be rewarded for their participation in these activities through consulting fees and by sharing in royalties resulting from the commercialization of their work. However, it is inappropriate for the actions or decisions of an individual made in the course of his/ her University activities to be determined by considerations of personal financial gain. Such behavior calls into question the professional objectivity and ethics of the individual, and it also reflects negatively on the University.

Conflicts of interest related to research involving human subjects pose special concerns. The University and its researchers have ethical obligations to honor the rights and protect the safety of persons who participate in research conducted at or by the University. Financial interests held by those conducting the research or by the sponsor of the research may compromise or appear to compromise the fulfillment of those ethical obligations and the well-being of the research subjects, as well as the integrity of the related research. Accordingly, there is a strong presumption against permitting any person with related significant financial interests to participate in the conduct of such research, particularly if the protocol involves more than minimal risk. Only in rare and compelling circumstances might an exception be made. The University Committee on Human Research (CHR), which is charged with reviewing and monitoring human subjects research, has established a rigorous policy and procedure for review of financial interests related to human subjects research performed at the University or by University researchers. These policies and
procedures are intended to supplement the Koç University Policy on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment.

Here are some examples of conflicts of commitment and interest:

- Direction of a program of research or scholarship at another institution that could be conducted appropriately at Koç University as part of the normal duties of the faculty member can deprive our students, colleagues and our institution of the benefits of the primary intellectual energies of the faculty member.
- Submitting research proposals through channels other than Koç University to support work that could be performed at Koç University is another example. First, the use of Koç University resources in the course of such work is practically unavoidable. Second, it becomes difficult, if not impossible, for the University to review and reward the contributions of Koç University faculty, staff, and students for work managed and/or conducted elsewhere. Third, such action can result in situations that place students and staff in conflicts of interest. For these reasons, Koç University faculty members on full-time active duty are normally prohibited from serving as Principal Investigators on sponsored projects submitted and managed through other institutions. This stipulation is not intended to limit faculty from participating in multi-site training or research programs. Nor is it intended to apply to circumstances in which the research of the faculty member requires access to facilities not available at Koç University. For special circumstances, permission for such activities may be granted by the Offices of VPRD and the President.
- Significant management roles (those that involve supervision of the work of others and/or day-to-day responsibility for operating decisions) in private business typically are demanding both in terms of time and energy. It is unlikely that such roles can be fulfilled by a manager working only 1 day per week, the maximum time permitted for full-time faculty to engage in outside consulting activities. Because full-time faculty are expected to devote their primary energies and professional interests to their University obligations, they may not accept significant managerial responsibilities as part of their outside consulting activities. Normally, it would be necessary for faculty to take a full leave of absence from their University responsibilities in order to take on a significant management role in an outside entity. Engaging in such activities while being on sabbatical is not appropriate, since the purpose of a sabbatical is expressly to allow the faculty member to advance in his/her scholarly research.
- Whenever faculty members are involved in research as part of their outside consulting or business activities, they must establish clear boundaries that separate their University and outside obligations, so as to avoid questions about their appropriate use of resources and attributions of products of their work.
- Faculty and staff who consult should remember that their primary employer is Koç University and that they have a heightened responsibility to their primary employer when deciding whether to assign their inventions to Koç University or to a company for whom they consult. If they have questions, they should
consult with the Office of the VPRD before deciding to whom the invention should be assigned.

- It is a conflict for Koç University faculty or staff to accept research sponsorship from a company in which they have a significant financial interest. The conflict arises because the outcome of the research could materially affect the personal wealth of the researcher or an immediate family member. Therefore, it is possible that the objectivity of the faculty member as to whether he/she fosters an atmosphere of academic freedom by
  - promoting the open and timely exchange of results of scholarly activities,
  - ensuring that their advising of students and postdoctoral scholars is independent of personal commercial interests, and
  - informing students and colleagues about outside obligations that might influence the free exchange of scholarly information between them and the faculty member could reasonably be questioned. This policy, however, should not prevent an investigator from receiving research support from a company just because the researcher or a family member owns some shares in the company.

Other forms of conflict, in the more traditional meaning of conflict of interest, derive from the opportunities an individual may have because of his/her position at the institution to influence the relationship of Koç University with an outside organization in ways that would lead directly to personal financial gain for the individual. Potential conflicts of interest of a particularly sensitive nature may arise from opportunities that an individual may have to influence or to be influenced improperly by personal relationships, in ways that are not consistent with the education and employment policies and the principles to which Koç University is committed, especially in the context of educational or employment supervision and evaluation.

In response to these concerns, Koç University has adopted the following statement of policy: It is the policy of Koç University that its officers, faculty, staff, and others acting on its behalf have the obligation to avoid ethical, legal, financial, or other conflicts of interest and to ensure that their activities and interests do not conflict with their obligations to the University or its welfare. Essential to effective administration and adherence to this policy are the annual disclosure of outside activities and interests to Office of the Dean, including financial interests that might give rise to conflicts.

VI.2 Key Provisions and Details of the Policy
Although some of these provisions may have been discussed in the examples provided above, they are included in this list for the sake of completeness.

1. Faculty must maintain a significant physical presence on campus (main or others) throughout each semester they are on active duty.

Significant physical presence on campus: A full-time appointment conveys an obligation for a faculty member to have a significant physical presence on campus (main or others), to be accessible to students and staff, and to be available to interact with Koç University colleagues throughout every semester during which he/she is on active duty, unless the relevant Dean has granted specific prior approval for extended or frequent absences from campus for
academic reasons. Because requirements for field research and other reasons for absence from campus differ across the University, Deans of Colleges may define for the individual faculty members what qualifies as inappropriate, extended or frequent absences.

2. Faculty must not allow other professional activities to detract from their primary allegiance to Koç University. For example, a faculty member on full-time active duty must not have significant outside managerial responsibilities and must not act as a Principal Investigator on sponsored projects that could be conducted at Koç University but instead are submitted and managed through another institution.

Limitations on outside professional activities: It is an appropriate role for the University to facilitate the transfer of the knowledge gained through academic research to applications that can benefit the general population. Moreover, experience gained by faculty in the course of outside professional activities can enhance their teaching and research or scholarship within the University. But the process of technology transfer can create the potential for conflicts of commitment and/or interest, particularly when there is opportunity for personal gain on the part of the faculty. The intent of this provision of the policy is to minimize such conflicts and to provide means of managing them when they arise.

An implicit assumption underlying Koç University policy on outside professional activities by faculty members is that, such outside professional activities are a privilege and not a right and must not detract from a full-time obligation of the faculty member to his/her University duties. When any outside activity detracts from the conduct of University duties, a conflict of commitment would result and must be resolved.

Consulting: In general, consulting is defined as professional activity related to the field or discipline of a person, where a fee-for-service or equivalent relationship with a third party exists.

There are many types of consulting relations and fee arrangements, and the precise form entered into may vary. The principle is that, in consulting, a person agrees to use his or her professional capabilities to further the agenda of a third party, in return for an immediate or prospective financial (or other) gain. Activities or titles that constitute or imply managerial or supervisory responsibility are not permitted under Koç University conflict of commitment policies, and are not allowable as consulting relations.

Faculty must avoid titles that include terms such as Executive Officer, Director, Manager, or Chief as they imply or indicate management responsibilities and create real or perceived conflicts of commitment. Situations may arise in which a Koç University faculty member is chosen to serve on a Board of Directors, Advisory Council or Scientific Advisory Board of a company or other institution.
These appointments and titles are different from managerial roles and titles, and are permitted in the context of consulting relations.

Consulting is permitted provided the full-time obligation of the faculty member to the University is met. The maximum number of consulting days permissible for a faculty member on a full-time appointment is 1 day per week, including university holidays. A limited amount of "averaging" of consulting time is permissible as long as the total amount of time is not more than 52 days per year. In addition to this general policy on consulting, varying University policies may be instituted in individual academic units, but such policies cannot reduce the limitations imposed by the University at large.

The responsibility for adhering to the limit on consulting days, and other aspects of Koç University consulting policy, lies first with the individual faculty member. Faculty members should resolve any questions and/or ambiguities with their Dean before the fact, so that the University community is not injured by their actions. The University has the right, and indeed the obligation, to protect itself from losses due to excess consulting and to seek reimbursement from the faculty member for salary and benefits covering time spent on consulting beyond the limits provided for by this policy, especially in cases where amounts are significant and the faculty member had not sought prior consultation or follow the advice given by his/her Dean. Faculty members have an obligation to report fully the level (i.e., number of days) of their consulting activities with the Office of the Dean so that the adherence to the principles set forth herein may be unambiguously determined.

Faculty members must be especially sensitive to potential conflicts of interest between their teaching and research responsibilities for graduate students working under their supervision and their outside consulting interests.

Faculty members are expected to share Koç University Requirements for Faculty Consulting Activities and Agreements document with the third party.

3. Faculty must foster an atmosphere of academic freedom by promoting the open and timely exchange of results of scholarly activities, by ensuring that their advising of students and postdoctoral scholars is independent of personal commercial interests, and by informing students and colleagues about outside obligations that might influence the free exchange of scholarly information between them and the faculty member.

Free and Open Exchange of Research Results: The integrity of the University as a community of scholars requires the free and open exchange of ideas and the results of scholarly activities. Faculty are obligated to maintain an atmosphere free from unwarranted external influences. Students and collaborators must be able to pursue topics of interest, have access to available information and facilities, and be able to communicate the results of their work to other scholars and the public. Therefore, faculty must ensure that
a. The results of research or scholarship undertaken at Koç University are disseminated on an open and timely basis to the broader scholarly community and public;
b. The academic activities of students and postdoctoral scholars are free from the personal commercial interests of the faculty member; and
c. The work of students, staff, postdoctoral scholars and collaborators is not exploited in the course of a faculty member's outside obligations. To this end, faculty members should be open about their involvements with and obligations to outside third parties who could benefit from the work or ideas of their students, staff, and colleagues. Similarly, students, associates, and staff should have access to information about the sources of funds that support their research.

4. Faculty may not use University resources, including facilities, personnel, equipment, or confidential information, except in a purely incidental way, as part of their outside consulting activities or for any other purposes that are unrelated to the education, research, scholarship, and public service missions of the University.

Inappropriate use of University resources includes the following:

a. Assignment by the faculty member of tasks to the students, staff or postdoctoral scholars of the University for purposes of potential or real financial gain of the faculty member rather than the advancement of the scholarly field or the educational development of the students.
b. Involvement of the students or staff of the faculty member in his/her outside consulting or business activities without specific and detailed prior approval of the college/school Dean.
c. Granting of access to external entities to Koç University resources or services for purposes outside the missions of the University, or provision of inappropriate favors to outside entities in an attempt to unduly influence them in their dealings with the University.
d. Use for personal gain, by or granting unauthorized access to others, of confidential information acquired through conduct of University business or research activities. Confidential information includes, but is not limited to, medical, personnel, or security records of individuals; proprietary knowledge about corporate anticipated material requirements or price actions; and proprietary knowledge of possible new sites for government operations or information about forthcoming programs or selection of contractors or subcontractors in advance of official announcements.
e. Provision of preferential access to research results, materials or products generated from University teaching or research activities to an outside entity for personal financial gain. (This consideration would not preclude appropriate licensing arrangements for inventions, or consulting on the basis of sponsored project results where there is significant additional work or expertise involved).
5. Faculty must disclose on a timely basis the creation or discovery of all potentially patentable inventions created or discovered in the course of their University activities or with more than incidental use of University resources to Research, Project Development and Technology Transfer Directorate. Ownership of such inventions resides with the University regardless of source of funding. The inventor would share in royalties earned when the patent is licensed. Faculty are urged to read Koç University Policy on Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer in its entirety to fully understand the spirit of this provision.

6. Faculty must disclose to the Office of the VPRD whether they (or members of their immediate family) have consulting or employment relationships with, and/or significant financial interests (defined below), in an outside entity before the University may approve the following proposed arrangements involving them between such entities and Koç University: a) gifts; b) sponsored projects; c) technology licensing arrangements; and d) certain procurements. In such cases, approval by the VPRD is required prior to entering into each proposed arrangement.

When the faculty member is engaged in research involving human subjects, and has any financial interest in the sponsoring entity (or when a member of the immediate family has such interest), that interest must be disclosed on an ad-hoc basis to the Committee on Human Research (CHR), regardless of its value. When such proposed arrangements are disclosed, the CHR shall determine an appropriate resolution for the case in hand.

Significant Financial Interests in an entity means:

a. Any current or pending ownership interests (including shares, partnership stake, or derivative interests such as stock options) in a privately-held entity (e.g., in a "startup" company), or in a publicly-traded entity; or

b. Any income amounting to at least 10,000 TL per year (other than from employment, consulting, or ownership interests as covered above) -- including for example honoraria, licensing or royalty income.

Research funding from a startup and testing of faculty-generated intellectual property licensed to a startup: There is a strong presumption against accepting research funding in the form of grants, subcontracts, or gifts, from a startup or other company in which the faculty member proposing the research has an equity interest or a Board seat (or other significant financial interest), if the research is to be done in the research group of the faculty member, or if the students or postdoctoral fellows or associates of the faculty member would participate in the funded research projects. Rigorous restrictions also apply to human subjects research and non-human subjects research that involves testing, when the faculty member has a related financial interest.
The presumption is applied as follows:

**Human subjects research.** The regulations protecting human research subjects are based on the ethical principles described in the Belmont report (National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, *Department of Health, Education and Welfare* (DHEW) (30 September 1978)): respect for persons, beneficence, and justice. The Belmont principles should not be compromised by financial relationships. Where the proposed research involves human subjects, the presumption against permitting a related startup to sponsor the research is particularly strong. Any equity interest in the outside company (including stock options, warrants and instruments convertible into equity), or a non-equity financial interest of over 10,000 TL in a year (whether derived from consulting fees, honoraria, royalties, or in some other vehicle), would almost always preclude the financially interested faculty member from conducting human subjects research sponsored by the startup. This presumption may be overcome only in rare and compelling circumstances, as judged by the CHR, and where the Committee is satisfied that effective controls to mitigate any possible effects of the conflict can and will be implemented. Such circumstances might include, for example, that the researcher is uniquely qualified to perform the experimental procedure. In such circumstances, the CHR may advise the Office of the VPRD as to whether the researcher should divest himself or herself of the equity interest, or place the equity in a blind trust for an appropriate period of time. The presumption is less likely to be rebutted when the object of the conflicted research is testing of a device or compound for public validation or other similar purpose.

**Research not involving human subjects.** When a startup or an outside company proposes to sponsor research to be conducted by a faculty member who holds equity or a Board seat in the company, and which involves neither human subjects nor validation testing, the presumption may be rebutted if, in the judgment of the CHR appropriate controls are in place (see item c below), and one of the following sets of conditions is met:

- The research is of a fundamental or basic nature; the research is not directly related to the financial success of the startup or company; and the relationship of the faculty member with the company is otherwise limited (i.e., does not involve multiple additional entanglements such as consulting agreements and scientific advisory board membership); so that the likelihood of any distortion of the research endeavor is minimal; or, the equity interests of the faculty member in a venture are so diluted that his/her control or influence over the decisions of the firm and the possible benefit from KU-based activity are negligible, and the relationship of the faculty member with the company is otherwise limited; or
- The research is essential to maintain the continuity of a research effort related to the licensed intellectual property during a short interval of time (normally under six months), while the research activity is being established in the startup or outside company; and during this period oversight is exercised by non-interested peers appointed by the CHR.

Except in extraordinary circumstances, the presumption may not be rebutted when the research in question has as its object the testing of an invention in which the faculty member has a royalty or other interest in a startup or a company, or a Koç University invention that is licensed to a startup or a company in which he or she has an equity interest. For purposes of this provision, ‘testing’ is intended to describe the conduct of research designed to validate to the public or perform a similar function regarding an invention created at Koç University and licensed to a startup or other company. (The same restrictions would generally apply to testing undertaken for a publicly held company holding a license from Koç University.)

c. Controls. In each case in which the CHR recommends that research be permitted to proceed despite the presumption against such research, it shall ensure, in addition to measures adopted by the Committee, and complete compliance with the other strictures of this policy on startups, the following:

- The research agreement contains no restrictions on publication other than those stated in the KU Policies on Intellectual Property Rights and Technology Transfer document (https://tto.ku.edu.tr/sites/tto.ku.edu.tr/files/KU_IPR_policies.pdf)
- All individuals working on the research project are provided a written notice that the research is being sponsored by a venture in which the faculty member has an ownership interest or fiduciary relationship;
- Before the Committee makes a recommendation that the research is allowed to proceed, the faculty member provides the Committee a written description of the proposed research and an assurance of his or her compliance with the restrictions set forth above; and thereafter, provides the Committee written reports on the progress of the research, listing related peer-reviewed publications and grants, no less frequently than annually; and
- All other management measures deemed appropriate by the Committee are in place. Examples of such measures are requirement of a data safety monitoring board, in the case of human subjects research; an oversight committee to review data, publications and other issues; requirement of disclosure in publications; and commitment of equity to a blind trust for a period of time.
Common sense must prevail in the interpretation of these provisions. That is -- no matter what TL amounts are involved -- if an independent observer might reasonably question whether the professional actions or decisions of an individual are or may be determined by considerations of personal gain, the relationship should be disclosed and approval must be sought for the proposed transaction.

7. In situations in which the objectivity of a faculty member could reasonably be questioned, the Dean of his/her College/School may advise the CHR to review the appropriateness of the proposed research to be conducted at Koç University, to oversee the conduct of the research (including use of students and postdoctoral scholars), and to ensure open and timely dissemination of the research results.

**Questions of Scientific Objectivity:** Clinical trials and other research involving human subjects raise particularly sensitive issues in those cases where the investigator has any personal financial interests -- no matter what TL amounts are involved -- in the outcomes and these financial interests must therefore be disclosed to the CHR. The demand for therapeutics requires that new agents be developed and tested. The processes that must be followed in the testing and development of therapeutics raise an inherently contradictory situation for faculty, since frequently the inventors of therapies or medical devices are those who do research on the disease in question, are the leaders in the field, and are the most qualified to carry out pre-clinical and clinical testing. Also, the most qualified laboratories and individuals to conduct trials may receive, or be candidates to receive, research support from the external organization. In neither case could the faculty member be free of bias with respect to the outcome of the trials.

Therefore, the faculty member (and the CHR to whom the disclosure is made) must take appropriate steps to guarantee objective evaluation of the agent or device, especially for advanced clinical trials (FDA phase II and phase III). Testing might involve other members of the school or division, but if the faculty member is a senior academic, the referral for testing the therapy/device to another faculty member (particularly to a junior faculty member) may carry implied coercion. Integrity should be protected by an independent oversight group recommended by the CHR for evaluation and monitoring of the research whenever:

- **a.** A faculty member is involved in clinical trials of his or her inventions;
- **b.** A company licensed to use an invention of the faculty member sponsors the trial;
- **c.** There may exist a reason to question a faculty member's objectivity;
- **d.** The outcome of the trial could be seen as influencing existing or potential research support;
- **e.** Such testing is referred to other members of the faculty member's program or division.
Under appropriate circumstances, the University may require that the investigator either divest any financial interest or not perform the work at Koç University.

8. On an annual basis all faculty members must certify to their Deans their compliance with Koç University policies related to conflict of interest and commitment. They must also disclose information about their (and their immediate family members, as described below) financial relationships with outside organizations that are sponsors of their teaching or research programs or are otherwise involved in current, proposed or pending financial relationships with the University that involve the faculty member. In addition, faculty must disclose to their Dean on an ad-hoc basis current, proposed or pending situations that may raise questions of conflict of commitment or interest, as soon as such situations become known to the faculty member. An electronic "disclosure and certification form" is available online and should be used for submission. Individual Colleges/Schools of the University may request additional information, but not less than that requested on the University electronic form.

9. Upon timely review of the disclosures, annual or ad-hoc, of potential or apparent conflicts, College/School Deans are expected to advise the faculty on the University policies, and immediately file the cases with the VPRD office with his/her own recommendations. The Deans of Colleges and Schools and Directors of the Institutes are expected to file their own annual disclosures and certifications of compliance with the VPRD office.

10. Review of disclosures forwarded to the VPRD Office may be conducted by the VPRD or delegated to the CHR or to an ad-hoc Committee on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment depending on the nature of the conflicts, whose details are given in Section V.3.3.

11. Should a faculty member wish to appeal a decision made by the CHR, he/she may present the appeal to the VPRD; to appeal a decision made by the VPRD, he/she may present the appeal to the President, who will consider the case in consultation with an Advisory Board appointed by the President.

VI.3 Disclosures and Review
The responsibility for avoiding conflict of interest or commitment rests, in the first instance, with the individual faculty member. An essential step in addressing an actual or apparent conflict of interest or commitment is for the individual involved to make full disclosure of relevant information to the Dean of the College/School. When a disclosure is received, the Dean reviews it and forwards it to the Office of the VPRD for final review and filing.

VI.3.1 Required annual disclosures
All faculty members with full-time University appointments; all faculty who hold administrative positions; and all faculty and non-faculty personnel who are responsible for the design, conduct or reporting of research (being "engaged in research") are required annually to submit a conflict of interest/conflict of commitment disclosure describing their external activities and significant financial interests.
Faculty members, investigators, and non-faculty personnel who are engaged in research must submit the annual disclosure forms to their Dean, who then reviews them and forwards the forms to the Office of the VPRD. In cases where the individual is a Dean or a Director, the disclosures are submitted directly to the VPRD Office.

Certain senior, non-faculty administrators designated by the President are also required to submit annual disclosures of outside activities and financial interests. These disclosures are to be prepared on the Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form for Senior Administrators and submitted to the Office of the President. The form is provided to those administrators who are required to submit them.

**VI.3.2 Required disclosures other than in annual disclosure process**

**Material change from annual disclosure:** Whenever significant financial interests, external activities, or internal responsibilities change materially from those described in the annual disclosure, the disclosure is to be updated as soon as possible, in writing. Updates are to be submitted according to the same procedure as the annual disclosures, described above. Whenever possible, individuals must attempt to disclose expected changes or newly anticipated conflicts before they occur, and seek advice from the Dean, CHR or VPRD on the restrictions that may result from any anticipated new significant financial interest, before the circumstances for such a financial interest occur. Whenever an application for funding of a new research project is submitted, the investigator is required to certify that he/she has submitted a complete and accurate annual disclosure, and that the new research project does not present the potential for any actual or apparent conflicts of interest not already identified in the annual disclosure.

**Human subjects research protocols:** Principal investigators and key research personnel involved in human subjects research at the School of Medicine are required to complete and submit Protocol-Related Conflict of Interest Disclosure forms or related screening forms to the CHR at the time of the submission of each protocol to the CHR. These disclosures are intended to supplement, not replace, the annual disclosure described above.

**Ad hoc disclosures by those not required to file annual disclosures:** Postdoctoral appointees, non-faculty employees other than designated senior administrators, and students are not required to submit annual disclosure forms unless they are responsible for the design, conduct, or reporting of research. They are required, however, on an ad hoc basis, to disclose potential and actual conflicts of interest relating generally to University research (including, for example, the use of research facilities and involvement of students in startup-company sponsored research), University financial decisions, and other matters whenever they arise. If there is any doubt about the existence of an actual or apparent conflict of commitment or conflict of interest, the individual is required to submit a disclosure for review by the Dean of the College/School.

The confidentiality of the disclosures is to be respected as far as possible. In particular, the information on the forms is not be shared with any person other than those who have a need to know.
VI.3.3 Review of Disclosures
The Dean or a person designated by the Dean (Associate Dean) reviewing an annual or other disclosure is to review the information in the disclosure to determine if a conflict of commitment exists, before forwarding it to the Office of VPRD.

Conflict of Commitment: If the initial review suggests that a conflict of commitment exists, the initial reviewer (or the Dean) should discuss the conflict with the individual, and take steps to assure that any actual conflict is eliminated. If the initial reviewer (or the Dean) is unable to assure the elimination of the conflict of commitment, he/she is expected to consult and work with the Office of the VPRD to resolve any remaining issues.

Conflict of Interest: When the disclosure relates to research activities, the initial reviewer (the Dean or Associate Dean) is not required to review the substance of the disclosure for possible conflict of interest; he/she may instead merely note that the disclosure was received and forward it to the Office of the VPRD. The initial reviewer is encouraged, however, to assist in the review process by commenting on the substance of the disclosure based on his or her knowledge of the circumstances. In some cases, the clarification of the facts by the initial reviewer may significantly accelerate the review of a potential conflict of interest.

Non-research activities: When the disclosure relates to University financial decisions or other non-research activities, the initial reviewer is to review the disclosure, identify actual and apparent conflicts, and develop a written plan that would eliminate or manage the identified conflicts. This plan could, among other possibilities, (i) authorize the individual to participate, under the reviewer's oversight, in a matter as to which the conflict exists, or (ii) instruct the individual not to participate in the decision or other matter relating to the conflict. The plan and disclosure is to be forwarded for a final decision to the VPRD Office.

Whether or not the initial review indicates that an actual or apparent conflict of interest exists, the initial reviewer forwards the disclosure form (or a written record of an oral disclosure), together with any comments by the initial reviewer, to the Office of the VPRD.

Review by the Office of the VPRD: Review of disclosures forwarded to the Office of the VPRD may be conducted by the VPRD or delegated to the CHR or to an ad hoc Committee on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment depending on the nature of the conflicts. The ad hoc Committee consists of the Director of Research and Development Office and one or more faculty members selected by the VPRD. If necessary, the CHR or VPRD or the Committee may discuss disclosure-related matters with the individual involved and may also consult with others who may have relevant information.

The review process handled by the Office of the VPRD as outlined above determines whether an apparent or actual conflict of interest exists, and, if so, by what means - such as the abstention of the individual from the external activity, modification of the activity, and/or monitoring of the activity - the conflict may be avoided or managed. In
making those determinations, the CHR or VPRD or committee is to be guided by the principles discussed in the Faculty Handbook.

If it is determined that a conflict exists, this determination and the means identified for eliminating or managing the conflict are communicated, in writing, to the individual and the initial reviewer who referred the case. The Office of the VPRD keeps a record of the disclosure and other relevant information for at least three years. If monitoring of the activity is prescribed, the VPRD describes specifically how the monitoring is to be performed and what records are to be kept.

**Rebuttal:** If the individual is not satisfied with the decision of the Office of the VPRD, he/she may request that the matter be referred to the President for review. Any matter referred to the President in this manner is to be accompanied by a written statement of the findings and recommendations of the VPRD, with copies to the individual, and the appropriate Dean. The Office of the President then notifies the individual, the VPRD, and the Dean of his/her decision, ordinarily within three weeks after receiving the report from the VPRD.

The decision of the President is final, and failure by the individual to adhere to the decision is cause for disciplinary action, including, in severe cases, termination of employment.

**VI.4 Conflict of Interest Policy on Teaching**
Teaching other than that approved by the University can constitute a conflict of commitment. Of particular concern is remunerated teaching. Specifically, faculty members cannot provide private lessons to students for personal gain as this constitutes a clear conflict of interest.

References:
1. Faculty Policy on Conflict of Commitment and Interest, Research Policy Handbook, Stanford University  
   (https://doresearch.stanford.edu/policies/research-policy-handbookch4.html)
2. Conflict of Interest, MIT Policies and Procedures  
   (http://web.mit.edu/policies/4/4.4.html)
3. Yale University Policy on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment, Office of the Provost, Yale University. (provost.yale.edu/conflict-policy)
VII. Sabbaticals and Other Leaves of Absence
Subject to the availability of resources, a sabbatical leave is granted by the University for the advancement of the University. A sabbatical leave is an important tool in the scholarly development of qualified faculty members. Although leave of full-time research faculty in a university is an integral part of the university life, it is also important to remember that leaves, in general, may not only reduce the contribution of a faculty member to the university, but may also disrupt instructional programs. Therefore, faculty members are expected to be regularly available to students and colleagues, to participate continuously in the academic affairs of the University. It is the utmost responsibility of the Deans to ensure the continuity of the educational programs of the University.

VII.1 Sabbatical Leave

The main purpose of sabbatical leaves with pay is to free full-time research track faculty members from their normal University duties and to make it possible for them to pursue their scholarly interests full-time. Thus, sabbaticals are expected to enable faculty members to acquire additional knowledge and competency in their respective fields, and thereby enhance their value to the University. It should be noted that sabbatical leave is not automatic, and the implementation of the policy in a specific case may be limited by the responsibility of the programs to meet their obligations. Ultimately, sabbatical leaves require the approval of the Dean, the Office of the VPAA and the President.

VII.1.1 Eligibility, Duration and Service Requirement
Sabbatical leave at Koç University is specifically designed for full-time research track faculty who has the rank of Professor or Associate Professor, and who has completed six years of full-time service as a member of the Faculty at the time of the leave. Note that years in which faculty members are on leave are not counted in the six years, and years of service beyond the six-year requirement cannot be counted toward qualification for subsequent sabbaticals.

The faculty with Associate Professor rank or above holding full-time administrative position may only take a sabbatical leave from their faculty positions after completely relinquishing their administrative positions. However, time in administrative appointments counts toward eligibility for the sabbatical leave.

The usual minimum length of sabbatical is one semester and the maximum length is one year at 100% salary, if the faculty has fulfilled the full-time service requirement of six years.

A faculty member must serve at Koç University, upon return, for a period of time at least equal to the length of his/her most recent sabbatical leave. If this obligation is not fulfilled, the faculty member or his/her new employer must reimburse the University for the salary paid while on sabbatical leave. This requirement is to be strictly enforced with no exceptions.

VII.1.2 Reporting After Sabbatical Leave

Upon returning from sabbatical leave, the faculty member must submit a written report on his or her study and travel during the leave. A reminder of this is sent to the
faculty member by the office of the relevant Dean’s. Submission is to be made through the normal channels (dean/director) within 60 service days of the start of the next academic term to the Dean of the College.

The report should explicitly include activities performed during the leave and should address how the sabbatical leave enhanced the individual’s research potential and value to the University.

The evaluation of the leave, based on the report and tangible output, if any, is initially performed by the Dean during the first annual evaluations of the faculty of the College, and is shared with the Faculty and VPAA following normal procedure of the faculty evaluations.

VII.1.3 Implementation

It should be emphasized that implementation of this policy in a specific case may be limited by the responsibility of the departments to meet their obligations. Once this is secured by the Dean of the respective college, the following steps has to be followed:

1) Application for sabbatical leave, including the “Statement of Plans,” is filed with the Office of the Dean by no later than December 1st for leaves in the subsequent Fall Semester and March 1st for leaves in the subsequent Spring Semester.

2) Dean of the College and Director of the Institute review the sabbatical leave request with care and certify that: i) they each believe the leave enhances the value of the faculty member to the University, ii) that the proposed plans improve the capabilities of the unit for carrying out objectives of the unit and the University, and iii) that the work of the unit would not be disrupted by the leave. This certification is to be completed by January 1st for Fall Semester leaves and April 1st for Spring Semester leaves.

3) Once the leave has been recommended by the Dean and Director, it is subject to review by the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA), and eventual approval by the President.

4) Applicants, and the VPAA, HR, respective Dean and Director Offices, are notified of the status of the application by the Office of the President by February 1st for Fall Semester leaves and May 1st for Spring Semester leaves.

5) Those who have been granted a sabbatical leave have to submit a report to the Office of the Dean within 60 service days of their return from sabbatical leave.

6) Dean shares his/her evaluation of the sabbatical leave in the first annual faculty evaluation with the faculty member and the VPAA office.

If the faculty, whose request for sabbatical leave has been granted, wishes to alter the proposal or academic objectives of the leave, he/she must inform the Dean in writing as soon as possible of the reasons for the proposed change and secure the approvals of all offices stated in the above implementation procedure. Having secured the approval of the former request does not guarantee the approval of the changes, and the Office of the Dean is responsible to carry the revision procedure in a timely manner.
After the request for sabbatical leave is granted, if the faculty member decides to not take the sabbatical, or to postpone it to another academic semester or year, the Dean may give first priority to other sabbatical requests from the same program in cases of multiple requests for the same or overlapping period(s).

Faculty with full-time administrative appointments may apply for sabbatical leave in an appropriate time prior to the end of his/her administrative term to the Office of VPAA. Once the request for sabbatical leave is reviewed by the VPAA, the application materials with the letter of recommendation by the VPAA are submitted to the Office of President. The Office of the President subsequently notifies the applicant, the Offices of VPAA, HR and respective Dean and Director of the status of the application. The rest of the rules and policies for sabbatical leaves, such as duration, service requirement and reporting, are the same as for the full-time faculty with no administrative duties.

VII.1.4 Restrictions
Sabbatical Leaves are given to members of the faculty primarily for the purpose of enabling them to acquire additional knowledge and competency in their respective fields. No one to whom a leave of absence with pay has been granted shall be permitted while on such leave to accept remunerative employment or engage in professional practice or work for which pecuniary compensation is received.

This prohibition, however, does not forbid a faculty member while on leave from giving a limited number of lectures or doing a limited amount of work. Nor does this prohibition forbid the acceptance by a faculty member, while on leave, of a scholarship or fellowship carrying a stipend for the purpose of study, research, or scientific investigation, or the acceptance of a grant of money made for such purposes, provided that the acceptance of the grant does not impose on the recipient duties and obligations that are incompatible with the general purpose for which leaves of absence are granted.

VII.2 Junior Faculty Research Leave
The purpose of the Junior Faculty Research Leave Program is to assist young scholars in their initial periods at academia by providing a concentrated period of time during which they can engage in research to advance their careers.

VII.2.1 Eligibility
Junior Faculty Leave with pay at Koç University is mainly intended for the faculty who hold the rank of Assistant Professors and who demonstrate outstanding research performance. Normally this leave may not be taken during the faculty first year or last year of appointment of the faculty member at Koç University, and cannot exceed one semester. Faculty members who have been given a terminal appointment do not qualify for a research leave.

VII.2.2 Application and Service Requirement
Faculty members are expected to consult with their Dean about the timing of leaves to ensure the best use of the opportunity and to be consistent with the teaching and other obligations of the faculty member. If all conditions are favorable, faculty apply to their Deans, and the application is in the form of a proposal outlining how the faculty
member proposes to use the time and how the work proposed fits into the research agenda of the faculty member. Once the leave has been recommended by the Dean and Director, it is subject to review by the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA), and eventual approval by the President.

It should be noted that the faculty member must serve at Koç University, upon return, for a period of time at least equal to the length of the leave. If this obligation is not fulfilled, the faculty member or his/her new employer must reimburse the University for the salary paid while on the leave. This requirement is strictly enforced with no exceptions.

**VII.2.3 Notes**

Junior Faculty Leaves are intended for research and does not stop the contract clock and does not affect the timing of sabbaticals that might be awarded to junior faculty if they are subsequently promoted to the rank of Associate Professors. If a faculty member is granted a junior faculty leave, then he/she can only apply for a sabbatical leave following the junior faculty leave for one semester (6 months) only.

**VII.3. Other Leaves for the Faculty**

**VII.3.1. Annual Paid Vacations**

The annual paid vacations for full-time faculty on twelve-month appointments is 30 days long including weekends, starts usually after one academic year from the recruitment, and is independent of the length of the past service of the faculty. During the annual paid vacation, the faculty is expected to take no other form of work from any other employer or entity and may receive no external compensation during this time. To take the annual vacation, the faculty is required to notify the Office of his/her Dean a month in advance by filling in the Leave Request and Approval Form, and it is the responsibility of the Dean to inform the HR Office of the leave by sending in the form with the approval of the Dean approval.

**VII.3.2 Compassionate (Casual) Leave**

The faculty member may be given a paid compassionate (casual) leave solely for any one of the reasons listed below, subject to its documentation within 10 working days:

- 5 working days in the case of marriage;
- 5 working days in the case of spouse giving birth;
- 3 working days in the case of death of spouse, children, parents or siblings;
  
  Up to 10 working days in the case of a natural disaster affecting his house or properties.

Moreover, faculty members may request additional professional and personal leaves up to 12 days a year. These additional leaves are subject to approval by the respective Dean and must be reported to Human Resources Directorate.

**VII.3.3. Sick Leave and Work after Sickness**

Any faculty member taking a sick leave from work up to 2 days (including the second day) is considered to be on an administrative leave. However, the faculty is expected to immediately notify Office of the Dean his/her college, and if the sick leave extends beyond the second day, the faculty is required to obtain a medical report and submit it to the Office of the Dean within the initial term of 10 days. The Office of the Dean is
subsequently responsible for passing the report to the office of Human Resources Directorate. Without a medical report, the total length of administrative leaves taken due to sickness cannot exceed twelve (12) working days in one (1) year, and the faculty member must not subsequently be asked to perform any compensatory work.

For medical reports longer than 10 days, the Social Security Institution (SGK-Sosyal Güvenlik Kurumu in Turkish) pays a certain amount of pension directly to the faculty against incapacity for work due to sickness. In order for the faculty to receive the full monthly salary at the end of the month, the pension received from the Social Security Institution has to be deposited into Account No. 386235, Koç University Branch of Yapı Kredi Bank, with a notice to the HR office of Koç University. However, how long Koç University will pay (the full monthly salary as described above) the faculty on medical leave is dependent on the length of the service of the faculty at Koç University according to the following rule: At the time of the leave, if the past service of the faculty is

- Shorter than 1 year, Koç University will pay for the first 1.5 months only;
- Longer than 1 year, Koç University will pay for an additional month for each additional year of the service.

However, for a medical report longer than 6 months, Koç University pays the full salary for 6 months only, beyond which the faculty will only be eligible for the pension paid by the Social Security Institution.

VII.3.4. Pregnancy and Maternity Leave
Koç University complies fully with the Labor Act Law No 4857 and Social Insurance Law No 5510 Article 16, in cases of pregnancy and maternity of female faculty.

Notice and Payment: A pregnant faculty member has to inform her Dean about the pregnancy and the expected timing of her leave at an appropriate time, to help the Dean in the planning of courses and other programs in the college during her absence. The Office of the Dean has to inform the offices of VPAA and HR of the backup plan during the maternity leave of the faculty member.

According to the above stated laws, when the faculty member is on maternity leave as determined by the Social Security Institution she can receive an allowance of disability to work from the SGK. For the sake of providing a steady income for the employee, Koç University continues to pay the monthly salary to the employee during the maternity leave. In return, the employee is required to deposit the allowance for disability for service paid by the Social Security Institution to Account No. 386235, Koç University Branch of Yapı Kredi Bank, and to notify the HR office of the University.

Period of Maternity Leave: A female employee is entitled to prenatal and postnatal leaves, according to the Labor Act Article 74, in total of 16 weeks, 8 weeks each. In case the employee gives birth to more than one child at one time, 2 weeks are added to the 8-week prenatal leave, bringing the total maternity leave to 18 weeks. The beginning and end dates of the maternity leave are determined by a State Hospital or private health institutions approved by SGK, with a written report.
In usual terms, a pregnancy lasts 40 weeks and therefore 8 weeks before the birth corresponds to the 32nd week of the pregnancy. The faculty may continue to work until 3 weeks prior to the birth if she can get a medical report that confirms her ability to work from a State Hospital or private health institution approved by SGK.

If the mother needs to extend her maternity leave, she has the right to take an unpaid leave for at most 6 months, which is not included in the calculation of the right for the annual paid vacation of the mother.

After using maternity leave, Female Faculty Member’s contract is automatically extended for one year. This duration is added to the expiration date of Faculty Member’s current contract.

*Nursing Right:* Followed by the maternity leave, the mother has the right to nurse and care for her child for 45 minutes each before and after lunch until the baby is one-year-old. If the faculty member wishes and her Dean approves, she can use this nursing right at the beginning or at the end of the working week. However, this right cannot be carried to other weeks or combined with vacation times. The schedule for nursing agreed upon by the faculty and the Dean must be reported to the office of HR by the Dean’s Office.

**VII.3.5. Unpaid Leaves**

For just and fair causes and if approved by both the faculty members’ Dean and the President, the faculty may be granted an unpaid leave for up to 6 months. In case of necessity, this duration may further be extended by the approval of the President. Human Resources Directorate must be notified about unpaid leave.
## Course Evaluation Form

The course evaluation form includes the following 19 questions:

| Q1 | The level of instructor's preparedness for class was ... |
| Q2 | The Instructor's ability to communicate and explain effectively was ... |
| Q3 | The Instructor's willingness to provide help when needed was ... |
| Q4 | The instructor's use of class time effectively was ... |
| Q5 | The instructor's enthusiasm (e.g. energy, encouragement, motivation) was ... |
| Q6 | The level of instructor's concern for students' learning and progress was ... |
| Q7 | The level of instructor's respect for students was ... |
| Q8 | The amount of knowledge gained from the course was ... |
| Q9 | The materials used in the course (including books, handouts, readings etc.) were ... |
| Q10 | In terms of helping me to learn the subject matter, course assignments (e.g. papers, projects, problem sets, homework, experiments) were ... |
| Q11 | The methods used to measure learning (e.g. exams, papers, reports, projects etc.) were ... |
| Q12 | The course's organization (e.g. structure, completeness, logical flow) was ... |
| Q13 | The instructor's content knowledge was... |
| Q14 | Overall, the instructor was ... |
| Q15 | Overall, the course was ... |
| Q16 | What grade do you think you will get from this course at the end of this semester? |
| Q17 | During the semester about how many hours per week did you study for this course outside of the official class meetings (e.g., lectures labs, problem or discussion sessions)? |
| Q18 | How many classes of this course did you miss during this semester? |
| Q19 | The level of difficulty in this course was |
A.2. Sample Letters Sent to Faculty

A.2.1. Sample Letters Sent to Faculty to Request the Annual Activity Report

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty of College of .......

FROM: ........, Dean/Director

DATE: .......

SUBJECT: Annual Report

Please submit your annual report/review file electronically to KUSIS and also to the Dean’s office by September 1, xx.

Each file should contain the following material.

1. A current CV.

2. An activity summary covering September 1 through August 31. Please see the attached template.

3. A brief self-assessment of your activities and performance during the past year. This statement should include:

   (a) a comparison of your actual performance against your specific goals and plans (if you have outlined them in during last year’s report), and

   (b) a statement of your strengths and areas for improvement.

4. A brief statement of your plans for next year.

5. Specific goals for next year, particularly in the categories indicated in the attached format.

Please see the “Faculty Handbook” for further details of Annual Evaluation process.

The purpose of the annual report/review process is not only performance assessment, but also, equally importantly, career development. In particular, I hope that everyone will make use of their goals and plans to chart their progress and as a foundation to assist in determination of their developmental goals and plans for the coming years.
If you have any questions, please give me a call. I will do my best to ensure that this year’s annual review is useful and meaningful for all concerned. I hope that all faculty will use the opportunity as a positive step in their career development. Thank you in advance for your participation and support.

A.2.2.2. Sample Letters Sent to Faculty to Request the Contract Renewal File

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty of College of .......

FROM: ......., Dean

DATE: .......

SUBJECT: Contract Renewal File

As you know, your contract with the University will expire on August 31, 20xx. To formulate a recommendation to the President, your cumulative academic performance at Koç University will be evaluated.

For this evaluation, I need from you a file that includes information about your teaching and research activities. Your file should include

- An updated cv,
- A cumulative version of the annual activities reports,
- Reprints or preprints of articles and books, and
- A teaching dossier.

Please see the “Faculty Handbook” for further details of renewal process.

Please submit your file to the Dean’s Office by September 1, 20xx.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need assistance with the preparation of this submission.
A.3. Annual Activities Report Form to be Filled by Faculty

KOÇ UNIVERSITY FACULTY ANNUAL ACTIVITIES REPORT

COLLEGE OF # # # # # # # # # # .

OCTOBER 1, 2010 TO SEPTEMBER 30, 2011

NAME: # # # # # # # # # # # .

1. Teaching Activities
   1.1. Courses taught, number of students, pass rate and average grade
   1.2. Graduate student supervision
   1.3. Independent study
   1.4. Teaching conferences, seminars or workshops attended
   1.5. Teaching awards
   1.6. Developing new courses, teaching techniques

2. Scholarly Activities
   2.1. Publications (Include only published and accepted work; give full reference including first and last page numbers of published work. Submitted and planned work is recorded in Sect. 2.3.)
      2.1.1. Theses
      2.1.2. Research articles in journals covered by ISI
      2.1.3. Research articles in journals not covered by ISI
      2.1.4. Conference proceedings articles (refereed)
      2.1.5. Conference proceedings articles (non-refereed)
      2.1.6. Books
      2.1.7. Chapters in books
      2.1.8. Technical reports
      2.1.9. Patents
      2.1.10. Creative work (e.g. play, novel, musical piece, # )
      2.1.11. Citations (cumulative and yearly)
   2.2. Presentations (Include only presented and accepted work; submitted and planned work is recorded in Sect. 2.3.)
      2.2.1. Conference or convention presentations
      2.2.2. Invited lecture
      2.2.3. University presentations
   2.3. Ongoing research activity
      2.3.1. Work submitted for publication
      2.3.2. Work submitted for presentation
      2.3.3. Work in progress not listed above (Indicate nature as new or extension of previous work)
   2.4. Editorial Activities
2.4.1. Journal editing  
2.4.2. Reviewing for professional journals  
2.4.3. Conference organization  
2.4.4. Reviewing for conferences  

2.5. Honors and Awards  
2.5.1. Honors and awards  
2.5.2. Honorific election  

2.6. Sponsored research  
2.6.1. Sponsored research by external sources  
2.6.2. Pending Research Proposals  

3. Service  

3.1. University Service  
3.1.1. Administrative positions held  
3.1.2. University committees  
3.1.3. Seminars workshops for faculty, staff or students  
3.1.4. Student advising  
3.1.5. Club advising  

3.2. Community Service  
3.2.1. Consulting to private, public or non-profit institutions  
3.2.2. Seminars and workshops  
3.2.3. Positions in private, public or non-profit institutions  

3.3. Non-professional publications and presentations  
3.3.1. Publications in non-academic magazines  
3.3.2. Presentations at non-academic meetings or conferences  
3.3.3. Contributions to popular media (TV, Radio, Newspaper)  

3.4. Honors and Awards for non-professional contributions  
3.5. Other:  

4. Other  

Individual Goals for 2004-2005  

(This section will not be shown in the College’s Annual Report)  

NAME:  

Research and Publication Goals:  

Teaching Goals:  

University and Professional service Goals:  

Self-Assessment  

Provide a self-assessment of your activities.
A.3.1. Self-Evaluation Form to be Filled by ELC Instructors

Please submit this document electronically through email, not in hard copy form. This form is due by October 3rd, but may be submitted earlier if you wish to do so.

The aim of this self-assessment is to help you and the ELC administration evaluate your performance, while ensuring that your input and views are fully taken into account. Take the time to accurately and fully complete this form. If one or more of the categories below do not apply to your work in the 2015-16 academic year, you may simply write N/A. The questions below are specific to the 2015-16 academic year. Please avoid referring to your achievements or contributions in previous years.

For each section, provide information relevant to the criteria, and rank your performance on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being Deficient, 2 being Below Expectations, 3 being Meets Expectations, 4 being Above Expectations, and 5 being Outstanding. The text that you write for each section should support the rank you have given yourself. For example, if you believe that your performance in a given area is 4 out of 5, you should explain how your performance is above expectations. You may refer to the instructor job description and committee responsibilities documents that have been taken from the Staff Handbook and provided to you. The administration will review your Self-Assessment and then assign a numerical score for each area of performance. This numerical score may agree or disagree with the one that you have provided.

Teaching Achievements 30%
This includes the teaching methods you have brought to the classroom and the ways in which you have worked to improve your teaching. It also includes the ways you have sought and addressed feedback from students, as well as the administration and/or colleagues, in order to improve your students’ learning. It includes as well how you have used various instructional resources in the ELC (course materials, supplementary materials, ELC Online) to maximize student learning. Provide at least one specific example of a challenge you faced in your teaching and how you successfully dealt with it. If your teaching was observed this year, include this experience and your response to the feedback in this section.

Self-Ranking (1 to 5):

Instructor Responsibilities 25%
This includes a record of the number of hours you taught in each semester, the names of the courses you taught in each semester, as well as syllabi for the fall, spring, and summer semesters. Your syllabi should contain all mandatory information. Instructor Responsibilities also includes proficiency exam-related responsibilities. Please identify any proficiency exams which you did not administer, even if you had permission to be absent on that day. Document your proficiency
exam responsibilities and specify any problems you encountered in administering or grading the exam. You do not need to submit your syllabi with this document, as this information is already available online.

**Self-Ranking (1 to 5):**

**Professional Contributions 25%**
This includes committees sat on or chaired, and specific descriptions of the contributions you made to the work of each committee. These contributions may include materials development, service as a course leader, midterm and final exam feedback, proof reading, the creation of exam audio files, Ed Tech support, exam or quiz development, and collaboration with colleagues in projects contributing to the program. Additionally, individual contributions to special projects, and the mentoring of new instructors should be included. Also, if you significantly deviated from ELC policies in 2015-16, include a specific plan for avoiding such deviations in the future.

**Self-Ranking (1 to 5):**

**Student Support 20%**
This includes how you have assisted students outside the classroom e.g. student tutorials, workshops, conversation groups, support you have given through ELC Online, and any other examples you think are relevant. Student feedback in the form of course evaluations will be factored into this category.

**Self-Ranking (1 to 5):**

**Professional Development Bonus (maximum of 5 points)**
This includes conferences attended and presentations given, external qualifications obtained, ELT courses attended, and articles published in the ELT field. Awards received from the university and attendance at KOLT seminars may also be included.

**Self-Ranking (1 to 5):**

Summation of the academic year 2015-2016, including any other contributions or achievements you would like to mention. If you believe that your 2015-16 activities in the ELC have significantly exceeded the requirements of your position, please explain how and why here.

**Overall Self-Ranking (1 to 5):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor's Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director's Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director's Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.4. Impact Factors of Professional Journals

The Scival database can be used to get information about the normalized impact factor of publications in journals included in the Scopus database.

The InCites Journal Citation Reports give various measures that assess the impact of a journal including Journal Impact Factor.

A.5. Sample of Letter Sent to External Reviewers for Promotions

Dear Professor ………………..:

Dr. ………………………….., who is currently an Assistant Professor of ……………………. at Koç University is being considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. As an integral component of our promotion procedures we seek the evaluation of each potential candidate from prominent faculty members at other institution. We would very much appreciate your help in evaluating Professor …………………………..’s scholarly achievements.

To assist you in this evaluation, I am enclosing a current copy of Dr. …………………………..’s resume and a selected sample of his current research publications and/or working papers. In making your evaluation of Dr. …………………………..’s accomplishments, it would be helpful if you could evaluate and comment upon the following:

1. Professor …………………………..’s achievements and stature in comparison with other scholars in his field who are similar stages in their careers;

2. The strengths and weaknesses of his scholarship and the degree of recognition achieved within his discipline, noting any distinctive contributions;

3. The relevance of Dr. …………………………..’s chosen topics and the scope and significance of his research interests and activities as they have made original or otherwise significant contributions to the discipline;

4. Whether, based on your knowledge of his work and the enclosed resume, Dr. ………………………….. would be a strong candidate for an Associate Professor position in a respectable ………………… department.

5. If you are familiar, Dr. …………………………..’s teaching ability and performance and any additional insights that may be helpful to the College in determining whether or not to recommend that promotion be awarded.

All of your comments regarding Dr. …………………………..’s scholarship will be held in strictest confidence by the promotion evaluation committee and the University.

We will be most grateful for your assistance in this important decision. We look forward to receiving your frank assessment before March 31, 20xx.
## A.6. Performance Matrix

### a. Performance Matrix for Professoriate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Above Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O or AE</td>
<td>AE or ME</td>
<td>ME or BE</td>
<td>BE or U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expectations</td>
<td>O or AE</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>AE or ME</td>
<td>ME or BE</td>
<td>BE or U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>AE or ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME or BE</td>
<td>BE or U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
<td>ME or BE</td>
<td>ME or BE</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>BE or U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>BE or U</td>
<td>BE or U</td>
<td>BE or U</td>
<td>BE or U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### b. Performance Matrix for Full-Time Instructors and Lecturers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Above Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O or AE</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>AE or ME</td>
<td>BE or U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expectations</td>
<td>O or AE</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>AE or ME</td>
<td>ME or BE</td>
<td>BE or U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>AE or ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME or BE</td>
<td>BE or U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>BE or U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### c. Performance Matrix for Researchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Above Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O or AE</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>AE or ME</td>
<td>ME or U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expectations</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>AE or ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME or U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME or BE</td>
<td>BE or U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>BE or U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O: Outstanding; AE: Above Expectation; ME: Meets Expectation; BE: Below Expectation; U: Unsatisfactory
A.7. **Documents for Diploma Equivalency Applications**

All the current documents and application procedures are available online:

- Equivalency Form-High School
- Equivalency Form-Master Diploma
- Equivalency Form-PhD
- Equivalency Form-Assoc. Prof.
- Equivalency Form-Prof.
A.8. Faculty Consulting Activities and Agreements

REQUIREMENTS FOR FACULTY CONSULTING ACTIVITIES AND AGREEMENTS

The terms of consulting and non-disclosure agreements between faculty and external organizations must be consistent with all of the following requirements:

1. Koç University is not a party to consulting or non-disclosure agreements between faculty and external organizations, shall have no obligations or potential liability under the agreements, and its rights may not be impaired in any way by the agreement. The university does not provide indemnity for these activities.

2. Consultant’s Obligations to Koç University
   - Consulting is permitted provided the faculty member’s full-time obligation to the University is met.
   - KU faculty members owe their primary professional allegiance to KU, and their primary commitment of time and intellectual energies should be to the education, research, and scholarship programs of the institution. Outside professional activities must not detract from a faculty’s full-time obligation to these duties.

3. Limitations on time spent as a consultant and type of responsibilities
   - The maximum number of consulting days permissible for faculty on a full-time appointment is 1 day per week throughout the year, including during the time of paid annual vacation.
   - A faculty member on full-time active duty or sabbatical leave must not have outside managerial responsibilities and may not have titles that imply otherwise, regardless of actual consulting duties.

4. Restrictions concerning students and research staff
   - The academic activities of students and postdoctoral scholars must be free from the personal commercial and consulting interest of the faculty member.
   - The work of students, staff, postdoctoral scholars and collaborators must not be exploited in the course of a faculty member’s outside obligations.
   - Faculty may not hire or directly supervise a KU student in employment activities outside the University while serving as the student’s advisor or as a participant on the student’s dissertation committee without written approval.

5. Restrictions on use of University resources
   - KU facilities, personnel and equipment may not be used except in a purely incidental way, as part of outside consulting activities.
• Preferential access to research results, materials or products generated from University teaching or research activities may not be provided to an outside entity for personal financial gain.

• Confidential information acquired through conduct of University business or research activities may not be used for personal gain, or to grant unauthorized access to others; confidential information includes any information that comes into your possession as a result of your employment by KU that is not broadly available to the general public.

6. Ownership of intellectual property

• KU owns the title to all potentially patentable inventions conceived, or first reduced to practice, in whole or in part, by faculty in the course of University responsibilities, or with more than incidental use of University resources, and must be assigned to the University. Faculty members do not have the authority to assign or otherwise transfer rights in any of the University’s inventions.

• Any publication, invention, discovery, improvement, or other intellectual property that results solely and directly from Consultant’s services either alone or with employees of or other consultants or advisors to the external organization are not subject to KU disclosure and ownership policies.

7. Use of Koç University name

• The KU name and logo may not be used in any consulting activities.

• The office address of the consultant may be used for convenient communication.

8. Authorship, speaking and marketing activities

• If a faculty member is listed as an author on any publication resulting from performance of consulting services, a disclosure should be included stating that "Dr./Professor [NAME]'s contribution to this publication was as a paid consultant, and was not part of his/her Koç University duties or responsibilities”.
  
  • The same disclosure should be given in speaking activities related to consulting services.

  • KU School of Medicine faculty are prohibited from publishing articles under his/her own name that are written in whole or material part by company employees.

• KU School of Medicine Faculty are not permitted to participate in dedicated marketing and training programs designed solely or predominantly for sales or marketing purposes. All faculty are strongly discouraged from performing any sales, marketing, or promotional services for the company requesting consulting services. This includes promotional marketing activities to academic colleagues, clinical colleagues, the media, the public or as an exhibitor.
A.9. Guidelines for the Recruitment of Professoriate

The Founding Vision & Goals of our institution is to strive to be a center of excellence in order to provide a world-class education to its students, to create new knowledge & apply that knowledge for the benefit of society and to equip our students with the highest sense of ethics, social awareness & responsibility.

Hiring the best faculty and incentivizing them for excellence in cutting-edge scientific research is the only means of ensuring the future of our institution as an outstanding research university and a global center of excellence in science & education. Recruitment of the best undergraduate & graduate students, and promotion of interdisciplinary thinking are also important dimensions of our Founding Vision & Mission.

The purpose of this document is to outline the guidelines for recruitment of the best possible research faculty across the board in all of our Colleges & Departments. In this connection, it is important to note that our university can only be as good as its faculty, and that the collective wisdom of all of our faculty members must be brought to bear in the development of all of our diverse Colleges & Departments. We must strive to encourage interdisciplinary understanding, awareness & cooperation across our university, because we are the only university in the region that has been able to capture global excellence across the board in all disciplines, ranging from Administrative Sciences, Engineering, Sciences, Humanities & Social Sciences, Law and Medicine.

Recruitment of Academic & Research Faculty (i.e., Professoriate) embodies a long term commitment to develop, promote and maintain that faculty member on its ranks for the long term, often until the retirement age. Accordingly, recruitment of such faculty at Koç University is initially facilitated by budgetary allocation for faculty growth by the Board of Trustees. When there is budgetary allocation, the recruitment process starts with the allocation of a faculty position billet by the President, upon discussions with/among Deans and the President.

Once a faculty billet is allocated for a particular position at a department(s) & College(s), a Faculty Search Committee is appointed by the President. The Committee is chaired by the Dean(s) of the relevant College(s) and typically consists of two members from the relevant program(s) and two additional members from other Colleges & Schools of the University.

The presence of the faculty members from the relevant department is expected to ensure full participation in the process of faculty from the particular discipline. The presence of Committee members from outside the College is expected to enhance interdisciplinary awareness among faculty, to promote transparency of the entire process and to ensure that university-wide global criteria and standards are upheld. Such involvement also allows all faculty members to be exposed to the most important process of the university, i.e., the recruitment and hiring of faculty who will conduct cutting edge research.
The Search Committee has the ultimate responsibility for the conduct of the search, for the selection of candidates invited for interview and for the formulation of the recommendation for the President. Since the circumstances of each Department & College are different and possibly unique, the particular details of the search process are expected to vary from case to case with adaptations made at the discretion of the Committee, as long as the ‘Guidelines’ articulated herein are kept in mind and adhered to.

The Search Committee starts its work by preparing a position description to be advertised for a worldwide search to attract high quality applications. Upon approval of the position description by the President, the Faculty Search commences with the posting of the position description at various outlets.

Normally, a large number of applications are received for Faculty Searches at Koç University. The Committee members from the relevant program or department(s) conduct discussions with all of their departmental faculty colleagues to prepare a short-list of candidates. It should be noted that the departmental evaluation of applications in terms of assessment of the technical quality of the scholarly work of the applicant in a manner and level suitable to the particular discipline and identification of candidates to be short-listed is of paramount importance. Accordingly, the Dean and the two Committee members from the relevant department must ensure the active participation of all faculty members in the process of evaluations and the identification of the short-listed candidates. As the Chair of the Search Committee, the Dean may be part of these departmental discussions as an observer when he/she feels the need to do so. The short-list of candidates is then sent to the Committee Chair (Dean), together with a list of other candidates who were worthy of discussion but for one reason or other remained just below the short list.

The Search Committee subsequently deliberates extensively to identify a number of candidates (typically 3 to 4 or more as needed) to be invited for interview. The invitees are typically chosen from among the short-list submitted by the department, but other candidates who were just below the short-list and who were listed as candidates worthy of discussion may also be invited.

In some cases, applications may be received over a period of many months or even throughout the entire academic year, in which case the candidate folders may be periodically evaluated as they arrive, with decisions as to whether or not candidates should be short-listed spread over a period of time. In such cases, the departmental evaluation and suggestions for candidates to be short-listed are still of primary importance, but the ultimate decision as to whether to invite a candidate for interview still resides with the Search Committee.

Once a candidate is invited, it is important that faculty members from the relevant department actively participate in the interview process and especially attend the seminar presented by the candidate. Such participation by faculty members of the relevant department should be strongly encouraged by both the Dean and the two departmental members of the Search Committee. In the end, the departmental assessment of the technical quality of the scholarly work of the applicant, in a manner suitable to the particular discipline is of paramount importance. It also goes without saying that all Search Committee Members must do all they can to participate in the
interview visits of the candidates and be present during their presentations.

Upon the completion of the interview visits, all faculty members from the relevant department are invited to provide their individual assessments of the interviewed candidates. These assessments are provided in writing (email) only to the Committee Chair (Dean) and must normally be kept strictly confidential. The Dean may share these comments with the Search Committee as needed, either directly (verbatim) or anonymously (in the form of a synopsis of the comments) during the discussions of the Search Committee.

Upon detailed deliberations of all candidates interviewed, the Search Committee prepares a recommendation for the President, which may involve a single candidate for appointment or multiple candidates to be evaluated by the President. Alternatively, the Search Committee may recommend that no appointment be made at that time, since none of the candidates are worthy of further consideration.

For Assistant/Associate Professor appointments, the President brings the dossier to the University Executive Council for information and informal counsel, after which the President decides to submit the appointment for final approval to the Board of Trustees. For appointments at the level of Full Professor, the dossier is brought to the University Executive Council for formal discussion and endorsement, upon which the President submits the appointment to the Board of Trustees for final approval.