



UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN
COLLEGE OF ACCOUNTING

GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC STAFF

*(including guidelines for ad hominem promotion,
excellence awards, merit awards and expected performance)*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

UCT COLLEGE OF ACCOUNTING: SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC STAFF

1. SCOPE OF THESE GUIDELINES	2
2. PRINCIPLES OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION	2
2.1 Categories of performance evaluation.....	2
2.1.1 <i>Scholarship</i>	2
2.1.2 <i>Teaching & Learning</i>	2
2.1.3 <i>Leadership & Management</i>	3
2.1.4 <i>Public & Professional Service (including Social Responsiveness)</i>	3
2.3 Determining scores for each category	3
2.4 Determining the weighted average score	4
3. REGULAR PERFORMANCE REVIEW	4
3.1 High performance	4
3.2 Expected performance	4
3.3 Under-performance	5
3.4 Unsatisfactory performance	5
4. AD HOMINEM PROMOTION	5
4.1 Eligibility for ad hominem promotion	5
4.2 Performance evaluation for ad hominem promotion	5
4.3 Application for ad hominem promotion	5
4.4 Referees	6
5. EXCELLENCE AND MERIT AWARDS.....	6
5.1 Excellence awards	6
5.2 Merit awards	6
5.3 Performance evaluation for an excellence or merit award	7
5.4 Application for an excellence or merit award	7
6. THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PORTFOLIO	8
7. THE SCHOLARSHIP REVIEW	10
8. PROMOTION & AWARDS: RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CANDIDATE, HEAD OF COLLEGE AND DEAN	11
8.1 Responsibilities of the candidate	11
8.2 Responsibilities of the Head of College	11
8.3 Responsibilities of the Dean	12
8.4 Responsibilities of the HR practitioner.....	13
9. PURPOSE, COMPOSITION AND PROCEDURES OF THE FPRC	15
RANK: PROFESSOR	17
RANK: PROFESSOR (continued)	18
RANK: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	19
RANK: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (continued).....	20
RANK: SENIOR LECTURER.....	21
RANK: SENIOR LECTURER (continued)	22
RANK: LECTURER.....	23
RANK: LECTURER (continued)	24
VISION	25
MISSION	25

1. SCOPE OF THESE GUIDELINES

These guidelines apply to all academic staff members within the College of Accounting, with the following exceptions:

- Academic staff formally employed as academic teachers
- Academic staff formally employed as research officers

2. PRINCIPLES OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

The principles contained in this section apply to all forms of performance evaluation, regardless of whether the performance evaluation is conducted as part of the regular performance evaluation cycle, or as part of an application for ad hominem promotion or an excellence or merit award.

2.1 Categories of performance evaluation

Performance evaluation includes an evaluation of the staff member's contribution in four categories: scholarship; teaching & learning; leadership & management; and public & professional service (including social responsiveness).

This section sets out the activities that are relevant in determining the performance of a staff member within each category. The period of activities used to evaluate a staff member's performance will depend on the reason for the performance evaluation (e.g. a staff member will regularly be assessed over the performance cycle of four years, but where he/she applies for promotion, all of his/her activities during his/her career would be relevant).

2.1.1 Scholarship

A good, fully competent scholar contributes to knowledge in his/her field of scholarship, at a level appropriate to his/her rank (see Appendix A for specific performance expectations at each academic rank). An academic staff member should not simply be recognised as an expert in his/her (sub)discipline(s), as the performance evaluation is done mostly by academics in other (sub)disciplines; the staff member must also be able to show how he/she has made contributions to knowledge in his/her field of scholarship. Such evidence may consist of a wide variety of activities, including: papers in academic journals; major research projects such as masters or doctoral dissertations; chapters in books; authorship of books; articles in professional journals; participation in conferences; applied research reports; seeking and obtaining research funding; being rated as a researcher by a recognised research body (e.g. NRF); policy documents for public bodies, companies and civil society agencies; publications resulting from consultation to a profession closely linked to the staff member's field of scholarship; professional and private work based on the staff member's academic skills and which contributes to scholarship in Commerce. Senior staff members will also be recognised for assisting junior staff in making contributions to scholarship. To the extent that a staff member's contributions to knowledge are produced via membership of a committee such as a regulatory body, a formal performance evaluation requires an independent confirmation of the staff member's role in the publication of the documents produced by the body, and of the fact that these documents do constitute a contribution to knowledge.

Note that the above list is not exhaustive, nor is every instance of one of the abovementioned activities in fact a contribution to knowledge (e.g. some books, some professional journal articles and many publications resulting from professional consultations do not contribute to knowledge).

2.1.2 Teaching & Learning

A good, fully competent teacher uses communication skills, innovative thinking, scholarship and/or developments in the field to contribute effectively to student learning, as a teacher of undergraduates, a teacher of postgraduates, and/or a supervisor of postgraduate research projects (see Appendix A for

specific performance expectations at each academic rank). As with scholarship, the staff member must be able to show how he/she has contributed to teaching & learning. Evidence would typically include: student evaluations; external examiners' reports; information relating to the number and range of research projects supervised at senior undergraduate, honours, masters and/or doctoral level; information relating to the development and effectiveness of learning materials; explanations of how student assessments are aligned with measurable learning outcomes; UCT Distinguished Teacher Award nominations or awards; any other teaching award; the use of the staff member's teaching material by other teachers; invitations to serve as an external examiner at other institutions; and/or assessments, if any, by colleagues or others charged with evaluating the staff member's teaching.

2.1.3 Leadership & Management

A good, fully competent leader or manager is not simply a member of the College, but also participates effectively in the administration of courses, of the College, of the Faculty, and/or of the University. This may be achieved by means of a wide variety of activities, including: successfully fulfilling leadership and administrative functions, for example as Deputy Dean, Head of College, convenor of courses, programmes and/or orientation activities, and/or curriculum advisor; serving on or leading College, Faculty or University committees; serving on or leading the executive committee of the Academics Union; organisation of academic conferences, colloquia and workshops; writing and/or coordinating proposals for fundraising; establishing and/or directing research projects, groups and/or teams; participation in training courses on teaching & learning; and providing intellectual leadership by stimulating debate and discussion, proposing new scholarship and teaching initiatives, mentoring junior staff and generally contributing to a collegial and intellectually creative culture. See Appendix A for specific performance expectations at each academic rank.

2.1.4 Public & Professional Service (including Social Responsiveness)

A staff member's score in this category is determined by his/her contributions, based on his/her academic skills, to bodies outside the University. This may be done in a variety of ways, including: serving as an office-bearer and active member of a professional society; serving as an editor of, or adviser to, professional and research journals; serving on national committees and agencies concerned with tertiary education and/or scholarship; serving as a member of, or adviser to, governmental and other regulatory bodies; serving as an external examiner to another institution; being asked to give public lectures or participating in public education; assisting other Universities and/or other entities with educational and/or transformational objectives; according service to NGOs, including participation in committees and councils, as well as contributions to policy forums; and communicating and diffusing the results of academic expertise and scholarship to the public media. Senior staff members will also be recognised for assisting junior staff in making contributions to public and professional service. See Appendix A for specific performance expectations at each academic rank.

Note that some overlap exists between this category and other categories, notably cases such as serving as an external examiner to another institution, and drafting policy documents for public bodies. Such activities may provide evidence of the strength of a staff member's teaching or scholarship, while at the same time being a socially responsive public service by the staff member. For example, the fact that the staff member has been moved to accept an invitation to act as an external examiner should in no way diminish the implication of the invitation for his/her expertise as a teacher.

2.3 Determining scores for each category

For all formal performance evaluation processes, a score out of 10 will be assigned in each category, relative to the staff member's current job level, using the tables included in Appendix A.

Note that the tables include examples of activities which would provide evidence to substantiate a certain score. These are not exhaustive lists: any activity should be considered if it satisfies one of the conditions described in section 2.1 above. Furthermore, a staff member need not engage in all of the listed activities:

it is appreciated that individuals will vary in the balance of emphasis amongst their activities. Of course, when a staff member exhibits just one or two instances of the examples for a particular score, this does not necessarily imply that the score is deserved.

The language in these tables is necessarily imprecise: for example, whether an activity is “effective”, “substantial” or “satisfactory” is relative, and should be judged with due consideration given to top performers in each category at each job level, and within each field of study. The imprecision is necessary because the number and variety of relevant activities within the College makes it impracticable to stipulate a score at each job level for a certain frequency, quality, quantity and nature of each activity, especially given that most staff members will exhibit a mix of such activities.

2.4 Determining the weighted average score

A staff member’s optimum weighted average score out of 10 will be obtained by weighting each category within the following permissible ranges (such that the total is 100%):

Scholarship	25 – 50%
Teaching & Learning	25 – 50%
Leadership & Management	10 – 25%
Public & Professional Service (including Social Responsiveness)	10 – 25%

Note that, if in the process of a formal performance evaluation, a determination is made that a staff member’s score in one or more categories should be adjusted, and if a different set of permissible weighting would optimise the overall score of the staff member, then the new optimised weightings should be used.

3. REGULAR PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The University policy on performance management processes requires the Head of College to conduct a performance review of each staff member in the College every four years, with biennial reviews conducted on the basis of a completed HR174. Face-to face interviews take place at least twice in a four-year cycle: in the fourth year, and ideally in the second year. In addition, an interview will take place in any year if requested by the Head of College or by the staff member, and for any staff member who is likely to be a candidate for promotion or an excellence or merit award in that year. Assessment of the Head of College will be carried out by the Dean.

The staff member may be assessed as exhibiting high performance, expected performance, under-performance or unsatisfactory performance. The assessment will be approved by the Dean. A staff member has the right to appeal directly to the Dean where he/she is not satisfied with the outcome of his/her assessment by the Head of College.

3.1 High performance

In cases of high performance, a staff member may be nominated or apply either for ad hominem promotion (see section 4) or for an excellence or merit award (see section 5).

3.2 Expected performance

To meet expected performance, a weighted average score of 5 or above must be achieved for scholarship, teaching & learning, leadership & management and public & professional service (including social responsiveness). In addition, at the Associate Professor and Professor levels, a minimum score of 5 must be achieved for scholarship and for teaching & learning.

Academic staff achieving these levels of performance over a 4-year period will be deemed to have met the performance expectations associated with their academic rank for the following 4-year performance cycle.

3.3 Under-performance

Academic staff who fall slightly below the expected level but who have a weighted average score of at least 4.5 and in the case of Professor a score of at least 4 for scholarship, will be considered as under-performers. Under-performers will be counselled by the Head of College and possibly put on a performance improvement plan with the aim of achieving expected performance levels within a designated period. The staff member will be subject to annual performance evaluation during this period.

3.4 Unsatisfactory performance

Academic staff with a weighted average score of below 4.5 and/or in the case of Professor a score of below 4 for scholarship, will be considered as unsatisfactory performers until their performance returns to the expected level as defined above. Staff falling into the unsatisfactory performance category, will be placed on a performance improvement plan with the aim of achieving expected performance levels within a designated period. The staff member will be subject to annual performance evaluation during this period.

4. AD HOMINEM PROMOTION

Promotion, if granted, will take the form of movement from the present rank to a more senior rank. Promotion will not be subject to Faculty quotas.

4.1 Eligibility for ad hominem promotion

All permanent members of the academic staff in the ranks of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and Associate Professor whose appointments have been confirmed may apply for ad hominem promotion.

4.2 Performance evaluation for ad hominem promotion

Candidates' performance during their entire academic careers is relevant to assessment for ad hominem promotion. If a candidate has been promoted, special attention will be paid to the candidate's performance since that promotion. Decisions about ad hominem promotion are made by the Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee (FPRC). To be eligible for ad hominem promotion, a staff member must meet expected performance requirements (see 3.2) and:

- Score a 7 or higher in three of the four performance categories; and
- Have a weighted average score of 8 or higher; and
- Where applying for promotion to Professor, score an 8 or higher in the category of scholarship
- Where applying for promotion to Associate Professor, score a 7 or higher in the category of scholarship

4.3 Application for ad hominem promotion

As a consequence of the regular performance review, members of academic staff may be recommended by their Head of College for ad hominem promotion. Alternatively, an academic staff member has the right, even if not nominated, to apply for promotion.

A candidate for ad hominem promotion, whether a nominee or an applicant, must submit the following documents to the Dean's Office by the ad hominem application deadline: a covering letter, a full *curriculum vitae*, a completed HR174 and HR175, and a performance evaluation portfolio (see section 6). No more documentation should be submitted. The covering letter should indicate:

- that the candidate is applying for ad hominem promotion

- the names and contact details of three referees, who will be contacted to verify aspects of the candidate's application (see section 4.4).

The ad hominem application deadline will be announced each year with sufficient time for candidates to prepare their applications. No late applications will be considered.

4.4 Referees

The names and details of at least three referees are required for ad hominem promotion. It is the candidate's responsibility to establish the referees' willingness, and to send them any personal documentation relevant to their report (e.g. a *curriculum vitae*). Only current referee reports will be accepted for an ad hominem promotion application. Note that, at the senior levels, international recognition of scholarship is a prerequisite, and it would be advantageous to include at least two respected, international referees.

It is essential that all referees' reports arrive well before the meetings scheduled for the FPRC, in order to allow for a proper assessment of candidates. This, in addition to the responsibilities listed above, candidates are responsible for informing referees of the deadline for their reports, and of the importance of meeting the deadline.

5. EXCELLENCE AND MERIT AWARDS

Excellence and merit awards imply a payment at levels above the Standard Academic Salary Package (SASP). They reward high achievement (above the high standards expected of academic staff at the University) in the categories in which academic staff are assessed. Merit and excellence awards are subject to budgetary constraints. The number of awards which can be made in any given year will depend on a number of factors including the number and ranks of those academic staff members already receiving an award, and also the number, ranks and quality of candidates in the given year.

5.1 Excellence awards

A permanent academic staff member who occupies the rank of Professor may apply or be nominated for an excellence award (the staff member's appointment need not have been confirmed). There are two categories of excellence awards: "Excellence 1" recognises excellent performance, while "Excellence 2" recognises truly outstanding performance. Excellence awards will be determined annually, as a percentage of the standard CoE package. Excellence awards are paid monthly, are pensionable, and are usually applied for four years.

5.2 Merit awards

A permanent academic staff member who occupies the rank of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer or Associate Professor may apply or be nominated for a merit award (the staff member's appointment need not have been confirmed). Merit awards are determined annually, as a percentage of the standard CoE package. Merit awards are made for a period of two years, with effect from the year following that in which the assessment is made. They are paid as a lump sum annually, and are non-pensionable. Merit awards apply at the current rank of the staff member, and fall away on promotion to a higher rank. Subject to the budget, Faculties have the discretion to award different numbers of merit awards at the different academic ranks (i.e. the percentage of academic staff in receipt of merit awards in one rank may be higher or lower than that in another rank).

5.3 Performance evaluation for an excellence or merit award

Candidates' performance should be assessed since their appointment, most recent promotion, or most recent successful merit or excellence award application, whichever is more recent (limited to the last four years).

Recommendations about merit and excellence awards are made by the Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee (FPRC) to the DVC responsible for academic matters, following a similar procedure as for decisions about ad hominem promotions.

To be eligible for a merit award, a staff member must, in the FPRC's view:

- Score an 8 or higher in one performance category, which must be either Teaching & Learning or Scholarship
- Have a weighted average score of 7 or higher.

To be eligible for an excellence award, a staff member must, in the FPRC's view:

- Score an 8 or higher in two performance categories, of which one must be either Teaching & Learning or Scholarship
- Have a weighted average score of 7 or higher.

5.4 Application for an excellence or merit award

As a consequence of the regular performance review, members of academic staff may be nominated by their Head of College for an excellence or merit award. Alternatively, an academic staff member has the right, even if not nominated, to apply for an award.

In addition to the candidates who have applied specifically for a merit award, the FPRC may also consider for a merit award any candidate for promotion whom it considers to have demonstrated excellent performance despite not meeting the conditions required for promotion. In these cases, the merit award should not be considered a consolation for a failed promotion application, but rather as the more appropriate way to recognise a staff member's meritorious achievement at this stage of his/her career. Thus, if a staff member is hopeful for a merit award in the event that his/her application for promotion is unsuccessful, there is no need to apply both for promotion and for a merit award. If a staff member does apply for both, no merit award will be given if his/her application for promotion is successful.

A candidate for an excellence or merit award, whether a nominee or an applicant, must submit the following documents to the Dean's Office by the awards application deadline: a covering letter, a full *curriculum vitae*, a completed HR174 and HR175, and a performance evaluation portfolio similar to that submitted by candidates for ad hominem promotion (see section 6). No more documentation should be submitted. The covering letter should indicate:

- that the candidate is applying for an excellence or merit award
- the names and contact details of three referees, who may be asked to verify aspects of the candidate's application.

Note that, unlike for ad hominem promotion, the referees will be contacted at the FPRC's discretion. It is the candidate's responsibility to establish the referees' willingness, to send them any relevant personal documentation (e.g. a *curriculum vitae*), and to explain that they need only prepare a report if contacted by a representative of the FPRC.

The awards application deadline will be announced each year with sufficient time for candidates to prepare their applications. No late applications will be considered.

6. THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PORTFOLIO

In addition to a covering letter, a full *curriculum vitae*, and a completed HR174 and HR175, an application for ad hominem promotion and/or for an excellence or merit award should include a performance evaluation portfolio. This portfolio should be 4 to 10 pages in length, and should describe the candidate's most recent activity (limited to the past four years). It should include the following information:

- **Scholarship activities:**

- A list of activities which constitute contributions to knowledge in the candidate's field(s) of scholarship (see section 2.1.1 for examples of relevant activities).
- An explanation as to how each of the activities listed contributes to knowledge. This explanation may be as brief or lengthy as required to make the candidate's case. Often, for example in the case of papers in academic journals, peer-review is inherent in the publication process, and (because it is the essence of academic journals to publish new findings) neither the explanation required of the candidate, nor the confirmation by his/her representative, will be extensive. In other cases, the candidate's contribution to knowledge is not self-evident, for example as a participant in the drafting of policy documents for a public body. In these cases, in order for a candidate's activities to be regarded as a contribution to knowledge, the candidate will be required to explain in detail how this should be the case.
- Sufficient evidence to assess the quality of the candidate's contributions to knowledge, including: the rating and/or circulation of journals; the extent of the candidate's personal contribution to publications with multiple authors; the number and context of citations by other scholars; the extent of use of the candidate's publications at other academic institutions; any awards, independent reviews, or other relevant comments on the candidate's scholarship activities; whether a conference was local, national or international; whether participation in a conference involved a poster, presentation or a keynote presentation, and whether the participation was by invitation; the extent of the candidate's personal contribution to policy documents as a member of a group; independent evidence of the impact that a candidate's work has had on the practice of his/her field; the status of referees, if any, commenting on a candidate's contribution to knowledge; etc.
- Where a staff member is applying for ad hominem promotion, or where scholarship is one of the categories in which a candidate for an excellence or merit award claims to have exhibited exceptionally high achievement:
 - Note that the scholarship review procedure will also provide an objective account of the candidate's scholarship activities (see section 7).
 - Where any activity listed by the candidate in this category is not peer-reviewed as a normal consequence of publication, the candidate is encouraged to supply the name of a referee who can confirm that the activity is indeed a contribution to knowledge, and who can comment on the quality and impact of the activity. It is the candidate's responsibility to inform the referee that he/she is required to provide such confirmation in the referee's report. The FPRC will consider the objectivity and qualifications of the referee in deciding the extent to which the activity should be recognised as a legitimate contribution to knowledge.

- **Teaching & learning activities:**

- A list of all courses taught, indicating whether they are undergraduate or postgraduate courses
- Details of research projects supervised at undergraduate, honours, masters and/or doctoral level
- Evidence of teaching performance (see section 2.1.2 for examples of relevant evidence)
- A "teaching manifesto": a description of pedagogical approach; innovative teaching methods; participation in curriculum and/or programme design; and involvement in the development of new course materials

- **Leadership & management activities:**

- A list of the candidate's leadership & management activities during the evaluation period (see section 2.1.3 for examples of relevant activities)
- An explanation of how each listed activity is a valuable contribution.
- A description of the complexity and time-consuming nature of each activity listed.

- **Public & professional service (including social responsiveness) activities:**

- A list of the candidate's contributions, based on the candidate's academic skills, to bodies outside the University (see section 2.1.4 for examples of relevant activities)
- An explanation of how each listed activity is a valuable contribution.
- A description of the complexity and time-consuming nature of each activity listed.

7. THE SCHOLARSHIP REVIEW

The scholarship review (SR) procedure will provide the Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee (FPRC) with an unbiased and independent view of the quality of scholarship of the staff member who is being put forward for promotion or a merit award. Furthermore, this system would only apply to staff seeking promotion to Associate Professor or Professor level as the scholarship requirement for promotion to Senior Lecturer is generally the completion of a Master's degree, which has its own quality control procedures. This system would also apply in applications for merit / excellent awards in those unique instances where scholarship is one of the categories in which the applicant has exhibited exceptionally high achievement. The system will work as follows:

- 7.1 Staff member indicates intention (to Head of College) to apply for:
Ad hominem promotion to Associate Professor / Professor; or an Excellence / merit award where Scholarship is one of the categories in which they have exhibited exceptionally high achievement.

The staff member may also present a list of names of those whom he/she would not want to act as a reviewer of their scholarship.
- 7.2 The Head of College nominates at least three appropriate 'experts' (i.e. Reviewers who have the requisite skills to evaluate scholarship activities) in the applicant's field of scholarship. These scholarship reviewers will be academics or practitioners who are recognised as leaders in their fields, who are independent of the College and who will be requested to review the applicant's scholarship activities and be able to comment on the relevance of the applicant's scholarship to the accounting profession. In the case of an applicant who is seeking promotion to professor the reviewer should be able to comment on the international standing of the applicant's scholarship. Furthermore, scholarship reviewers for candidates applying to be promoted to professorial rank must themselves have an established international reputation. These scholarship reviewers are akin to the external examiners who examine a post graduate thesis or the blind reviewer of articles submitted to refereed journals. The names of these individuals and a brief CV are submitted to the Advisory Board.
- 7.3 The three scholarship reviewers are ranked by the Advisory Board according to suitability (i.e. expertise, independence, etc.).
- 7.4 The Head of College approaches the two most suitable scholarship reviewers as identified by the Advisory Board and requests a crisp and concise written evaluation of the applicant's scholarship activities. This evaluation should explain whether, and if so, how, the scholarship activities constitute a contribution to knowledge, comment and conclude on the quality, impact and relevance of the scholarship activities to the vision and mission of the College.
If a suitable reviewer is unavailable then the next most suitable reviewer will be approached.
- 7.5 The scholarship reviewers submit the written evaluation directly to HR for inclusion in the portfolio presented to the FPRC.

7.6 Additionally:

- The requirement for the applicant to submit the names of referees will still be applicable.
- The scholarship review would be independent of the applicant.
- The decision to consider, and the authority to make recommendations on, ad hominem promotions and excellence and merit awards will remain exclusively with the FPRC.

8. PROMOTION & AWARDS: RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CANDIDATE, HEAD OF COLLEGE AND DEAN

This section summarises the role played by the candidate, the candidate's Head of College and the Dean in the ad hominem promotions and excellence and merit awards process.

8.1 Responsibilities of the candidate

- A candidate is expected to be familiar with, and observe, the guidelines contained in this document
- A candidate is expected to be familiar with, and observe, the application deadlines
- If he/she is unclear about any aspect of the guidelines or deadlines, it is the responsibility of a candidate to ask the Head of College or the HR practitioner for assistance
- Whether the original idea to apply for promotion or an award came from the Head of College or from the candidate him/herself, once the candidate has decided to apply, he/she is solely responsible for:
 - Arranging timeous meetings with the Head of College
 - Providing the Head of College with sufficient information to prepare for these meetings
 - Preparing and collecting all necessary documentation for the application, as indicated in these guidelines
 - Submitting all necessary documentation to the Dean's Office by the deadline
 - Informing all referees of the details required to be communicated to them, as indicated in these guidelines

8.2 Responsibilities of the Head of College

General

- The meetings between the Head of College (HoC) and the candidate constitute a serious, lengthy process where too narrow a focus on the most outstanding performances and/or the most recent performances should be guarded against. Note that for ad hominem promotion, a candidate's entire academic career is relevant, whereas excellence or merit award applicants will be assessed since their appointment, most recent promotion, or most recent successful merit or excellence award application, whichever is more recent (limited to the last four years).
- The HoC should recognise a staff member's right to apply for promotion without the HoC's support; in such cases the HoC should still assist the candidate in collating a performance evaluation portfolio
- When presenting to the FPRC, the HoC has an obligation to represent a candidate fairly and honestly

Process

- The HoC may recommend that the staff member apply for promotion or an excellence or merit award, or the candidate may announce his/her intention to apply
- If the HoC does not support the candidate's application, the HoC should make this clear to the candidate, and should advise the candidate of his/her right to apply without the HoC's support
- The HoC should provide the candidate with guidelines to prepare a portfolio
- The HoC and candidate meet to finalise the portfolio and performance scores (to be filled in on the HR175); in case of disagreement regarding performance and performance scores, such differences will form part of the presentation to the Committee
- The HoC may be required to meet the candidate an additional time to finalise the application

- In the case of a candidate for ad hominem promotion to the level of associate professor or professor, or a candidate for an excellence or merit award who claims that scholarship is one of the categories in which he/she has exhibited exceptionally high achievement, the HoC follows the procedure (outlined in Section 7) to appoint two scholarship reviewers. The HoC prepares the case for presentation to the preliminary meeting (attended by the Faculty of Commerce representatives and servicing officer of the FPRC): he/she should anticipate questions and queries, and try to ensure that his/her information is complete and accurate
- When presenting to the FPRC, the HoC will present the score for each performance category, provide evidence for this score from the performance evaluation portfolio, and strengthen the evidence with additional support from referee reports, as appropriate
- The HoC should be prepared to provide compelling evidence and arguments for the score assigned, as the score may be challenged by the FPRC (each member will have assigned his/her own score)
- The HoC may need to revise and improve the case for the candidate, based on the preliminary meeting (attended by the Faculty of Commerce representatives and servicing officer of the FPRC), and follow up on questions arising from that meeting, before the FPRC meeting (which includes the DVC and external Deans)

8.3 Responsibilities of the Dean

The Dean is responsible for chairing the preliminary meeting (attended by the Faculty of Commerce representatives and servicing officer of the FPRC) and the FPRC meeting, ensuring adequate and accurate reporting of their recommendations, and providing meaningful feedback to candidates.

- The Dean liaises with Human Resources (HR) and ensures that all documentation is updated and sent timeously to all academic staff in the College
- The Dean assesses the performance of all Commerce Faculty Heads of Department, including the HoC, and ensures completion of their HR174 and HR175 forms, including a possible indication that they will be applying for ad hominem promotion and/or for excellence or merit awards.
- The Dean receives ad hominem promotion and/or excellence or merit award applications from all candidates.
- The Dean should ensure that the details of the membership of the FPRC are published in a Dean's Circular each year, prior to the deadline for applications for ad hominem promotion and excellence and merit awards.
- The Dean ensures, in collaboration with HR, that members of the FPRC are advised in good time of the dates of the two meetings, and that suitable alternative committee members are found to present the case for the HoC if the HoC is applying for ad hominem promotion and/or for an excellence or merit award. This would usually be another full professor from the College.
- The Dean monitors the progress of HR in obtaining referees' reports for each candidate, and assembling of documentation for the preliminary meeting (attended by the Faculty of Commerce representatives and servicing officer of the FPRC).
- The Dean ensures that all FPRC members are thoroughly familiar with the current College performance evaluation guidelines, and that they understand the key differences between the College guidelines and the guidelines which apply to academic staff in the rest of the Faculty.
- At the preliminary meeting, the Dean gives an overview of the current applications for ad hominem promotion, excellence awards and merit awards, clarifies the current guidelines, and outlines how the meeting will proceed.
- The Dean then asks Heads of Department to present the case for staff applying for ad hominem promotion from their Departments. Accordingly, the HoC will present the case for College staff. Usually the process would start with candidates of the lowest rank, and proceed through the ranks to those applying for promotion to Full Professor.
- The FPRC considers applications for merit and excellence awards at the same meetings as applications for ad hominem promotion, according to the performance evaluation requirements set out above. Usually the merit and excellence awards will be left to the end of each meeting.

- The Dean ensures that relevant minutes from recent FPRC meetings are available where a candidate's application history may be relevant.
- The Dean may request each committee member to supply his/her own rating of each candidate in the four performance categories. If so, these need to be captured, averaged and weighted using the optimal weightings.
- The Dean ensures after discussion pertaining to each candidate that, if the meeting is not unanimous, an anonymous "recommend promotion" / "do not recommend promotion" vote is taken for each candidate for promotion, and that the counts for and against promotion are recorded. A similar anonymous vote should take place in the case of candidates for excellence or merit awards.
- Any other important points, such as follow-up investigations required by the HoC on aspects of his/her candidates' portfolios, or conditions for future promotion or future applications, should also be noted.
- If a candidate is deemed not to be ready for promotion at this stage, the areas in which he/she is presently lacking, and the steps that would be necessary to rectify this, should be set out as clearly as is possible to ensure meaningful and helpful feedback later. This may also help discussion at the FPRC meeting.
- The Dean chairs the FPRC meeting, mentions any important general points at the start and asks external members if they have any comments. Once ground rules are confirmed, Heads of Department, including the HoC, are asked to present the case for their candidates.
- The Dean ensures that, after discussion, an anonymous "recommend promotion" / "do not recommend promotion" vote is taken for each candidate for promotion, and that the counts of votes of Commerce members and the external members are separately counted and recorded.
- The Dean is responsible for ensuring that any promotion candidates for whom the FPRC decides not to recommend promotion should be considered for a merit award.
- The Dean ensures that, after discussion, an anonymous "recommend award" / "do not recommend award" vote is taken for each candidate for a merit or excellence award, and that the counts of votes of Commerce members and the external members are separately counted and recorded.
- The Dean liaises with HR to ensure that the previous *aide memoire* is updated with relevant comments and decisions from the FPRC meeting, and checks the minutes timeously for accuracy and for adequate recording of information for feedback purposes.
- The HoC and the Dean prepare a developmental discussion document which the Dean will use as a guide for feedback to the unsuccessful candidates; this document is not handed to the candidate, but is provided to the HoC for developmental purposes.
- The Dean, and only the Dean, provides the candidate with feedback on the outcome of the promotion application within 2 weeks of the full process being concluded. (The Dean should remind members of the FPRC not to pre-empt the outcome by communicating any process information or non-ratified decisions to the candidate.) The Dean should prepare carefully for this discussion and be prepared to handle disappointment and/or anger from the unsuccessful candidate. The ideal outcome of this meeting would be the candidate leaving with a clear sense of how to improve his/her performance so that his/her next application will be successful.

8.4 Responsibilities of the HR practitioner

General

- This complicated and important process requires the assistance of two HR practitioners at the meetings.
- The HR practitioner assigned to the Faculty should ensure, together with the Dean, that adequate time, preparation and administrative oversight is allocated to the ad hominem promotion and excellence and merit awards process.
- The HR practitioner is responsible for the:
 - collation of all application information and documentation,
 - adequate and accurate recording of the preliminary meeting and the FPRC meeting,

- provision of meaningful administrative support to the ad hominem promotion and excellence and merit awards process
- provision of meaningful advice and support to the applicants themselves

Process

- The HR practitioner should, in consultation with the Dean, prepare a set of timelines for the full ad hominem promotion and excellence and merit awards process.
- The HR practitioner ensures that the abovementioned timelines, along with the various performance evaluation guidelines, are sent at the beginning of May each year to all permanent Commerce Faculty academic staff (including those at the GSB).
- The HR practitioner also ensures updated documents are placed on the web.
- The HR practitioner receives all the ad hominem promotion and excellence and merit award application forms and portfolios and other documentation from the Dean's Office the day after the application deadline and timeously follows up on any outstanding documentation.
- The HR practitioner checks all documentation received for completeness and advises on any further procedural and other requirements.
- The HR practitioner ensures, in collaboration with the Dean and his/her office, that members of the FPRC are advised in good time of the dates of the two meetings, and finds suitable alternative committee members to present the case for any Heads of Department who may be applying for Ad hominem promotion and/or excellence or merit awards.
- The HR practitioner timeously obtains referees' reports for each candidate, and assembles the relevant documentation for the preliminary meeting.
- The HR practitioner reminds the Dean to ensure that the details of the membership of the FPRC are published in a Dean's Circular each year, prior to the deadline for applications for ad hominem promotion and excellence and merit awards.
- The HR practitioner prepares a file containing all relevant, updated information regarding all candidates for each internal member of the FPRC, and sends the file to each member at least two weeks before the preliminary meeting, to ensure that there is sufficient opportunity to study the performance guidelines, candidates' applications, portfolios and referees' reports.
- The HR practitioner includes, in each file of information: the current relevant performance evaluation guidelines, the agenda for the meeting (with candidates being considered from the lowest to the highest ranks), the application documentation received from the candidates to be considered for ad hominem promotion and excellence and merit awards, and the minutes of previous meetings, if applicable.
- The HR practitioner services the preliminary meeting, ensuring that he/she has the following documentation and/or information and facilities available at the meeting:
 - A means to speedily and accurately calculate and report the individual scores and test the optimisation of weightings
 - A means to document, count, record and report on the votes via secret ballot
 - Relevant minutes from previous FPRC meetings, where a candidate's application history may be relevant
- The HR practitioner creates minutes: a suitably detailed and accurate account of the discussion for each candidate, including the key points relating to each candidate's application and the views of the committee members.
- At various points in the meeting, each committee member supplies his/her own rating of each candidate in the four performance categories. The HR practitioner then captures the individual scores, calculates the weighted average of the scores and immediately shares the results of the calculations with the committee.
- The HR practitioner, after discussion pertaining to each candidate at the preliminary meeting, administers the vote (distributing and collecting ballot papers) and reports on the outcome of the votes for all candidates, including those who applied for excellence and merit awards.

- Any other important points, such as follow-up investigations required by the HoD on aspects of his/her candidates' portfolios, or conditions for future promotion or future applications, are noted for action and follow up by the HR practitioner.
- If a candidate is deemed not to be ready for promotion at this stage, the areas in which he/she is presently lacking and the steps that would be necessary to rectify this are recorded by the HR practitioner in sufficient detail to facilitate meaningful and useful feedback by the Dean. This may also help discussion at the FPRC meeting.
- The HR practitioner ensures that the responsible DVC and other Deans who form part of the FPRC, receive full copies of the candidates' documentation to peruse in good time before the main FPRC meeting, in addition to a copy of the relevant performance evaluation guidelines, the agenda for the meeting and the approved minutes of the preliminary meeting.
- The HR practitioner, after discussion pertaining to each candidate at the FPRC meeting, administers the vote (distributing and collecting ballot papers) and reports on the outcome of the votes for all candidates, including those who applied for excellence and merit awards.
- The HR practitioner ensures that suitably detailed and accurate minutes are taken to facilitate adequate recording of information for feedback purposes.
- The HR practitioner prepares the file for approval by the Vice Chancellor indicating the membership of the FPRC, their recommendations, the minutes of the FPRC meeting and all pertinent information regarding all candidates.
- The HR practitioner hand delivers the file to the Vice Chancellor's office and awaits and receives the outcome from the Vice Chancellor's office.
- Once the outcome has been received, the HR practitioner informs the Dean's office and provides the detailed minutes of the FPRC meeting and a copy of the approval from the VC's office to facilitate the Dean's feedback sessions with the candidates.
- The HR practitioner supplies the necessary documentation regarding merit and excellence awards to assist the Dean in his/her preparation for the Committee of Deans' meeting. This documentation will include a list of the candidates, the motivation for each candidate, the minutes of the preliminary meeting and any other pertinent information that will assist the Dean with presenting the candidates' applications/nominations.

9. PURPOSE, COMPOSITION AND PROCEDURES OF THE FPRC

Purpose:

To give effect to, and make decisions arising from, the policy on performance management, including ad hominem promotion and excellence and merit awards.

Composition:

- The Dean
- A Deputy Vice Chancellor, nominated by the Vice Chancellor (external member)
- Two Deans from other Faculties, nominated by the Vice Chancellor (external members)
- The Dean of CHED (non-voting external member)
- Heads of each Department in the Faculty, e.g. the Heads of the College of Accounting, the School of Economics, the Department of Finance and Tax, the School of Management Studies, the Department of Information Systems, the Director of the GSB, etc.
- The Deputy Deans of the Faculty
- Other members as determined by the Dean.

Chairperson: The Dean of Commerce

Deputy Chairperson: A faculty member as designated by the Dean

Servicing Officer: The Faculty Human Resources practitioner

Terms of Reference:

The Committee receives applications for ad hominem promotions and excellence and merit awards, and is to:

- a) consider these
- b) recommend candidates for ad hominem promotion to the Vice Chancellor
- c) recommend awards of excellence to the DVC responsible for academic matters for approval by the meeting of the Deans.
- d) recommend merit awards to the DVC responsible for academic matters for approval by the meeting of Deans.

Procedures:

- The full FPRC meets once every year
- There is a preliminary meeting of Faculty of Commerce representatives and the servicing officer
- Recommendations for ad hominem promotion require a two-thirds majority vote of the FPRC in support. In addition, it requires the support of two out of the three external members.
- In the test for a candidate's eligibility for promotion or an excellence or merit award, the FPRC may at its discretion apply rounding to the scores determined for the candidate.
- Recommendations to the Vice Chancellor on ad hominem promotions must contain a copy of the candidate's application, and the names and details of the referees consulted. In the case of a promotion to the rank of Professor, the recommendation must contain the Committee's assessment that it is satisfied as to the international standing of the candidate's scholarship.
- The ad hominem decision is final. However, a candidate may request a review of the process if he/she believes that there may have been a significant degree of unfairness in the procedure or that the outcome was unreasonable in terms of the relevant performance evaluation guidelines. The request for a review must be submitted to the responsible Deputy Vice Chancellor, via the Dean, within 14 days of notification of the ad hominem outcome. Further details of the process can be obtained from the Human Resources Department.
- The Head of College will represent all candidates in the College, for all levels of promotion (i.e. Professor, Associate Professor, Senior Lecturer). In the event that the Head of College is a candidate for promotion, the Dean shall appoint a replacement to represent the HoC, and to vote in his/her place. The replacement will serve only while the HoC's case, and any other cases of ad hominem application to the rank to which the HoC is applying, are under consideration.
- No member of the FPRC may assess the merit or excellence award applications of other staff members if he/she is an applicant for a merit or excellent award him/herself.
- The DVC responsible for academic matters holds final authority for the approval of excellence and merit awards. There is no appeals process. However, if there is a breakdown in the process of application and assessment, the case will be addressed on an individual basis.

COLLEGE OF ACCOUNTING
GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC STAFF

RANK: PROFESSOR

OVERALL APPRAISAL	SCORE RANGE	SCHOLARSHIP	TEACHING & LEARNING	MANAGEMENT & LEADERSHIP	PUBLIC & PROFESSIONAL SERVICE (INCLUDING SOCIAL RESPONSIVENESS)
High performance	8 to 10	<p>Has international reputation as active expert in field. Is making regular, major contributions to knowledge of outstanding quality. The following activities will be recognised in determining whether a staff member has achieved at this level*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • papers in top-ranked international academic journals • strong international academic peer review of applied research reports, chapters in books, professional journals, and/or conference papers • keynote addresses at international research conferences • invitations to present research papers at overseas universities • regular citation and review • is a leader of a research group • recipient of awards for contributions to knowledge • attracts leaders in the discipline to UCT • has produced either a major research monograph or a major series of research articles and/or reports <p><i>The following activities do not necessarily constitute a contribution to knowledge. It is the staff member's responsibility to explain how the activity in his/her case contributes to knowledge. This will need to be confirmed by the HOC, and, in the case of applicants for promotion and/or awards, the SR (if applicable) and FPRC (see sections 6 & 7 of the guidelines):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • policy documents for public bodies, companies and civil society agencies; • publications resulting from consultation to a profession closely linked to the candidate's field of study; • professional and private work based on the staff member's academic skills and which contributes to scholarship in the College • authorship of textbooks • assisting junior staff in making contributions to scholarship in the College 	<p>Excellent teacher. Evidence includes*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • major contributions to undergraduate and/or postgraduate teaching • student evaluations, external and collegial reviews are good • provides leadership in curriculum design and development • scholarship interests reflected in teaching and in postgraduate supervision • is in demand as masters and doctoral supervisor, and is good supervisor • acts regularly as external examiner at undergraduate and postgraduate levels • recipient of teaching awards 	<p>Has contributed substantially to major leadership and/or administration roles at course, College, Faculty and/or University level, appropriate to Professor.</p>	<p>Has made outstanding contributions, based on his/her academic skills, to bodies outside the University, e.g. office bearer in professional society, or editor of journals or actively involved with historically disadvantaged Universities or other extension activities, as well as assisting junior staff in making contributions to public and professional service.*</p>

* This list is not exhaustive: any activity should be considered if it satisfies one of the conditions described in the guidelines for performance evaluation. Furthermore, a staff member need not engage in all of the listed activities: it is appreciated that individuals will vary in the balance of emphasis amongst their activities. Of course, when a staff member exhibits just one or two instances of the examples for a particular score, this does not necessarily imply that the score is deserved.

RANK: PROFESSOR (continued)

Good, fully competent performance	5 to 7	<p>Has international reputation as active in field. Is making regular and/or major contributions to knowledge of high quality. The following activities will be recognised in determining whether a staff member has achieved at this level*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • papers in international and top-ranked SA academic journals • strong academic peer review of applied research reports, chapters in books, professional journals, and/or conference papers • regularly presents papers to national and some international research conferences and seminars • regular citation and review • is a member of a research group • has produced either a major research monograph or a major series of research articles and/or reports <p><i>The following activities do not necessarily constitute a contribution to knowledge. It is the staff member's responsibility to explain how the activity in his/her case contributes to knowledge. This will need to be confirmed by the HOC, and, in the case of applicants for promotion and/or awards, by the SR (if applicable) and FPRC (see sections 6 & 7 of the guidelines):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • policy documents for public bodies, companies and civil society agencies; • publications resulting from consultation to a profession closely linked to the candidate's field of study; • professional and private work based on the staff member's academic skills and which contributes to scholarship in the College • authorship of textbooks • assisting junior staff in making contributions to scholarship in the College 	<p>Good teacher. Evidence includes*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • substantial contributions to undergraduate and/or postgraduate teaching • student evaluations, external and collegial reviews are good • active in curriculum design and development • scholarship interests reflected in teaching and in postgraduate supervision • active and good masters and doctoral supervisor • acts regularly as external examiner at undergraduate and/or postgraduate levels • recipient of teaching awards 	<p>Has contributed satisfactorily to substantial leadership and/or administration roles at course, College, Faculty and/or University level, appropriate to Professor.</p>	<p>Has made major contributions, based on his/her academic skills, to bodies outside the University, e.g. involved in some leadership capacity with journal, professional society, historically disadvantaged Universities or other extension work, as well as assisting junior staff in making contributions to public and professional service.*</p>
Under performance	3 to 4	<p>Has produced few contributions to knowledge of high quality in current cycle. Attends few research conferences and seminars.</p>	<p>Does not play full role in either undergraduate or postgraduate programmes.</p>	<p>Weak and unenthusiastic contribution</p>	<p>Has made some contribution</p>
Unsatisfactory performance	1 to 2	<p>Is not considered to be active in field. Does not draft applied research reports or policy documents.</p>	<p>Does not play a role in either undergraduate or postgraduate programmes.</p>	<p>Little or no contribution</p>	<p>Little or no activity</p>

* This list is not exhaustive: any activity should be considered if it satisfies one of the conditions described in the guidelines for performance evaluation. Furthermore, a staff member need not engage in all of the listed activities: it is appreciated that individuals will vary in the balance of emphasis amongst their activities. Of course, when a staff member exhibits just one or two instances of the examples for a particular score, this does not necessarily imply that the score is deserved.

**COLLEGE OF ACCOUNTING
GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC STAFF**

RANK: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

OVERALL APPRAISAL	SCORE RANGE	SCHOLARSHIP	TEACHING & LEARNING	MANAGEMENT & LEADERSHIP	PUBLIC & PROFESSIONAL SERVICE (INCLUDING SOCIAL RESPONSIVENESS)
High performance	8 to 10	<p>Has international reputation as active in field. Is making regular and/or major contributions to knowledge of high quality. The following activities will be recognised in determining whether a staff member has achieved at this level*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • papers in international and top-ranked SA academic journals • strong academic peer review of applied research reports, chapters in books, professional journals, and/or conference papers • regularly presents papers to national and some international research conferences and seminars • regular citation and review • is a member of a research group • has produced either a major research monograph or a major series of research articles and/or reports <p><i>The following activities do not necessarily constitute a contribution to knowledge. It is the staff member's responsibility to explain how the activity in his/her case contributes to knowledge. This will need to be confirmed by the HOC, and, in the case of applicants for promotion and/or awards, by the SR (if applicable) and FPRC (see sections 6 & 7 of the guidelines):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • policy documents for public bodies, companies and civil society agencies; • publications resulting from consultation to a profession closely linked to the candidate's field of study; • professional and private work based on the staff member's academic skills and which contributes to scholarship in the College • authorship of textbooks • assisting junior staff in making contributions to scholarship in the College 	<p>Excellent teacher. Evidence includes*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • substantial contributions to undergraduate and/or postgraduate teaching • student evaluations, external and collegial reviews are good • active in curriculum design and development • scholarship interests reflected in teaching and in postgraduate supervision • active and good masters and doctoral supervisor • acts regularly as external examiner at undergraduate and/or postgraduate levels • recipient of teaching awards 	<p>Has contributed satisfactorily to substantial leadership and/or administration roles at course, College, Faculty and/or University level, appropriate to Professor.</p>	<p>Has made major contributions, based on his/her academic skills, to bodies outside the University, e.g. involved in some leadership capacity with journal, professional society, historically disadvantaged Universities or other extension work, as well as assisting junior staff in making contributions to public and professional service.*</p>

* This list is not exhaustive: any activity should be considered if it satisfies one of the conditions described in the guidelines for performance evaluation. Furthermore, a staff member need not engage in all of the listed activities: it is appreciated that individuals will vary in the balance of emphasis amongst their activities. Of course, when a staff member exhibits just one or two instances of the examples for a particular score, this does not necessarily imply that the score is deserved.

RANK: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (continued)

Good, fully competent performance	5 to 7	<p>Has national reputation as active in field. Is making regular and/or substantial contributions to knowledge of quality . The following activities will be recognised in determining whether a staff member has achieved at this level*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • papers in SA and/or international academic journals • favourable academic peer review of applied research reports, chapters in books, professional journals, and/or conference papers • regularly presents papers to national research conferences and seminars • some citations and review • is a member of a research group • has produced either a major research monograph or a major series of research articles and/or reports <p><i>The following activities do not necessarily constitute a contribution to knowledge. It is the staff member's responsibility to explain how the activity in his/her case contributes to knowledge. This will need to be confirmed by the HOC, and, in the case of applicants for promotion and/or awards, by the SR (if applicable) and FPRC (see sections 6 & 7 of the guidelines):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • policy documents for public bodies, companies and civil society agencies; • publications resulting from consultation to a profession closely linked to the candidate's field of study; • professional and private work based on the staff member's academic skills and which contributes to scholarship in the College • authorship of textbooks • assisting junior staff in making contributions to scholarship in the College 	<p>Good teacher. Evidence includes*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • substantial contributions to undergraduate and/or postgraduate teaching • student, peer and external examiner reports good • some curriculum design or development • active postgraduate supervisor • scholarship interests reflected in teaching and in postgraduate supervision 	<p>Has contributed satisfactorily to substantial leadership and/or administration roles at course, College, Faculty and/or University level, appropriate to Associate Professor.</p>	<p>Has made substantial contributions, based on his/her academic skills, to bodies outside the University, e.g. actively involved with journal, professional society, historically disadvantaged Universities or other extension work, as well as assisting junior staff in making contributions to public and professional service.*</p>
Under performance	3 to 4	<p>Has produced few contributions to knowledge of quality in current cycle. Attends few research conferences and seminars.</p>	Weak teacher	Weak and unenthusiastic contribution	Has made some contribution
Unsatisfactory performance	1 to 2	<p>Is not considered to be active expert in field. Does not draft applied research reports or policy documents.</p>	Poor teacher	Little or no contribution	Little or no activity

* This list is not exhaustive: any activity should be considered if it satisfies one of the conditions described in the guidelines for performance evaluation. Furthermore, a staff member need not engage in all of the listed activities: it is appreciated that individuals will vary in the balance of emphasis amongst their activities. Of course, when a staff member exhibits just one or two instances of the examples for a particular score, this does not necessarily imply that the score is deserved.

**COLLEGE OF ACCOUNTING
GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC STAFF**

RANK: SENIOR LECTURER					
OVERALL APPRAISAL	SCORE RANGE	SCHOLARSHIP	TEACHING & LEARNING	MANAGEMENT & LEADERSHIP	PUBLIC & PROFESSIONAL SERVICE (INCLUDING SOCIAL RESPONSIVENESS)
High performance	8 to 10	<p>Has national reputation as active in field. Is making regular and/or substantial contributions to knowledge of quality. The following activities will be recognised in determining whether a staff member has achieved at this level*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • papers in SA and/or international academic journals • favourable academic peer review of applied research reports, chapters in books, professional journals, and/or conference papers • regularly presents papers to national research conferences and seminars • some citations and review • is a member of a research group • has produced either a major research monograph or a major series of research articles and/or reports <p><i>The following activities do not necessarily constitute a contribution to knowledge. It is the staff member's responsibility to explain how the activity in his/her case contributes to knowledge. This will need to be confirmed by the HOC, and, in the case of applicants for promotion and/or awards, by the SR (if applicable) and FPRC (see sections 6 & 7 of the guidelines):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • policy documents for public bodies, companies and civil society agencies; • publications resulting from consultation to a profession closely linked to the candidate's field of study; • professional and private work based on the staff member's academic skills and which contributes to scholarship in the College • authorship of textbooks • assisting junior staff in making contributions to scholarship in the College 	<p>Excellent teacher. Evidence includes*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • substantial contributions to undergraduate and/or postgraduate teaching • student, peer and external examiner reports good • some curriculum design or development • active postgraduate supervisor • scholarship interests reflected in teaching and in postgraduate supervision 	<p>Has contributed satisfactorily to substantial leadership and/or administration roles at course, College, Faculty and/or University level, appropriate to Associate Professor.</p>	<p>Has made substantial contributions, based on his/her academic skills, to bodies outside the University, e.g. actively involved with journal, professional society, historically disadvantaged Universities or other extension work, as well as assisting junior staff in making contributions to public and professional service.*</p>

* This list is not exhaustive: any activity should be considered if it satisfies one of the conditions described in the guidelines for performance evaluation. Furthermore, a staff member need not engage in all of the listed activities: it is appreciated that individuals will vary in the balance of emphasis amongst their activities. Of course, when a staff member exhibits just one or two instances of the examples for a particular score, this does not necessarily imply that the score is deserved.

RANK: SENIOR LECTURER (continued)

Good, fully competent performance	5 to 7	<p>Is developing a national reputation as active in field. Has made several contributions to knowledge of quality. The following activities will be recognised in determining whether a staff member has achieved at this level*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • papers in SA academic journals • academic peer review of applied research reports, policy documents, chapters in books, and/or conference papers • presents papers to national conferences and seminars • makes contributions to research / policy / professional group • participates in and has input at government or professional debate / conferences / seminars • some citations and review • is involved to some extent with at least one research group • has produced either a research monograph or a major series of research articles and/or reports <p><i>The following activities do not necessarily constitute a contribution to knowledge. It is the staff member's responsibility to explain how the activity in his/her case contributes to knowledge. This will need to be confirmed by the HOC, and, in the case of applicants for promotion and/or awards, by the SR (if applicable) and FPRC (see sections 6 & 7 of the guidelines):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • policy documents for public bodies, companies and civil society agencies; • publications resulting from consultation to a profession closely linked to the candidate's field of study; • professional and private work based on the staff member's academic skills and which contributes to scholarship in the College • authorship of textbooks • assisting junior staff in making contributions to scholarship in the College 	<p>Good teacher. Evidence includes*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contributes to undergraduate and/or postgraduate teaching • student, peer and external examiner reports good • active postgraduate supervisor 	<p>Has contributed satisfactorily to substantial leadership and/or administration roles at course, College, Faculty and/or University level, appropriate to Senior Lecturer.</p>	<p>Has made contributions, based on his/her academic skills, to bodies outside the University, e.g. involved with journal, professional society, historically disadvantaged Universities or other extension work, as well as assisting junior staff in making contributions to public and professional service.*</p>
Under performance	3 to 4	<p>Has produced few contributions to knowledge in current cycle. Attends few research conferences and seminars.</p>	Weak teacher	Weak and unenthusiastic contribution	Has made some contribution
Unsatisfactory performance	1 to 2	<p>Is not considered to be active in field. Does not draft applied research reports or policy documents.</p>	Poor teacher	Little or no contribution	Little or no activity

* This list is not exhaustive: any activity should be considered if it satisfies one of the conditions described in the guidelines for performance evaluation. Furthermore, a staff member need not engage in all of the listed activities: it is appreciated that individuals will vary in the balance of emphasis amongst their activities. Of course, when a staff member exhibits just one or two instances of the examples for a particular score, this does not necessarily imply that the score is deserved.

COLLEGE OF ACCOUNTING
GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC STAFF

RANK: LECTURER

OVERALL APPRAISAL	SCORE RANGE	SCHOLARSHIP	TEACHING & LEARNING	MANAGEMENT & LEADERSHIP	PUBLIC & PROFESSIONAL SERVICE (INCLUDING SOCIAL RESPONSIVENESS)
High performance	8 to 10	<p>Is developing a national reputation as active in field. Is making contributions to knowledge of quality. The following activities will be recognised in determining whether a staff member has achieved at this level*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • papers in SA and/or international academic journals • favourable academic peer review of applied research reports, chapters in books, professional journals, and/or conference papers • regularly presents papers to national research conferences and seminars • some citations and review • is involved to some extent with at least one research group • has produced either a major research monograph or a major series of research articles and/or reports <p><i>The following activities do not necessarily constitute a contribution to knowledge. It is the staff member's responsibility to explain how the activity in his/her case contributes to knowledge. This will need to be confirmed by the HOC, and, in the case of applicants for promotion and/or awards, by the SR (if applicable) and FPRC (see sections 6 & 7 of the guidelines):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • policy documents for public bodies, companies and civil society agencies; • publications resulting from consultation to a profession closely linked to the candidate's field of study; • professional and private work based on the staff member's academic skills and which contributes to scholarship in the College • authorship of textbooks 	<p>Excellent teacher. Evidence includes*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • substantial contributions to undergraduate and/or postgraduate teaching • student, peer and external examiner reports good • some curriculum design or development • active postgraduate supervisor • scholarship interests reflected in teaching 	<p>Has contributed satisfactorily to substantial leadership and/or administration roles at course, College, Faculty and/or University level, appropriate to Senior Lecturer.</p>	<p>Has made a contribution based on his/her academic skills, to bodies outside the University, e.g. actively involved with journal, professional society, historically disadvantaged Universities or other extension work.*</p>

* This list is not exhaustive: any activity should be considered if it satisfies one of the conditions described in the guidelines for performance evaluation. Furthermore, a staff member need not engage in all of the listed activities: it is appreciated that individuals will vary in the balance of emphasis amongst their activities. Of course, when a staff member exhibits just one or two instances of the examples for a particular score, this does not necessarily imply that the score is deserved.

RANK: LECTURER (continued)

Good, fully competent performance	5 to 7	<p>Is developing a reputation as active in field. Has made a contribution to knowledge of quality. The following activities will be recognised in determining whether a staff member has achieved at this level*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> papers in SA academic journals academic peer review of applied research reports, chapters in books, professional journals, and/or conference papers presents papers to national conferences and seminars is involved to some extent with at least one research group participates in and has input at conferences / seminars has completed or made substantial progress toward the completion of a higher degree <p><i>The following activities do not necessarily constitute a contribution to knowledge. It is the staff member's responsibility to explain how the activity in his/her case contributes to knowledge. This will need to be confirmed by the HOC, and, in the case of applicants for promotion and/or awards, by the SR (if applicable) and FPRC (see sections 6 & 7 of the guidelines):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> policy documents for public bodies, companies and civil society agencies; publications resulting from consultation to a profession closely linked to the candidate's field of study; professional and private work based on the staff member's academic skills and which contributes to scholarship in the College authorship of textbooks 	<p>Good teacher. Evidence includes*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> contributes to undergraduate and/or postgraduate teaching student, peer and external examiner reports good 	<p>Has contributed satisfactorily to substantial leadership and/or administration roles at course, College, and/or Faculty level, appropriate to Lecturer.</p>	<p>In the early stages of making a contribution, based on his/her academic skills, to bodies outside the University, e.g. involved with journal, professional society, historically disadvantaged Universities or other extension work.*</p>
Under performance	3 to 4	<p>Has produced contributions to knowledge of low quality in current cycle. Attends few research conferences and seminars.</p>	Weak teacher	Weak and unenthusiastic contribution	Has made some contribution
Unsatisfactory performance	1 to 2	<p>Has made little progress towards completing a higher degree or has no scholarly output.</p>	Poor teacher	Little or no contribution	Little or no activity

* This list is not exhaustive: any activity should be considered if it satisfies one of the conditions described in the guidelines for performance evaluation. Furthermore, a staff member need not engage in all of the listed activities: it is appreciated that individuals will vary in the balance of emphasis amongst their activities. Of course, when a staff member exhibits just one or two instances of the examples for a particular score, this does not necessarily imply that the score is deserved.

**COLLEGE OF ACCOUNTING
STATEMENT OF VISION AND MISSION**

The College of Accounting will have the following vision and mission:

VISION

To be a centre of excellence in professional accounting education.

MISSION

- To prepare students for leadership roles in business by equipping them with excellent accounting skills, sound business judgement, and a firm grasp of professional ethics.
- To provide excellent continuing business learning opportunities to practitioners, via the introduction of short courses.
- To engage in scholarship that contributes valuable knowledge to the accounting profession.
- To contribute meaningfully to the transformation of the accounting profession.