



GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF RESEARCH STAFF

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. SCOPE OF THESE GUIDELINES	2
2. PRINCIPLES OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION	2
2.1 Categories of performance evaluation.....	2
2.1.1 Research.....	2
2.1.2 Teaching & Learning	2
2.1.3 Leadership & Management.....	3
2.1.4 Public & Professional Service (including Social Responsiveness).....	3
2.2 Determining scores for each category	3
2.3 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.....	4
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.....	5
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.....	6
5.4 Application for an excellence or merit award	6
6. THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PORTFOLIO	7
7. PROMOTION & AWARDS: RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CANDIDATE, HEAD OF DEPARTMENT, THE DEAN AND THE HR PRACTITIONER.....	8
7.1 Responsibilities of the candidate	8
7.2 Responsibilities of the Head of Department	8
7.3 Responsibilities of the Dean	9
7.4 Responsibilities of the HR practitioner	10
8. PURPOSE, COMPOSITION AND PROCEDURES OF THE FPRC	12
RANK: PRINCIPAL RESEARCH OFFICER	14
RANK: PRINCIPAL RESEARCH OFFICER (cont).....	15
RANK: CHIEF RESEARCH OFFICER.....	16
RANK: CHIEF RESEARCH OFFICER (cont)	17
RANK: SENIOR RESEARCH OFFICER	18
RANK: SENIOR RESEARCH OFFICER (cont).....	19
RANK: RESEARCH OFFICER.....	20
RANK: RESEARCH OFFICER (cont)	21

1. SCOPE OF THESE GUIDELINES

These guidelines apply to all research staff members within the Faculty of Commerce. Separate guidelines are available for:

- All academic staff in the College of Accounting
- Academic staff formally employed as academic teachers
- Academic staff for the rest of the Faculty, excluding the College of Accounting

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: research; 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 Research

A good, fully competent researcher contributes to knowledge in his/her field of research, at a level appropriate to his/her rank (see Appendix A for specific performance expectations at each academic rank). A 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 research. Such evidence may consist of a wide variety of activities, including: papers in accredited academic journals (or if the journal is not accredited, evidence needs to be provided of the academic standing of the journal); major research projects such as masters or doctoral dissertations; chapters in scholarly, peer-reviewed books; authorship of scholarly, peer-reviewed books; papers in peer-reviewed conference proceedings; applied research reports; preparing competitive grant proposals and/or obtaining research funding from outside of the university; and being rated as a researcher by a recognised research body (e.g. NRF).

Please note that the above list is not exhaustive.

2.1.2 Teaching & Learning

For the purposes of clarifying how teaching and learning and related activities will be acknowledged and assessed, the Faculty of Health Sciences' definition has been adopted "Teaching in the research context refers to training, development and research capacity building. Teaching facilitates the transfer of knowledge/skills in a conducive environment. The format of this development may vary from lectures, tutorials, seminars, student thesis/dissertation supervision or research staff training. The beneficiaries of these activities include but are not limited to: Students, Students of research projects, Staff, Public, Critical interest groups, and Stakeholders (As appropriate)." FHS, Perform_Guidelines_research_officers_2011, p 4.

A good, fully competent teacher uses communication skills, innovative thinking, research 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 research, 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 Faculty, but also participates effectively in the administration of courses, of the Department, 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 Department, convenor of courses, programmes and/or orientation activities, and/or curriculum advisor; serving on or leading Department, 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 research 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 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 research; 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; according service to NGOs, including participation in committees and councils, as well as contributions to policy forums; communicating and diffusing the results of academic expertise and research to the public media; preparing policy documents for public bodies, companies and civil society agencies; publishing results from consultation to a profession closely linked to the candidate's field of study; conducting professional and private work based on the staff member's academic skills and which contributes to scholarship; authorship of textbooks. 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 rank.

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

2.2 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. 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 Faculty 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.

2.3 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%):

Research	50 – 80%
Teaching & Learning	0 – 25%
Leadership & Management	10 – 25%
Public and 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 Department to conduct a performance review of each staff member in the Department 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 Department 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 Heads of Department 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 Department.

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 research, teaching & learning, leadership & management and public & professional service (including social responsiveness). In addition, at the Principal and Chief Research Officer levels, a minimum score of 5 must be achieved for research.

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

3.3 Under-performance

Research staff who fall slightly below the expected level but who have a weighted average score of at least 4.5 and a score of at least 4 for research, will be considered as under-performers. Under-performers will be counselled by the Head of Department (in consultation with the Head of the Research Unit) 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

Research staff with a weighted average score of below 4.5 and/or a score of below 4 for research, 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 research staff in the ranks of Research Officer, Senior Research Officer and Chief Research Officer 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 section 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 Principal Research Officer, score an 8 or higher in the category of research
- Where applying for promotion to Chief Research Officer, score a 7 or higher in the category of research

4.3 Application for ad hominem promotion

As a consequence of the regular performance review, members of research staff may be recommended by their Head of Department for ad hominem promotion. Alternatively, a research 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 research 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. 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 Principal Research Officer may apply or be nominated for an excellence award. 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 Research Officer, Senior Research Officer or Chief Research Officer may apply or be nominated for a merit award. 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 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 the Research category.
- 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, one of which must be Research.
- 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 Department 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:

- **Research activities:**
 - A list of activities which constitute contributions to knowledge in the candidate's field(s) of research (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.
 - 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 research 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; 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.
- **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. PROMOTION & AWARDS: RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CANDIDATE, HEAD OF DEPARTMENT, THE DEAN AND THE HR PRACTITIONER

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

7.1 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 Department or the HR practitioner for assistance
- Whether the original idea to apply for promotion or an award came from the Head of Department 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 Department
 - Providing the Head of Department 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

7.2 Responsibilities of the Head of Department

General

- The meetings between the HoD 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 HoD should recognise a staff member's right to apply for promotion without the HoD's support; in such cases the HoD should still assist the candidate in collating a performance evaluation portfolio
- When presenting to the FPRC, the HoD has an obligation to represent a candidate fairly and honestly

Process

- The HoD 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 HoD does not support the candidate's application, the HoD should make this clear to the candidate, and should advise the candidate of his/her right to apply without the HoD's support
- The HoD should provide the candidate with guidelines to prepare a portfolio
- The HoD 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 HoD may be required to meet the candidate an additional time to finalise the application

- The HoD 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 HoD 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 HoD 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 HoD 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)

7.3 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 Department
- The Dean assesses the performance of all Commerce Faculty Heads of Department, 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 HoD if the HoD is applying for ad hominem promotion and/or for an excellence or merit award. This would usually be another Professor from the Department.
- 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 Faculty performance evaluation guidelines.
- 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. Usually the process would start with candidates of the lowest rank, and proceed through the ranks to those applying for promotion to Full Professor or Principal Research Officer.
- The FPRC considers applications for merit and excellence awards at the same meeting 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 HoD 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 ensures that the responsible DVC and other Deans receive full copies of candidates' documentation to peruse in good time before the FPRC meeting, in addition to a copy of the Faculty performance evaluation guidelines.
- The Dean liaises with HR to ensure that minutes of the preliminary meeting are made available to committee members before the FPRC meeting, and that HR representative(s) have details of candidates' past applications, and paper for voting purposes.
- 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 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 internal 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 HoD 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 HoD 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.

7.4 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.

8. 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
- The Deputy Deans
- A Deputy Vice Chancellor, nominated by the Vice Chancellor (external member)
- Two Deans from other Faculties, nominated by the Vice Chancellor (external members) and the Dean of CHED (as a non-voting 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 and the Director of the GSB.
- 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 Principal Research Officer, the recommendation must contain the Committee's assessment that it is satisfied as to the international standing of the candidate's research.

- 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.
- 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 excellence award him/herself.
- The Head of Department will represent all candidates in the Department, for all levels of promotion (i.e. Principal Research Officer, Chief Research Officer, Senior Research Officer and Research Officer). In the event that the Head of Department is a candidate for promotion, the Dean shall appoint a replacement to represent the HoD, and to vote in his/her place. The replacement will serve only while the HoD's case, and any other cases of ad hominem application to the rank to which the HoD is applying, are under consideration.
- 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.

**FACULTY OF COMMERCE
GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC STAFF**

RANK: PRINCIPAL RESEARCH OFFICER					
OVERALL APPRAISAL	SCORE RANGE	RESEARCH	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 or research unit • 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 • management of a major research project 	<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 • research 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, Department, 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 in extension activities; has applied scholarly knowledge and academic skills to preparation of important policy or professional reports; has applied scholarly knowledge and academic skills to high-level consulting work; has importantly facilitated the professional or consulting opportunities of junior staff.</p> <p>Other examples of activities/outputs that will be recognised include*:</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 • authorship of textbooks

* 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: PRINCIPAL RESEARCH OFFICER (cont)

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 or research unit has produced either a major research monograph or a major series of research articles and/or reports management of a major research project 	<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 research 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, Department, 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 or professional society or other extension work; has applied scholarly knowledge and academic skills to preparation of minor policy or professional reports, and/or mid-level consulting; has helped junior staff to expand their professional or consulting opportunities.</p> <p>Other examples of activities/outputs that will be recognised include*:</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 authorship of textbooks
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>Weak teacher</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>Poor teacher</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.

**FACULTY OF COMMERCE
GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC STAFF**

RANK: CHIEF RESEARCH OFFICER

OVERALL APPRAISAL	SCORE RANGE	RESEARCH	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 or research unit • has produced either a major research monograph or a major series of research articles and/or reports • management of a major research project 	<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 • research 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, Department, 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 or professional society or other extension work; has applied scholarly knowledge and academic skills to preparation of minor policy or professional reports, and/or mid-level consulting; has helped junior staff to expand their professional or consulting opportunities.</p> <p>Other examples of activities/outputs that will be recognised include*:</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 • authorship of textbooks

* 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: CHIEF RESEARCH OFFICER (cont)

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 or research unit • has produced either a major research monograph or a major series of research articles and/or reports • management of a research project 	<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 • research interests reflected in teaching and in postgraduate supervision 	<p>Has contributed satisfactorily to substantial leadership and/or administration roles at course, Department, 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 or professional society or other extension work; some policy and/or consulting work based on scholarly knowledge and academic skills, ideally with some sharing of network resources with junior staff. Other examples of activities/outputs that will be recognised include*:</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 • authorship of textbooks
Under performance	3 to 4	<p>Has produced few contributions to knowledge of quality in current cycle. Attends few research conferences and seminars.</p>	<p>Weak teacher</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>Poor teacher</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.

**FACULTY OF COMMERCE
GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC STAFF**

RANK: SENIOR RESEARCH OFFICER					
OVERALL APPRAISAL	SCORE RANGE	RESEARCH	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 or research unit • has produced either a major research monograph or a major series of research articles and/or reports • management of a research project 	<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 • research interests reflected in teaching and in postgraduate supervision 	<p>Has contributed satisfactorily to substantial leadership and/or administration roles at course, Department, 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 or professional society or other extension work; some policy and/or consulting work based on scholarly knowledge and academic skills, ideally with some sharing of network resources with junior staff. Other examples of activities/outputs that will be recognised include*:</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 • authorship of textbooks

* 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 RESEARCH OFFICER (cont)

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 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 or research unit has produced either a major research monograph or a major series of research articles and/or reports involvement in the management of a research project 	<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, Department, 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 or professional society or other extension work; occasionally uses academic knowledge and professional skills in the policy or consulting arena. Other examples of activities/outputs that will be recognised include*:</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 authorship of textbooks
Under performance	3 to 4	<p>Has produced few contributions to knowledge in current cycle. Attends few research conferences and seminars.</p>	<p>Weak teacher</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>Poor teacher</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.

FACULTY OF COMMERCE
GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC STAFF

RANK: RESEARCH OFFICER					
OVERALL APPRAISAL	SCORE RANGE	RESEARCH	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 or research unit • has produced either a major research monograph or a major series of research articles and/or reports • involvement in the management of a research project 	<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 • research interests reflected in teaching 	<p>Has contributed satisfactorily to substantial leadership and/or administration roles at course, Department, 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 or professional society or other extension work; occasionally uses academic knowledge and professional skills in the policy or consulting arena. Other examples of activities/outputs that will be recognised include*:</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 • authorship of textbooks

* 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: RESEARCH OFFICER (cont)

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 or research unit • participates in and has input at conferences / seminars • has completed or made substantial progress toward the completion of a higher degree 	<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, Department, 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 or professional society or other extension work; is beginning to cultivate networks and opportunities for policy and/or consulting work.</p> <p>Other examples of activities/outputs that will be recognised include*:</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 • authorship of textbooks
Under performance	3 to 4	<p>Has produced contributions to knowledge of low quality in current cycle. Attends few research conferences and seminars.</p>	<p>Weak teacher</p>	<p>Weak and unenthusiastic contribution</p>	<p>Has made some contribution</p>
Unsatisfactory performance	1 to 2	<p>Has made little progress towards completing a higher degree or has no scholarly output.</p>	<p>Poor teacher</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.