



Dean: Faculty of Engineering & the Built Environment
iNtloko: iFakalthi yeziFundo zobuNjineli neMekobume eyaKhiweyo
Dekaan: Fakulteit Ingenieurswese & die Bou-omgewing

Professor Alison Lewis

Private Bag X3, Rondebosch, 7701, South Africa
5th Floor, New Engineering Building, Upper Campus
Tel: +27 (0) 21 650 2701
E-mail: Dean.ebe@uct.ac.za
Internet: www.ebe.uct.ac.za
Internet: www.ebe.uct.ac.za

Dear EBE Colleagues

1. AN INVITATION FOR APPLICATIONS OR NOMINATIONS

Academic Staff in the Faculty are invited to apply for, or to nominate, persons for **promotion to a higher rank, merit award, or excellence payment**. These promotions are available to academic staff on standard conditions of service appointed through the GOB, research staff on the academic track (research officers etc) and academic staff on academic teaching conditions of service.

2. SUBMISSION OF APPLICATIONS AND NOMINATIONS FOR PROMOTION

[2 pdf files]

A. The first PDF file should contain the following in sequence:

1. A summary CV using the attached template [APPENDIX A]
2. A copy of the CV [max 10 pages]
3. A copy of the completed HR 174 form
4. A maximum 1000 word summary indicating the candidate's approach to teaching, teaching workload and experience as well as a self-review of their performance. (*Please refer to the appropriate section of this document for more detail.*) This addendum provides the Committee with an insight into the merits of the candidate's **teaching** performance. This should include, for example, references to their involvement with curriculum development, design of courses, use of various teaching methods, role in programme committees, etc. at either the undergraduate or postgraduate level, or both. Candidates are reminded that the supervision of post-graduate research students is part of their teaching activity.
5. A maximum 1000 word summary which provides the Committee with an insight into their **research** activity. This may include, for example, the extent of their research portfolio and indicators of its quality, the relevance of their research, peer recognition, research leadership positions within or outside UCT, etc. The summary should focus on the **impact** of their research nationally and/or internationally. The idea is to motivate and explain how all the quantitative details (numbers of publications, impact factors, citation record) add up to the qualitative research impact.

6. A maximum 1000 word summary which provides the Committee with insights into the candidate's **social responsiveness (SR)** activities. (*Please refer to the appropriate section of this document for more detail.*)

B. The second PDF file should contain:

7. A copy of the completed HR 175 form
8. The names and email addresses of three contactable referees. The candidate must also indicate their relationship with each referee and the reason for their nomination. **The candidate is required to ensure that the referee has been alerted and has been sent a copy of the relevant documentation.** The Faculty Office will contact the referees for a report. For persons applying for promotion to the Associate Professor or Professorial rank, at least some of the referees should be from outside South Africa. It should be noted that the University has agreed that the Committee may reserve the right to approach independent referees where this is considered necessary.

Please also submit hardcopies of all the above documentation.

The Convenors of the Teaching, Research and Social Responsiveness Working Groups will meet as soon as possible after the closing date of applications to confirm that submissions are complete. Where necessary, candidates may be asked to submit additional material.

2.1 ACADEMIC TEACHING ONLY TRACK

In general, the criteria for promotion of such staff members are similar to those applicable to academic staff on standard conditions of service. However, recognition is given to the fact that their focus is, and should be, mainly on teaching, most likely at undergraduate level (as defined by their job description and/or in agreement with the operational needs of their department). They may also be involved in post-graduate teaching activities, including supervision of honours and/or post-graduate students. To be eligible, teaching must be a substantial component of their activities. This is recognised by the higher weighting given to teaching in the scoring scheme and the option to exclude research. Successful applicants will be known as effective teachers who carry heavy teaching loads in comparison to those on the standard conditions of service.

Academic staff on academic teaching conditions of service are appointed to rank of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer only.

2.2 RESEARCH TRACK

Research Officers (including SROs, CROS and PROs) applying for appointment to a higher rank on the academic "research" track and / or to the academic title of Professor or Associate Professor on the "comprehensive academic" track should pay careful attention to the Guidelines for the Promotion of Research Officers in submitting their documentation.

2.3 MERIT AWARD AND EXCELLENCE PAYMENT

Submissions for Merit and Excellence Awards should follow the guidelines in Section 2 above.

MERIT AWARD

Academic staff (below the rank of full Professor) are eligible for Merit Awards. These are for a period of 2 years, paid as a non-pensionable lump sum annually and fall away on promotion.

To qualify for a Merit Award, a staff member would normally be expected to achieve an overall score within the top 2 to 3 points of the range applicable to the staff member's rank. In addition, the applicant must score significantly higher than that applicable to the rank of the staff member in Teaching or Research. Merit awards are competitive in the sense that a limited number, constrained by budget, will be awarded each year.

EXCELLENCE PAYMENT

Excellence payments are available to Full Professors. Excellence awards are paid monthly, are pensionable and usually apply for 4 years. To qualify for an Excellence Award a candidate would need to score at or above 80 points while demonstrating additional "standout" performance or defining achievement of appropriate calibre. Refer to page 8 and 9 of this document for more details.

C. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO A HIGHER RANK, MERIT AWARD AND EXCELLENCE PAYMENT

The system that has been adopted by the Faculty to assist in the evaluation of performance of a candidate, whereby points are allocated to the candidate in each of the four categories on which performance is evaluated (cf. attachments below), is intended to be an aid to the Committee in its deliberations and is not definitive in its conclusions. A recommendation on the candidate's rating in the cases of Research, Teaching and Social Responsiveness will be made to the Committee by the respective Working Groups set up for this purpose. These Groups act in an advisory capacity. They may also interview the candidate in order to inform themselves better in regard to the strength of the case. The candidate's Head of Department will be asked to provide a recommendation to the Committee in the area of Management, Leadership and Administration. It is ultimately the task of the Committee to evaluate all these inputs as well as referees' reports and any other relevant information in coming to a final decision. Voting in this Committee is by secret ballot.

Members of staff are reassured that every effort is made throughout this exercise to ensure that each case is treated with the utmost fairness and care. This Committee is arguably the most important committee in the Faculty since it is crucial to the success of the Faculty that staff members are not only highly motivated but also that everyone is confident that their efforts will be duly recognised and rewarded.

Typically, where a candidate has been unsuccessful in an application for Ad Hominem promotion, a minimum interval of two years between applications is required. Where a good case exists for earlier consideration, a nominated application will be considered. The nominator is required to motivate the case and should be of senior academic rank or the HOD.

The Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee will normally not consider an application for *Ad Hominem* promotion by a candidate who, on 30 June of the year of application, has been in their current academic rank for less than three years. An exceptional case will have to be made to the Dean by the applicant's Head of Department, at least one week in advance of the closing date for applications, in order for this rule to be waived.

Staff who are funded by research or non-GOB funds must note that the cost for the promotion must be borne by the source of funding or grant holder.

3. COMMITTEE AND WORKING GROUPS

The Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee (PaRC)

The purpose of the Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee is to give effect to, and to make decisions arising from, the policy on performance management, including the ad hominem promotion of staff in the Faculty.

Composition

The Dean (Chair)

A Deputy Vice-Chancellor nominated by the Vice-Chancellor

Two Deans from other faculties, nominated by the Vice-Chancellor

The Dean of CHED as a non-voting member

Deputy Deans (x4)

Heads of Department (x6)

Lecturer/Senior Lecturer, nominated by the Dean

Other members

Convenors of the Teaching, Research & Social Responsiveness Working Groups (x3)

Servicing Officer: HR Practitioner

Terms of reference

The Committee receives applications and nominations for ad hominem promotions and proposals for academic staff to be considered for Merit Awards or Excellence payments and is to:

- a) consider these;
- b) recommend to the Vice-Chancellor the ad hominem promotion of the staff member; and
- c) recommend awards for Excellence payments or Merit Awards to the DVC responsible for academic matters, for approval by the meeting of the Deans.

Procedures

- The Faculty Promotion & Remuneration Committee meets once every year.
- The Committee is served by three Working Groups.
- The Working Groups meet as frequently as necessary prior to the meeting of the Faculty Promotions & Remuneration Committee.
- Recommendations for ad hominem promotions require a two-thirds majority vote of the Faculty Promotions & Remuneration Committee in support. In addition, it requires support of two from the group consisting of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and the two other Deans.
- Recommendations to the Vice-Chancellor on ad hominem promotions must contain a copy of the candidate's Curriculum Vitae or Portfolio and the names and addresses of the referees consulted. In the case of a promotion to the rank of a Professor, the recommendation must contain the Committee's assessment that it is satisfied as to the international standing of the candidate's scholarship.

- The Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee must arrange for feedback to be given to successful and unsuccessful candidates and the relevant Heads of Departments (HODs). An unsuccessful candidate should be given reasons as to why their application was not successful.
- The decision of the Faculty Promotion & Remuneration Committee is final. If a candidate believes that there is evidence of unfairness, bias, prejudice or irregularity, an unsuccessful applicant may request a review of the decision by the relevant Deputy Vice Chancellor via the Faculty Dean.

The Working Groups

There are three Working Groups reporting to the Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee:

- Teaching Working Group
- Research Working Group
- Social Responsiveness Working Group

Purpose

The three working groups consider applications and nominations for promotion with respect to each category, i.e. teaching, research and social responsiveness and will produce a score per candidate for each of the categories.

Composition

Teaching Working Group

Convenor: Working group to nominate

HOD to nominate one departmental representative (6)

Dean to nominate a representative from the Research Officer Cohort

Dean to nominate a representative from the Academic Development Lecturer Cohort

Research Working Group

Convenor: Working group to nominate

HOD to nominate one departmental representative (6)

Dean to nominate a representative from the Research Officer Cohort

Social Responsiveness Working Group

Convenor: Working group to nominate

HOD to nominate one departmental representative (6)

Dean to nominate a representative from the Research Officer Cohort

Each Convenor services their own working group.

Terms of reference

- All members of the respective working groups will look at all applications/nominations for their respective portfolios.
- The convenors will set up meetings with their working groups and request additional information from the applicant/nominee as necessary.
- The working group will produce a score for each candidate.
- Convenor to submit a report/summary and the score on each candidate to Faculty HR which will be tabled at the Faculty Core Committee and the Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee.

- Convenors will present each candidate's score together with a motivation for this score at the Faculty Core Committee and the Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee.

Membership

Details of the membership of the Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee and Working Groups will be published annually in a Dean's Circular by not later than mid-year.

D. PROCESS FOR SUBMISSION

Applications or nominations must be submitted **in hard copy** and **e-mail** (with all documents mentioned in 2 above), be marked "**Strictly Confidential**", and must reach Ms Mel Scheepers, Dean's PA, by Friday, **12 July 2019**.

- Hard copy: Dean's Office, Room 5.39, Level 5, New Engineering Building
- E-mail: mel.scheepers@uct.ac.za

In the case of a nomination, the nominator should have the consent of the nominee. The Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee (FPRC) will meet at the beginning of **September 2019**.

I would like to thank you most sincerely for your contributions to the Faculty and University.

Yours sincerely



Alison Lewis
Professor and Dean: Faculty of Engineering & the Built Environment

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION OR MERIT AND EXCELLENCE PAYMENTS

The Faculty of Engineering and the Built Environment considers promotion of academic staff in terms of three categories

1. The “comprehensive” academic track

This track expects a balance between teaching and research. It is the track for all GOB academics on standard conditions of service and for research academics wishing to earn the title of Associate Professor or Professor.

2. The “teaching rich” track

This track considers GOB staff on “teaching only” conditions of service.

3. The “research rich” track

This track considers academic research staff for promotion through the ranks of research officer, senior research officer, chief research officer and principal research officer. Research academics wishing to earn the title of Associate Professor or Professor will be considered via the “comprehensive academic” track with an expectation to both create knowledge through research and disseminate knowledge through teaching.

The positions available through each of these tracks is detailed below with the associated weighting of scores for these:

Positions for academic tracks:

“Teaching rich” track	“Comprehensive” academic track	“Research rich” track
	PROFESSOR	PRINCIPAL RESEARCH OFFICER
	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	CHIEF RESEARCH OFFICER
SENIOR LECTURER	SENIOR LECTURER	SENIOR RESEARCH OFFICER
LECTURER	LECTURER	RESEARCH OFFICER

Weightings for academic tracks:

	“Teaching rich” track	“Comprehensive” academic track	“Research rich track”
Teaching	5 – 8	2 – 5	1 – 4
Research	0 - 3	2 – 5	3 – 6
Admin, management and leadership	1 - 4	1 - 4	1 - 3
Social responsiveness	0 – 2	0 - 3	0 - 3

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION OR MERIT AND EXCELLENCE PAYMENTS FOR ACADEMIC STAFF ON THE “COMPREHENSIVE” TRACK, including staff on STANDARD CONDITIONS OF SERVICE AND RESEARCH TRACK FOR ACADEMIC TITLE

1. The points system is for the guidance of the relevant assessor or committee. It serves as a guideline for addressing academic attributes, allows comparisons of academic staff at different ranks and in different disciplines, and it facilitates consistency in assessments from year to year.
2. The points system is an aid in the assessment of academic excellence which is manifest by achievements in scholarship (mainly Teaching and Research) and in manifestations of Management, Leadership and Administration, Social Responsiveness and contribution to Public and Professional Service.

Scholarship consists of the mastery of a particular discipline which expresses itself by various forms of research output, transfer of knowledge through teaching and/or in a lasting influence on students. Scholarship is measured, *inter alia*, by the intellectual impact of the candidate's work on students and on the community of scholars engaged in cognate activity.

3. There are four broad areas (categories) for judging academic excellence, viz.:
 - Teaching,
 - Research and equivalent Creative and Professional Work,
 - Management, Leadership and Administration,
 - Social Responsiveness and contribution to Public and Professional Service.

Each category is scored out of 10 in the points allocation system. No explicit points value is assigned to any one of the individual academic attributes in each category. Candidates are therefore assessed according to their performance in each category as a whole.

4. Points for each person in each category are assigned relative to the most accomplished academics in the Faculty i.e. the 'champion' and the performance of a particular candidate is compared and scored according to that standard. Thus, the lower academic ranks will almost always have lower absolute scores associated with them than the higher ranks.
5. The absolute scores attained are compared relative to those of other candidates at the same academic rank and judged according to comparative scores achieved by candidates previously.
6. The Faculty has adopted a 'weighting' system which allows individual members of the academic staff to choose, within limits, how they would like their academic performance to be judged; thus members of staff can 'play to their strengths' by choosing a weighting in each of four assessment categories. For the “comprehensive academic track”, these are as follows:

Category	Allowed Weighting Range	Points score
Teaching	2 to 5	0 to 10
Research and Equivalent Creative and Professional Work	2 to 5	0 to 10
Management, Leadership and Administration	1 to 4	0 to 10
Social Responsiveness	0 to 3	0 to 10

The chosen weighting factors must add up to a total of 10. The points score for the individual being assessed in each of the four categories chosen, is then multiplied by the weighting for that category, resulting in a rating scale from 0 - 100.

The Faculty has approved the following **recommended guidelines** for score ranges (**out of a maximum of 100**) with respect to promotion to the various ranks:

Lecturer: 45 to 50 points

Senior Lecturer: 55 to 60 points

Associate Professor: 65 to 70 points with a minimum of 6 for each of teaching and research (5 for teaching and 7 for research if on the research track)

Professor: 75 to 80 points with a minimum of 7 for each of teaching and research (6 for teaching and 8 for research if on the research track)

Merit Awards & Excellence Payments

Further, the Faculty has approved the following **recommended guidelines** for score ranges with respect to consideration for merit awards for staff members at the rank of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and Associate Professor, as well as payment at the Excellence 1 and 2 categories for Professors:

Lecturer: 52 points and above, on a competitive basis

Senior Lecturer: 62 points and above, on a competitive basis

Associate Professor: 72 points and above, on a competitive basis

Professor – Excellence 1: scoring 80 points or above, with an additional demonstrable “standout” performance or defining achievement

Professor – Excellence 2: scoring 80 points or above, with an additional demonstrable “standout” performance or defining achievement of a standard substantially higher than excellence 1.

7. It is implied from paragraphs 3 to 6 above that a strong performance in Teaching, Research/Creative Work in particular as well as in contributions to Management, Leadership and Administration is a Faculty expectation for academics at the higher ranks on the “comprehensive” academic track (Associate Professor and Professor). The Faculty recognizes that Scholarship, Research and Innovation can be expressed and internationally respected through significant advances in education and teaching, including advances in the academic development programmes.

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING & THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT
**GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION OR MERIT AWARDS ON “TEACHING ONLY”
TRACK**

1. The points system is for the guidance of the relevant assessor or committee. It serves as a guideline for addressing academic attributes, allows comparisons of academic staff at different ranks and in different disciplines, and it facilitates consistency in assessments from year to year.
2. The points system is an aid in the assessment of academic excellence which is manifest by achievements in scholarship (mainly Teaching while provision is made to consider Research components too) and in manifestations of Management, Leadership and Administration, and Social Responsiveness.
Scholarship consists of the mastery of a particular discipline which expresses itself by various forms of research output and/or in a lasting influence on students.
Scholarship is measured, inter alia, by the intellectual impact of the candidate's work on students and on the community of scholars engaged in cognate activity.
3. There are four broad areas (categories) for judging academic excellence, viz.:
 - Teaching (dominant category),
 - Research and equivalent Creative and Professional Work (if chosen, not essential),
 - Management, Leadership and Administration,
 - Social Responsiveness.

Each category is scored out of 10 in the points allocation system. No explicit points value is assigned to any one of the individual academic attributes in each category. Candidates are therefore assessed according to their performance in each category as a whole.

4. Points for each person in each category are assigned relative to the most accomplished academics in the Faculty i.e. the 'champion' and the performance of a particular candidate is compared and scored according to that standard. Thus, the lower academic ranks will almost always have lower absolute scores associated with them than the higher ranks.
5. The absolute scores attained are compared relative to those of other candidates at the same academic rank and judged according to the comparative scores achieved by other candidates in the past.
6. The Faculty has adopted a ‘weighting’ system which allows individual members of the academic staff to choose, within limits, how they would like their academic performance to be judged; thus members of staff can ‘play to their strengths’ by choosing a weighting in each of four assessment

categories as follows:

For the “Academic teacher”:

Category	Allowed Weighting Range	Points score
Teaching	5 to 8	0 to 10
Research	0 to 3	0 to 10
Management, Leadership and Administration	1 to 4	0 to 10
Social Responsiveness	0 to 2	0 to 10

The chosen weighting factors must add up to a total of 10. The points score for the individual being assessed in each of the four categories chosen, is then multiplied by the weighting for that category, resulting in a rating scale from 0 - 100.

The Faculty has approved the following **recommended guidelines** for score ranges (**out of a maximum of 100**) with respect to promotion to the various ranks:

Lecturer: 45 to 50 points with a sub minimum of 5 for teaching

Senior Lecturer: 55 to 60 points with a sub minimum of 6 for teaching

Merit Awards

Further, the Faculty has approved the following **recommended guidelines** for the minimum score ranges with respect to consideration for merit awards for staff members at the rank of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer:

Lecturer: 52 points and above with a teaching score of 6 or more, awarded on a competitive basis

Senior Lecturer: 62 points and above with a teaching score of 7 or more, awarded on a competitive basis

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING & THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT
GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION – RESEARCH TRACK

Research Officers, Senior Research Officers and Chief Research Officers may apply for promotion to the rank of Senior, Chief and Principal Research Officer on the “research-rich” track. In the latter two cases the promotion may rather be considered in terms of the “comprehensive” academic track in which the incumbent demonstrates prowess in terms of both knowledge creation (through research) and knowledge dissemination (through teaching) to entitle the applicant to carry the rank of Associate Professor or Professor respectively.

In general the criteria for promotion of such staff members are similar to those applicable to regular academic staff. However recognition is given to the fact that their focus is, and should be, mainly on research and on post-graduate teaching activities, including supervision of post-graduate students. To be eligible, teaching must be a tangible component of their activities, perhaps one quarter to one third of a normal academic load, probably focused towards senior undergraduate, Honours or Masters level courses. Successful applicants will have a good track record of post-graduate supervision as primary supervisor. They would also, by definition, generally be expected to have a strong research record, particularly with respect to peer-reviewed publications in good quality journals, have significant international standing as a researcher, be NRF rated (or on track for consideration for a Y1 or P rating if under 35 years) and hold a PhD degree. Their research output would usually have had a demonstrable impact in their area of specialization. Research Officers who are candidates for promotion will be expected to satisfy the same set of criteria as that applicable to academic staff, but will need to achieve a minimum score of 7 for research in the case of promotion to Associate Professor and 8 in the case of promotion to Professor. In terms of weightings, the table below indicates the range values permitted for Research Officers. In the category ‘Administration’ this could be performed in the context of the research group in which the candidate is located. With respect to total scores the same ranges will apply as for academic staff.

For the “research rich” academic track (no titles):

Category	Weighting Range	Points score
Teaching	1 to 4	0 to 10
Research and Equivalent Creative and Professional Work	3 to 6	0 to 10
Management, Leadership and Administration	1 to 3	0 to 10
Social Responsiveness	0 to 3	0 to 10

For the “comprehensive” academic track (for title of Associate Professor / Professor):

Category	Weighting Range	Points score
Teaching	2 to 5	0 to 10
Research and Equivalent Creative and Professional Work	2 to 5	0 to 10
Management, Leadership and Administration	1 to 4	0 to 10
Social Responsiveness	0 to 3	0 to 10

The chosen weighting factors must add up to a total of 10. The points score for the individual being assessed in each of the four categories chosen, is then multiplied by the weighting for that category, resulting in a rating scale from 0 - 100.

The Faculty has approved the following **recommended guidelines** for score ranges (**out of a maximum of 100**) with respect to promotion to the various ranks:

Research Officer:	45 to 50 points
Senior Research Officer:	55 to 60 points
Chief Research Officer/Associate Professor:	65 to 70 points with a minimum of 5 for teaching (comprehensive academic track only) and 7 for research
Principal Research Officer/Professor:	75 to 80 points with a minimum of 6 for teaching (comprehensive academic only) and 8 for research

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING & THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT
POINTS SYSTEM FOR ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC STAFF
GUIDELINES FOR SCORING A CANDIDATE'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO

TEACHING & LEARNING

Guidelines and Specifications for the Teaching Portfolio:

The documentation in a staff member's portfolio for evaluating teaching must include:

1. A maximum 1000 word summary indicating the candidate's approach to teaching, teaching workload and experience as well as a self review of their performance is required. This summary should address the criteria from the appropriate category of the table alongside and briefly refer to the evidence included in the portfolio that supports the selection of that level.
2. Evidence to support the summary, in which teaching quantity, teaching quality and educational development are addressed.
3. Evidence to place your workload within the context of the typical teaching demands, teaching styles and practice of your department to enable your teaching to be interpreted within the context of your department.

In each category in the table, the criteria should be interpreted in terms of the areas of teaching quantity, teaching quality and educational development. These are described below.

Information and evidence that you can use in your portfolio

1. Teaching Responsibility: Quantity

- Allocated hours for the past three years (from HR174 and departmental teaching loads)
- Number of courses, nature of courses and your role in each of these courses; for example, distinguish between convenor / assistant roles
- Class sizes and teaching context – highlight teaching challenges e.g. large classes, high contact time, struggling students, etc
- PG and Honours-level research supervision – principal vs. co-supervision as well as the nature of supervisory contribution, contact time, language issues, etc
- The manner in which your workload fits into the departmental teaching allocation and your job description

2. Teaching responsibility: Quality

- A statement of your teaching philosophy
- Course evaluations – preferably summary course evaluation reports containing all scores and comments
- Appropriate unsolicited personal comments from students
- Evidence of lecturing / attendance at staff development opportunities
- Evidence of development and use of innovative and effective teaching strategies and

techniques

- Samples of teaching books or notes
- Masters and doctoral graduates' feedback reports
- External examiners' reports
- Peer review feedback, awards and other forms of recognition

3. Educational Development: Educational development is teaching-related work that goes beyond delivering a course and supervising students. It is aimed at improving the quality of teaching and learning across the programme. Activities in this area could include:

- Responding to student diversity
- Co-ordinating and/or contributing to excellence in student mentoring, staff (teaching and supervision) development, tutor training
- Developing an appropriate teaching philosophy – coherent, relevant, forward-looking
- Curriculum development or re-structuring, including being responsible for ensuring compliance with accreditation requirements of professional bodies
- Innovative course development, including teaching approaches with technology, etc
- Involvement with admissions, selection and placement of entering students
- Cohort analyses of student data including retention, results, and throughput; responding to course health watch data
- Involvement with developing effective teaching and assessment practices
- Authorship of scholarly materials related to teaching such as textbooks and commentaries on teaching and learning
- Development of learning materials (examples might include, where appropriate, the conceptualisation and implementation of technology and practical laboratory-based modules in support of courses)
- Policy design and implementation, monitoring and development

POINTS SYSTEM FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC STAFF GUIDELINES FOR SCORING A CANDIDATE'S

RESEARCH and EQUIVALENT CREATIVE and PROFESSIONAL WORK

Guidelines:

In establishing a score of a staff member, not all the criteria listed for a particular score need to be met. Consulting and involvement in practical projects of Architectural and/or Engineering design may be included provided it can be clearly demonstrated that:

- a significant contribution has been made by the member of staff,
- the contribution has advanced the discipline and
- the work has been peer reviewed.

Candidates are advised to use the scoring system outlined in Appendix C when completing the relevant sections in the Summary CV (Appendix A).

Specifications:

Documentation in a staff member's portfolio for evaluating research and/or equivalent creative and professional work should give clear evidence of quality, quantity and impact. This may include:

1. Outputs (Scholarship)

a. Peer reviewed

- Details of research projects and research **output**; articles, books and chapters in books; refereed publications;
- Details of creative work, professional work, policy research and internal publications which have been peer reviewed, or which the staff member is submitting for peer review by a faculty initiated review process. Where possible, the design methods and broader theoretical framework underpinning this work should be explicit;
- Peer-reviewed policy research **output**;

b. Other

- Conference presentations and attendance

2. Recognition

a. Citations

- Professional projects or creative work forming the subject of, or included in, publications by other authors;
- Analysis of citations of published research and h-index of candidate (drawn from Scopus and possibly other sources)

b. Awards & Rating

- **Awards** or competition winning professional projects, competitive funding or creative work;
- **NRF Rating** or other recognition of research standing

c. Invitations

- **Invitations** to participate in curated exhibitions;
- **Invitations** to present creative or professional work at other centres;
- **Invitations** to participate in formation of research-based policy;

d. Scientific community activities (Reviews, scientific committees)

- Independent reviews, awards and other critical comment;
- Activities such as **refereeing** for international journals.

SCORE	ACADEMIC ATTRIBUTES: RESEARCH and EQUIVALENT CREATIVE and PROFESSIONAL WORK
10 9	<p>Is the leader of a high achievement research grouping and / or Is recognised as an exceptional researcher and a leader in their field.</p> <p>Outputs (peer reviewed and other) Among the top researcher/creative worker in their field internationally and very productive. Often publishes in reputable refereed international journals.</p> <p>Recognition (Citations, Awards & Rating, Invitations, Reviews, Scientific Committees) Papers frequently cited or peer reviewed. Creative works well recognized relative to the best in the field internationally. Usually A, B or P rated by the NRF Frequently invited to speak or officiate at conferences of international status or to present creative work to international professional or academic audiences. Invited to be a member of the editorial board of international journals or specialised task or study groups of international bodies. Frequently used as a referee for high impact journals or a reviewer of professional creative work.</p>
8 7	<p>Participates as an effective researcher in a successful research grouping and is recognised as having a coherent research area.</p> <p>Outputs (peer reviewed and other) Certainly one of the best known in their field within his / her region of operation and with some production of internationally recognised work.</p> <p>Recognition (Citations, Awards & Rating, Invitations, Reviews, Scientific Committees) Regularly cited. Usually B, C, P, Y or L rated by the NRF. Frequently invited to speak or officiate at local conferences or to present creative work to national professional or academic audiences. Otherwise has a growing international presence and is sometimes invited to international conferences. Invited to be a member of the editorial board of national journals, or specialised task or study groups of national bodies. Often used as a referee for local journals or a reviewer of local professional creative work. Some invitations to act as a reviewer for internationally peer-reviewed journals.</p>
6 5	<p>Outputs (peer reviewed and other) Steady research output, including refereed journal papers and creative work output. Recognised in their field. Plays an important and regular role in local conferences and/or occasionally contributes to international conferences.</p> <p>Recognition (Citations, Awards & Rating, Invitations, Reviews, Scientific Committees) Work regularly cited or exhibited. Usually C, Y or L rated by NRF. Sometimes used as a referee for local journals or a reviewer of local professional creative work. Perhaps the occasional invitation to act as a reviewer for internationally peer-reviewed journals.</p>
4	<p>Outputs (peer reviewed and other) Likely to be a newly graduated PhD. Starting to become an active researcher, demonstrated through research outputs including a refereed journal paper (or equivalent wrt creative works etc.) over the rating period. Needs some more time to build up research impact.</p>

	Recognition (Citations, Awards & Rating, Invitations, Reviews, Scientific Committees) Not yet NRF rated but might be in the future.
3	Research outputs demonstrated through publication of a refereed journal paper (or equivalent wrt creative works etc.) over the rating period. Typically, if not holding a PhD, close to completing this. If holding PhD, has produced few conference papers or un-refereed journal papers in the past.
2	Registered and demonstrate active work towards PhD. Research outputs limited to conference proceedings and reports.
1	Research outputs limited to national conference proceedings and reports. Not yet an active researcher but has the potential to become one. Do not hold and not registered for PhD Otherwise, has not focussed on research (possibly due to a focus on other areas). Might have produced few papers or articles in the past but mostly not peer reviewed. Has not attended many conferences.
0	Does not do research

POINTS SYSTEM FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC STAFF GUIDELINES FOR SCORING A CANDIDATE'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO

MANAGEMENT, LEADERSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION

Guidelines:

In establishing a score of a staff member, not all the criteria listed for a particular score need to be met. This category of academic activity is exclusively internal University management and Administration.

SCORE	ATTRIBUTES: MANAGEMENT, LEADERSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION
10	Impressive and sustained top-leadership role in the Faculty/University. Consistently excellent track record in Departmental, Faculty and University Administration, innovation, decision-making, staff development and policy formulation. Noted excellence as a HOD, Deputy or Assistant Dean. Excellent and innovative organisational ability i.e. a reputation for "following through" and "delivering the goods". Is intimately involved with Faculty/University policy and management formulation. Recognised as being in the top leadership echelons in the Faculty/University.
9	
8	Among the most respected, innovative and effective leaders and administrators in the University and/or Faculty. Has considerable experience in serving on University Committees at policy formulating and leadership level. Serve as a good and effective HOD or equivalent. Plays an active role in staff development.
7	
6	Has a good reputation for leadership, Innovation, Decision-Making and Administration in the University/Faculty/Department. Serves effectively on University / Faculty / Departmental Committees. Effectively and efficiently carries significant Departmental Administrative responsibilities.
5	
4	Contributions to University, Faculty and Departmental Leadership, Innovation, Decision-making and Administration are not a high priority. Not an obvious choice if something needs to be done effectively and with due thought. Seldom serves on Faculty/University Committees but makes some contribution to Departmental Administration. Does what has to be done with little enthusiasm and efficiency.
3	
2	Makes very little contribution to the Management and Administration of the Department and/or Faculty and participates minimally in Administration Committees.
1	
0	Makes no contribution to leadership, Innovation, Administration, or Decision-making in the University, Faculty or Department.

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING & THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT
POINTS SYSTEM FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC STAFF
GUIDELINES FOR SCORING A CANDIDATE’S CONTRIBUTIONS TO

**SOCIAL RESPONSIVENESS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS TO INDUSTRY
OR THE PROFESSION, PUBLIC SERVICE OR ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP)**

Guidelines:

SOCIAL RESPONSIVENESS is an umbrella term that refers to different forms of engagement with external, non-academic constituencies for the purpose of contributing to our collective civic and democratic mission as an institution of higher learning (UCT, SR Policy Framework, 2012). As such, it encompasses a wide spectrum of activities, including, in the EBE context:

1. Contributions to industry or one’s profession;
2. Contributions to the formulation of state policies and frameworks;
3. Contributions to the provision of services *for* the public sector and/or civil society and/or industry (including innovations, systems development or community outreach);
4. Engaged scholarship *with* the public sector, industry or civil society constituencies for the purpose of coproducing knowledge; or
5. Information dissemination in the public domain.

The University goes on to stipulate that engagements with external constituencies need to be grounded in scholarship. Accordingly, social responsiveness **does not** include civic or outreach activities that are not explicitly linked to a staff member's disciplinary or professional expertise. **Nor** does it encompass academic work such as external examining, editing or reviewing articles for journal publications. (These activities need to be captured under the “Teaching” and “Research” sections of this application.) This is not to devalue the importance of academic engagement with other academic staff and peers (which provides some of the lifeblood of an institution defined as a ‘university’). Rather, social responsiveness with non-academic constituencies refers to the utilisation of an academic’s scholarly or professional expertise for public purpose or benefit.

For example, if a scholar of transport studies undertakes applied research or facilitates workshops for external audiences on how to implement more sustainable and affordable public transport networks, and if they explicitly draw on their scholarly expertise, this type of knowledge production or knowledge transfer meets the requirements of social responsiveness. Thus, consultancy work (whether paid for or not) that is based on a scholar’s, a unit’s or a research centre’s scholarly activities, and that is undertaken *with* external, non-academic constituencies, is classified as ‘social responsiveness’ for purposes of promotion or other academic awards. However, consultancy work that is carried out as paid private work and that has a negligible impact on knowledge production and research development is not considered as meeting SR criteria for the purposes of promotion or other academic awards (UCT, SR Policy Framework, 2012). For consultancy work to count as a socially responsive activity, scholars need to demonstrate:

1. Their engagement with external, non-academic constituencies;
2. How their consultancy work is informed by their scholarly activities (whether research or teaching activities); and
3. How their consultancy work contributes to public purpose, public interest, social benefit or the enhancement of professional practice for wider public benefit.

Definitions of the five categories of Social Responsiveness in the EBE Faculty

Contributions to industry or the engineering and built environment professions: Direct application of specialised knowledge, expertise, scholarship or research findings in a professional setting beyond the university. This category includes contributions to industry or professional societies as a specialist (research or innovation) advisor, or being called on by industry/societies to take part in their policy or management formulation structures. Contributions might also involve actively serving on committees, boards or councils of local/international organisations or non-academic societies that are external to the university and academia. Alternatively, contributions to industry or the profession might entail facilitating Continuing Professional Development (CPD) courses or conferences/workshops for non-academic audiences. Or, these contributions might entail working with (non-academic) public and private sector constituencies for the purpose of enhancing professional practices that, in turn, have a wider public benefit. In establishing a SR score for this category, a staff member must demonstrate: (1) What their contributions to industry or the profession are; (2) how these contributions are informed by their scholarly activities; (3) how these contributions feed back into their more formal research and/or teaching activities; (4) how these contributions enable some form of wider public purpose or benefit; and (5) in what form these contributions are captured as outputs.

Contributions to the formulation of state policies and frameworks: This category entails direct contributions to, or influence on, public policy development. This might include: Undertaking requested policy research, for example in the form of short written briefs or carefully considered verbal advice; being contracted or consulted by the state to write or contribute to public policy; submitting substantive policy or technical briefing papers to the government; making evidence-based submissions to parliament; participating in the drafting of policies, frameworks or guidelines; and/or actively participating in public policy review and amendment processes. In establishing a SR score for this category, a staff member must demonstrate: (1) What their contributions to the formulation of state policies and frameworks are; (2) how these contributions are informed by their scholarly activities; (3) how these contributions feed back into their more formal research and/or teaching activities; (4) how these contributions enable some form of wider public purpose or benefit; and (5) in what form these contributions are captured as outputs.

Contributions to the provision of services for the public sector and/or civil society and/or industry (including innovations, systems development or community outreach and development): Direct application of professional knowledge, expertise, scholarship, research findings or experiential teaching activities including student service-learning programmes (as part of the formal curriculum) for the purpose of contributing to public-sector services or industry-provided services; and/or to support the needs, hopes, aspirations and development challenges of community-based organisations (including NGOs, community leaders, economically stressed residents) via innovations, service-learning or community outreach initiatives/activities. This category might also include systems development, the production of popular materials, the provision of technical support or advocacy services in a public-sector or community setting, as well as the monitoring and evaluation of implemented services and materials. Or, it might include facilitating workshops, CPD-type courses (or other forms of knowledge transfer) for state-based and/or community-based and/or industry-based partners. In establishing a SR score for this category, a staff member must demonstrate: (1) Their contributions to the provision of services for non-academic constituencies; (2) how these contributions are informed by their scholarly activities; (3) how these contributions feed back into their more formal research and/or teaching activities; (4) how these contributions enable some form of wider public purpose or benefit; and (5) in what form these contributions are captured as outputs.

Engaged scholarship *with* the public sector, industry or civil society constituencies for the purpose of coproducing knowledge: This category explicitly involves the coproduction of knowledge with public sector constituencies and/or industry and/or civil society (including NGOs, community-based organisations, and economically stressed residents) for the purpose of enabling knowledge-sharing, mutual-learning and reciprocity during various phases of an engaged scholarship initiative (namely during the conceptualisation, design and implementation of an engaged scholarship project). To this end, applied or participatory action research (PAR) methods—or teaching and learning methods that fulfil the requirements of community-university engagements (as part of the formal curriculum)—are employed. This category of social responsiveness is underpinned by values of participatory democracy for the intentional purpose of enhancing engaged scholarship (ES). Engaged scholarship, in turn, assist us in generating coproduced knowledge, as well as new methods of teaching, learning and collaborative research with external, non-academic constituencies. In establishing a SR score for this category, a staff member must demonstrate: (1) How all participants of a community-university engagement contributed to (and, ideally, benefited from) the coproduction of knowledge; (2) what this coproduced knowledge is; (3) how coproduced knowledge alters conventional scholarships; (3) how coproduced knowledge informs an academic’s research and/or teaching activities; and (5) in what form this coproduced knowledge is captured as an output.

Information dissemination in the public domain: Direct application of professional knowledge, expertise, scholarship and/or research findings to inform, shape or challenge public discourses and debates at local, national and international levels beyond academia. This public information dissemination might include: Media interviews; writing articles or opinion editorials for print media; sustained and purposeful engagement on social media; participation in public debate panels; public lectures; and the like. In establishing a SR score for this category, a staff member must demonstrate: (1) How information dissemination in the public domain takes place; (2) how this dissemination informs, shapes or challenges public discourses and debates; (3) how this dissemination is informed by their scholarly activities; (4) how this dissemination feeds back into their more formal research and/or teaching activities; and (5) in what form this dissemination is captured as an output.

Guidelines:

1. In establishing a SR score, it is not expected that a staff member will have made a contribution in more than one of the five identified categories of Social Responsiveness (SR). However, where a staff member has made contributions in more than one category, they can motivate for a score one point higher than the highest individual category score.
2. In establishing a SR score, a candidate must demonstrate: (1) Their engagement with external, non-academic constituencies; (2) how their engagements are informed by their scholarly activities (that are based in their departments, schools or research units); (3) how their SR activities feed back into their more formal research and/or teaching activities; (4) how their engagements contribute, in some way, to public purpose/interest, social benefit or the enhancement of professional practice for wider public benefit; and (5) in what form their SR activities are captured as outputs.

SCORE	<p style="text-align: center;">ACADEMIC ATTRIBUTES: SOCIAL RESPONSIVENESS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS TO INDUSTRY OR THE PROFESSION, PUBLIC SERVICE OR ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP)</p>
10	<p><i>Your contributions result in significant enhancements of—and advancements from—the status quo. These contributions also have wider public benefits</i></p> <p><i>Yours is a demonstrable output-driven contribution with high impacts that concern excellence.</i></p> <p>Contributions to industry or the profession: Very strong interactions with local/international organisations or societies. You are regularly invited by industry to make significant contributions to professional organisations/societies (because you are identified as a highly respected specialist in your field). Or, you are regularly invited by industry/organisations/societies to take part in their policy or management formulation structures. Or, you actively serve on committees, boards or councils of local/international organisations as the President, Chair or Executive Officer of these organisations. Your active involvement in these organisations leads to a significant enhancement and advancement of professional practices with wider public benefits. Or, you regularly facilitate successful, high impact CPD courses, conferences or workshops for professional organisations. You need to demonstrate how a transfer of knowledge leads to a significant enhancement of industry or the profession; and how these SR activities are captured as significant, high quality outputs.</p> <p>Contributions to the formulation of state policies and frameworks: Very strong and regular contributions to, or influence on, public policy development. You are identified by the state as a highly respected specialist in your field. As such, you are regularly invited by the state to take part in policy formulation, review and amendment processes. Or, you make regular, high impact submissions to parliament. Or you frequently submit substantive policy or technical briefing papers to the state. Accordingly, you need to demonstrate how these contributions significantly enhance and advance state policies/frameworks; and how these contributions are captured as significant, high quality outputs.</p> <p>Contributions to the provision of services for the public sector and/or civil society and/or industry: A very strong application of professional knowledge, expertise, scholarship or teaching activities (as part of the formal curriculum)—as well as regular and high impact contributions to non-academic constituencies—for the purpose of significantly enhancing and advancing state, civil society and/or an industry’s services. This enhancement is geared towards addressing development challenges. As such, you need to demonstrate how your high impact innovations, systems development, service-learning courses, community outreach initiatives, popular materials, technical support or advocacy services lead to a significant enhancement and advancement of state, civil society and/or an industry’s services with wider public benefits. Or, you regularly facilitate high impact workshops (or other forms of knowledge transfer) for non-academic constituencies. You need to demonstrate how workshops lead to a significant transfer and advancement of knowledge with wider public benefits; and how your SR activities are captured as significant, high quality outputs.</p> <p>Engaged scholarship with the public sector, industry or civil society for the purpose of coproducing knowledge: A very strong application of research and/or teaching activities (as</p>

9	<p>part of the formal curriculum) for the explicit purpose of coproducing <u>new</u> knowledge <i>with</i> non-academic constituencies. You need to demonstrate how engagements are grounded in values of participatory democracy, and how engagements enable power-sharing (as opposed to knowledge transfer alone) and reciprocity (namely, how engagements have significant benefits for <u>all</u> participants of a project). You also need to demonstrate how mutual-learning takes place during <u>all</u> of the phases of a collaborative project (i.e. during the conceptualisation, design and implementation of the project). Moreover, you need to demonstrate how applied research methods, participatory action research (PAR), or teaching methods are employed to significantly advance engaged scholarships; and how these are captured as significant, high quality outputs.</p> <p>Information dissemination in the public domain: Very strong and regular contributions (based on scholarly activities) to public discourses at local/national/international levels beyond academia. Such contributions have a significant impact on shaping and, if relevant, challenging public opinions, discourses and debates. You need to demonstrate how information dissemination has a significant impact on public opinions, discourses and debates. You also need to demonstrate how you are regularly used as a specialist advisor for media interviews, opinion editorials, social media engagements, public debate panels, public lectures, and the like; how your contributions enhance, advance and alter public discourses; and how these SR activities are captured as significant, high quality outputs.</p>
8	<p><i>Your contributions improve the status quo, and these improvements have wider public benefits.</i></p> <p><i>Yours is a demonstrable output-driven contribution that concerns excellence.</i></p> <p>Contributions to industry or the profession: Strong and consistent interactions with local/international professional organisations or societies. You are invited to serve as a specialist advisor, or you are invited by industry/professional societies to take part in their policy or management formulation structures. Or, you actively serve on committees, boards or councils of local or international organisations/societies that are external to the university. Your active involvement in these organisations leads to an improvement of professional practices with wider public benefits. Or, you facilitate successful CPD courses, conferences or workshops for professional organisations/societies. Accordingly, you need to demonstrate how a transfer of knowledge leads to an improvement of industry or the profession with wider public benefits; and how these SR activities are captured as high quality outputs.</p> <p>Contributions to the formulation of state policies and frameworks: Strong and consistent contributions to, or influence on, public policy development. You are called on by the state to participate in policy formulation, review and amendment processes. Or, you make submissions to parliament. Or you submit substantive policy or technical briefing papers (based on your scholarly activities) to the state. Accordingly, you need to demonstrate how your contributions aim to improve state policies/frameworks (for the purpose of wider public benefits); and how these SR activities are captured as high quality outputs.</p>

7	<p>Contributions to the provision of services for the public sector and/or civil society and/or industry (including innovations, systems development or community outreach): A strong application of professional knowledge, expertise, scholarship or teaching activities (as part of the formal curriculum)—as well as consistent contributions to non-academic constituencies—for the purpose of improving state, civil society and/or an industry’s services. Improvements address development challenges. As such, you need to demonstrate how your innovations, systems development, service-learning courses, community outreach initiatives, popular materials, technical support or advocacy services lead to an improvement of state, civil society and/or an industry’s services with wider public benefits. Or, you regularly facilitate successful workshops (or other forms of knowledge transfer) for state-, industry- and/or community-based partners. You need to demonstrate how workshops lead to a transfer of knowledge with wider public benefits; and how these SR activities are captured as high quality outputs.</p> <p>Engaged scholarship with the public sector, industry or civil society for the purpose of coproducing knowledge: A strong application of research and/or teaching activities (as part of the formal curriculum) for the explicit purpose of coproducing knowledge <i>with</i> non-academic constituencies. Coproduced knowledge might include establishing alternative (but not necessarily new) methods of teaching, learning and/or collaborative research. Thus, you need to demonstrate how engagements are grounded in values of participatory democracy, and how such engagements enable power-sharing (as opposed to knowledge transfer alone), mutual-learning and reciprocity (namely, how engagements have benefits for <u>all</u> participants of a project). You also need to demonstrate how mutual-learning takes place during <u>all</u> of the phases of a collaborative project (namely, during the conceptualisation, design and implementation of the project). Moreover, you need to demonstrate how applied research methods, participatory action research (PAR), or teaching and learning methods are employed to improve engaged scholarships; and how these engagements are captured as high quality outputs.</p> <p>Information dissemination in the public domain: Strong and consistent contributions (based on scholarly activities) to public discourses and debates at local/national/international levels beyond academia. Such contributions have an impact on shaping and, if relevant, challenging public opinions, discourses and debates. You need to demonstrate how information dissemination has an impact on public opinions, discourses and debates. You also need to demonstrate how you are used as a specialist in your field for media interviews, opinion editorials, social media engagements, public debate panels, public lectures, and the like; and how these SR activities are captured as high quality outputs.</p>
6	<p><i>Your contributions are aimed at adding improvements to existing initiatives. As such, you have established solid foundations—and you have built quality relationships—with non-academic constituencies.</i></p> <p>Contributions to industry or the profession: Consistent and deliberate interactions with local/international professional organisations or societies. You are invited to serve on committees, boards or councils of local or international organisations/societies that are external to the university. Your involvement in these organisations/societies leads to a transfer of knowledge and an improvement to existing initiatives. Or, you facilitate well</p>

received CPD courses, conferences or workshops for professional organisations or societies. Accordingly, you need to demonstrate how your contributions to industry or the profession add improvements to existing knowledge/initiatives. You also need to demonstrate how you have established solid foundations—and built quality relationships—with industry or the profession; and how these SR activities are captured as quality outputs.

Contributions to the formulation of state policies and frameworks: A deliberate contribution to public policy formulation, review and amendment processes. Or, a deliberate contribution to public policies/frameworks via the submission of technical and other briefing papers to the state.

Accordingly, you need to demonstrate how your contributions add improvements to existing state policies and/or frameworks. You also need to demonstrate how you have established solid foundations—and built quality relationships—with state-based constituencies; and how these SR activities are captured as quality outputs.

Contributions to the provision of services for the public sector and/or civil society and/or industry (including innovations, systems development or community outreach): A deliberate application of professional knowledge, expertise, scholarship or teaching activities (as part of the formal curriculum) for the purpose of supplementing or adding improvements to state, civil society and/or an industry's services. Your supplementations or additions address development challenges. As such, you need to demonstrate how your supplementations or additions to existing innovations, systems development, service-learning courses, community outreach initiatives, popular materials, technical support or advocacy services lead to an improvement of state, civil society and/or an industry's services; and you need to demonstrate how you have established solid foundations—and built quality relationships—with non-academic constituencies. Or, you facilitate well received workshops (or other forms of knowledge transfer) for non-academic partners. Accordingly, you need to demonstrate how facilitated workshops add improvements to existing services. You also need to demonstrate how you have established solid foundations—and built quality relationships—with non-academic constituencies; and how these SR activities are captured as quality outputs.

Engaged scholarship with the public sector, industry or civil society for the purpose of coproducing knowledge: A deliberate application of research and/or teaching activities (as part of the formal curriculum) for the purpose of aiming to coproduce knowledge *with* the public sector, industry or civil society. As such, you need to demonstrate how engagements are grounded in values of participatory democracy. The ultimate goal of your engagements is to facilitate mutual-learning and reciprocity (namely, to facilitate equal benefits for all participants of a project). A demonstration of how mutual-learning takes place during most (but not, necessarily, all) of the phases of a collaborative project is required. You also need to demonstrate how your engagements aim to corroborate, supplement or add improvements to existing knowledge on engaged scholarship. Finally, you need to demonstrate how you have managed to establish quality relationships with non-academic constituencies; and how these SR activities are captured as quality outputs.

Information dissemination in the public domain: Consistent and deliberate contributions (based on scholarly activities) to public discourses and debates at local/national/international levels beyond academia. You need to demonstrate how information dissemination has some impact on public opinions, discourses and debates via

5	<p>your contributions to media interviews, opinion editorials, public lectures, and/or via your regular blog updates/tweets/etc. You also need to demonstrate how you have established a solid foundation for information dissemination in the public domain; and how these SR activities are captured as quality outputs.</p>
4	<p><i>Your contributions are aimed at supporting existing initiatives. As such, you are starting to build good relationships with non-academic constituencies.</i></p> <p>Contributions to industry or the profession: You have some interactions with local/international professional organisations or societies that are external to academia. You are invited to participate in professional-based activities (fora, debates, workshops) hosted by local or international organisations/societies. Or, you facilitate CPD courses/workshops for professional organisations or societies that are external to academia. Accordingly, you need to demonstrate how your contributions support industry or the profession. You also need to demonstrate how you are starting to build good relationships with industry or the profession; and how these SR activities are captured as outputs.</p> <p>Contributions to the formulation of state policies and frameworks: You make some contribution to public policy formulation, review and amendment processes. Accordingly, you need to demonstrate how you make some contribution to state policies/frameworks, what these contributions are, and how your contributions aim to support existing policies/frameworks. You also need to demonstrate how you are starting to build good relationships with state-based constituencies; and how these SR activities are captured as outputs.</p> <p>Contributions to the provision of services for the public sector and/or civil society and/or industry (including innovations, systems development or community outreach): An application of professional knowledge, expertise, scholarship or teaching activities (as part of the formal curriculum) for the purpose of supporting existing state, civil society and/or an industry's services. This support addresses development challenges. As such, you need to demonstrate how your support of existing innovations, systems development, service-learning courses, community outreach initiatives, popular materials, technical or advocacy services contributes to the maintenance of state, civil society and/or an industry's services; and how you are starting to build good relationships with non-academic constituencies. Or, you facilitate workshops (or other forms of knowledge transfer) for non-academic partners. Accordingly, you need to demonstrate how facilitated workshops support existing services. You also need to demonstrate how you are starting to build good relationships with non-academic constituencies; and how these SR activities are captured as outputs.</p> <p>Engaged scholarship with the public sector, industry or civil society for the purpose of coproducing knowledge: You apply your research and/or teaching activities (as part of the formal curriculum) for the purpose of aiming to coproduce knowledge <i>with</i> non-academic constituencies, and for the purpose of supporting their existing initiatives. To this end, engagements are grounded in values of participatory democracy, and the goal of these engagements is to facilitate some form of knowledge transfer for the benefit of the public sector, industry or civil society. You, therefore, need to demonstrate how your engagements aim to enable some form of knowledge transfer, and how engagements aim</p>

3	<p>to support the public sector's, an industry's or civil society's existing initiatives. Finally, you need to demonstrate how you are starting to establish quality relationships with non-academic constituencies; and how engagements are captured as outputs.</p> <p>Information dissemination in the public domain: You make some contributions (based on scholarly activities) to public discourses and debates at local/national/international levels beyond academia, and some of these contributions are <u>starting to have</u> an impact on public opinions, discourses and debates via media interviews with you, or via your contributions to opinion editorials, or via your participation in public lectures, or via your blog updates/tweets/etc. Accordingly, you need to demonstrate how you are starting to established a solid foundation for information dissemination in the public domain; and how these SR activities are captured as outputs.</p>
2 1	<p>Limited contribution to activities that are external to the university, including limited contributions to industry or the profession, public policy formulation, engaged scholarship, or information dissemination in the public domain.</p>
0	<p>You make no contribution to any of the five SR categories.</p>