

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

MEMORANDUM TO ACADEMIC/RESEARCH OFFICER STAFF

PROMOTION AND REMUNERATION - 2006

1. AN INVITATION FOR APPLICATIONS OR NOMINATIONS

1.1 All **Academic** members of the Faculty Staff are hereby invited to apply for, or to nominate, persons for promotion to a higher rank.

1.2 All **Senior, Chief and Principal Research Officers** in the Faculty are also hereby invited to apply for appointment at Associate Professorial or Professorial rank. Such persons may also be nominated by any member of the academic or research officer staff.

Applications or, preferably, nominations must be submitted **in hard copy**, and must reach Mr L Toerien, HR Adviser, c/o Faculty Office, by **Monday 10 July 2006**, be marked "**Strictly Confidential**". In the case of a nomination the nominator should have the consent of the nominee.

PLEASE TAKE SPECIAL CARE TO READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY.

The Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee (FPRC) will meet on Tuesday 12 September 2006.

2. CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION TO A HIGHER RANK

2.1 ACADEMIC STAFF

Candidates are required to submit the following documentation:

- A summary CV using the attached template (cf. APPENDIX A)
- A copy of your full CV
- Copies of completed HR 174 and 175 forms (cf. APPENDIX B)

The Committee appreciates that the above information does not necessarily capture all that a candidate would like to submit in support of their application. Therefore the Committee invites candidates to submit the following addenda unless this information is already included in the Summary CV :

- An addendum which provides the Committee with an insight into the merits of their 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. Candidates are reminded that the supervision of post-graduate research students is part of their teaching activity.
- An addendum which provides the Committee with an insight into their research activity. This may include, for example, descriptions of their interactions with industry, the relevance of their research, professional recognition or other forms of peer recognition, research leadership positions within or outside UCT, advisory services or consultancies to government or industry, engagement in public understanding activities, etc.
- The names and email addresses of three contactable referees. The candidate must please ensure that the referee has been alerted and has been sent a copy of the relevant documentation. The Faculty Office will contact the referee for a report. For persons applying for promotion to Assoc. Professorial or Professorial rank some of the referees should preferably 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.

The Dean or the Dean's nominee and the Convenors of the Teaching and Research Working Groups will meet as soon as possible after 10 July 2006 to confirm that submissions are complete. Where necessary, candidates may be asked to submit additional material by no later than **28 July 2006**.

2.2 RESEARCH OFFICERS

Research Officers applying for appointment to an academic rank of Professor or Associate Professor should pay careful attention to the Guidelines for the Promotion of Research Officers in submitting their documentation. In every other respect their submissions should follow the guidelines as set out in 2.1 above.

3. CANDIDATES FOR REMUNERATION AT 'ABOVE RATE-FOR-JOB'

The Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee is also responsible for all decisions regarding Remuneration at 'Above Rate-for-Job' for all ranks up to and including Professor.

Persons applying for such remuneration should ensure that they provide evidence which will convince the Committee that their performance in all four categories, viz. teaching, research, administration and social responsiveness, is of such a high standard that it **significantly exceeds** the norm expected for persons in their particular rank. Applicants who are not at professorial level should also explain why such performance has not led to promotion to a high rank.

Remuneration at 'Above Rate for the Job' is rare and exceptional and only about 3% of the entire academic staff of the University have qualified for such remuneration. Typically such persons should be scoring 9 for both teaching and research and be high achievers in the other two categories.

4. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO A HIGHER RANK

The system that has been adopted by the Faculty to assist in the evaluation of the 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 and Teaching 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, and Social Responsiveness. 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 continuously 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.

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING & THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

POINTS SYSTEM FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF CANDIDATES FOR

PROMOTION OR REMUNERATION OF ACADEMIC STAFF.

1. The points system is for the guidance of the relevant assessor or committee. It serves as a checklist of academic attributes (cf. guidelines for 'staff portfolios'), allows comparisons of academic staff at different ranks and in different disciplines, and it facilitates consistency in assessments from one year to the next.
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, 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,
 - Research and equivalent Creative and Professional Work,
 - 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 of the categories. 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:

Category	Allowed Weighting Range	Pts score
Teaching	2 to 5	0 to 10
Research or 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 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 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
Professor:	75 to 80 points out of a maximum of 100.

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 (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 OF CHIEF RESEARCH OFFICER OR PRINCIPAL
RESEARCH OFFICER TO RANK OF
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OR PROFESSOR RESPECTIVELY**

Chief Research Officers are on a salary scale equivalent to that of Associate Professors, and may apply, through the Faculty Promotions and Remuneration Committee, for appointment to the rank of Associate Professor. They may then use the title 'Associate Professor', although their salaries will continue to be paid from the same source as their post of Research Officer. Similarly **Principal Research Officers** are on a salary scale equivalent to that of Professors, and may apply, through the same Committee, for appointment to the rank of Professor. They may then use the title 'Professor', although their salaries will continue to be paid from the same source as their post of Research Officer.

In general the criteria for promotion of such staff members is 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 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 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.

Category	Allowed Weighting Range	Pts score
Teaching	2 to 5	0 to 10
Research or Equivalent Creative and Professional Work	3 to 6	0 to 10
Management, Leadership and Administration	0 to 3	0 to 10
Social Responsiveness	1 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 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
Professor:	75 to 80 points out of a maximum of 100.

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

Guidelines:

In establishing a score of a staff member, not all the criteria listed for a particular score need to be met. The evaluation of a person's teaching performance, the teaching load carried by a staff member does determine the context in which the teaching is carried out. Candidates may wish to submit as additional information the documentation submitted to the Faculty in recent years as part of the Workload Analysis of the quantity of their teaching activity including post-graduate supervision.

Specifications:

A performance assessment portfolio for evaluating a staff member's teaching should give clear evidence of teaching load and quality and may include *inter alia*:

- undergraduate and post graduate student course evaluations,
- masters and doctoral graduates feed back reports,
- external examiners reports,
- peer review comments and
- samples of teaching books or notes.

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING & THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

POINTS SYSTEM FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC STAFF.

GUIDELINES FOR SCORING A CANDIDATE'S

RESEARCH and/or 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
- work has been peer reviewed.

Candidates 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 members portfolio for evaluating research and/or equivalent creative and professional work should give clear evidence of quality and quantity and may include:

- 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;
- Awards or competition winning professional projects or creative work;
- Invitations to participate in curated exhibitions;
- Peer reviewed policy research output;
- Professional projects or creative work forming the subject of, or included in, publications by other authors;
- Invitations to present creative or professional work at other centres;
- Independent reviews, awards and other critical comment;
- Conference presentations and attendance;
- Research funding obtained from grants or contracts and from UCT sources;
- Funding obtained through professional commissions of the kind appropriate for peer review
- Activity such as refereeing for international journals.

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING & THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

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	ACADEMIC ATTRIBUTES
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. Serves as a good and effective HOD. 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

Guidelines:

- (1) In establishing a score of a staff member, not all the criteria listed for a particular score need to be met.
- (2) This category of academic activity is reserved exclusively for external University activities and involvements and includes work contributing to social benefit and public interest but excludes private work unless this has clearly demonstrable benefits for Teaching and Research.

SCORE	ACADEMIC ATTRIBUTES
10	Very strong external interaction and is used as a specialist advisor by both local and international external organizations. Involvement leads to a significant transfer of outputs of scholarship to the wider community and experience gained feeds back into the academic activities. Consistent and respected contributions to learned and/or professional societies as President / Chairman / Executive Officer / etc. Serves on committees and councils at a international and national level, and is called on by government, commerce and /or industry to take part in policy formulation in his/her area of expertise. Experience gained feeds back into research/creative work activities and proceeds contribute directly or indirectly to research funding, direction and new research projects or contracts. Involved in high level joint research and development projects with external organizations leading to a significant contribution to the University's research capacity.
9	
8	Strong external interaction and regularly sought-after by industrial, private and/or government organisations as a very valuable source of expertise. Significant local and/or international professional status. Leading advisor and expert with excellent reputation regionally and/or nationally. Regularly leads workshops and seminars for constituencies beyond University.
7	
6	Does some local or international specialist advisory work or professional commissions and/or has some interaction with industry. Some involvement in professional organizations and/or with industrial partners, government agencies or NGOs. Has some external project involvement of mutual benefit to the University's research and teaching objectives. Makes some contributions to communities and constituencies outside UCT.
5	
4	Limited interaction with external agencies, but participates sometimes as part of a team; OR, relatively new advisory work and is approached occasionally to contribute.
3	
2	Makes little contribution to activity outside the University.
1	
0	No private or public-sector involvement.

APPENDIX A

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING & THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

PROMOTION AND REMUNERATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY INFORMATION SHEET TO BE COMPLETED BY CANDIDATES

Please fill information in where appropriate on this form. If you have no information for a particular category, enter "Not Applicable". Where appropriate, and where not indicated otherwise, information should be provided for the **PRECEDING FIVE** year period.

1. Personal Details

Name:	Department:
-------	-------------

Employment history at UCT

Position:	Period of appointment:
-----------	------------------------

2. Performance Summary**2.1 Teaching**

2.1.1 Teaching Load Over the past 3 years. (You may wish to cut-and-paste your submissions for the Workload Analysis for this purpose.)

Year	Course Code	Lecture Hours	Tutorial Hours	Practical Hours	Field Trip Hours	Projects	Total

Note: Course Assessments (data, not assessment forms), should be provided as an attachment.

2.1.2 MSc students registered

Name:	Supervisor(s):	Year/date of registration:

2.1.3 MSc students graduated



Name:	Supervisor(s):	Year/date of registration:

2.1.4 PhD students registered



Name:	Supervisor(s):	Year/date of registration:

2.1.5 PhD students graduated



Name:	Supervisor(s):	Year/date of registration:

2.1.6 Other Notable Achievements

Research:		NRF Rating:		
Publications (last five years):				
Journals:				
Journal and year of publication	Impact Factor	Number of Authors	Rank of Authorship	Title of Paper

2.1.7 Peer-Reviewed Conference Proceedings

Title of Conference Proceedings & Year	Title of Paper	Authors

2.1.8 Other research outputs (cf. Appendix C for other types)

Type of Research Output	Authors	Details of Peer-Review

2.1.9 Books:

Title and authors	Publisher	Date

2.1.10 Funding Record (last five years):

Grant	Amount of Money	Collaborators

2.1.11 Invitations to local and international conferences

Name, place and date of conferences, attended in the last two years:

Number of local conferences attended in last five years:

Number of international conferences attended in last five years:

2.2 Administration

2.2.1 Programme Convenor (last three years)

Year	Programme	Number of students

2.2.2 Departmental Duties (last three years):

2.2.3 Faculty Committees (last three years):

2.2.4 University Committees (last three years):

2.2.5 National/International Committees (last three years):

2.2.6 Other:

2.3 Community and Industrial Involvement
--

2.3.1 Community Work:

--	--

2.3.2 Industry Work:

Industry	Amount of money generated

2.3.3 Government Work:

Government Committee	

PLEASE KEEP THE TABLE BELOW ON A SEPARATE SHEET

Name:	Department:
-------	-------------

Category	Preferred Weight	Self Evaluation	HOD Evaluation	Core Committee	Faculty P&R Committee
Teaching					
Research					
Admin and Leadership					
Social Responsiveness					
Weighted Total					

APPENDIX B

FORMS HR 174 AND 175

These can be found at the following site:

<http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/sapweb/forms/hr174.doc> (or [hr175.doc](http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/sapweb/forms/hr175.doc))**APPENDIX C:****POINTS ALLOCATED FOR VARIOUS RESEARCH OUTPUTS.**Candidates should refer to this table when completing **Section 2.1.8 of the Summary CV.**

	Type of Research Output	Points
1	Papers in peer reviewed ISI journals	1
1a	Papers in peer reviewed journals awaiting ISI/DNE recognition	0.8 - 1
2	Refereed Conference Proceedings with peer-reviewed full papers published	0.5
3	Peer Reviewed Extended Abstracts in Proceedings of international conferences	0.25
4	Articles in non-accredited, non-peer reviewed professional journals or in popular publications or media articles	0
5	Peer Reviewed Monographs	1
6	Patents	1
7	Books other than edited types or standard textbooks	4.5
8	Chapters in scholarly books	1
9	Book reviews	0
10	Editorships	0
11	Artistic presentations/Exhibitions [PR]. Only applicable to Architecture	1-4
12	Publications on personal work written by others	0
13	Invited Keynote Address at international conference	0.5
14	Awards: (subject to confirmation) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Projects • Regional/National • By Professional Bodies • For Buildings • Etc 	0-3