**FACULTY OF COMMERCE**

**Ad Hominem Promotions Checklist**

Candidates for ad hominem promotion may find the below checklist useful in ensuring that their portfolios meet the requirements as specified in the Commerce Guidelines for Performance Evaluation. All submissions to the Dean’s Office are expected to include:

1. **A covering letter** which should
   * set out the candidate’s desire to apply for ad hom promotion
   * include the names and contact details of three referees

Ensure that your referees can speak to your performance in any (or ideally all) of the four performance criteria considered for promotion. This would typically require that your referees be fellow academics although this is not a strict requirement.

At senior levels, international recognition of research is a prerequisite, and it would be advantageous to include at least two respected, international referees.

Engage thoroughly with your referees prior to providing their names to the Dean’s Office. Significant weight is attached to these reports, particularly for promotion to Professorial ranks, and referees providing negative reports could hamper your chances of success. This can often be the case where the expectations of international referees are not aligned with the criteria applied during our promotions process, so ensure that you provide them not only with your documentation but also with adequate insight into what the expectations and requirements are for the rank for which you are applying.

# A full curriculum vitae □

Your CV should ideally highlight your contributions along the lines of the four categories evaluated during the ad hominem process: **Research**, **Teaching and Learning**, **Leadership and Management** and **Public and Professional Service**. Lists of contributions and achievements are sufficient in the CV as the detail on these accomplishments will be fleshed out in the portfolio detailed later. Common items for inclusion under each category would include but are not limited to:

**Research:** A breakdown of your accredited and/or peer-reviewed papers, book chapters, books and conference proceedings; any research funding you’ve secured from outside of the university (particularly relevant to the Research Leader track), being rated as a researcher by a recognised research body (e.g. NRF), membership of any research organisations, any research collaborations engaged in, etc. 1

**Teaching and Learning:** A list of courses taught along with detail on the relevant dates/time periods, numbers of students per course and topics taught, completed supervision at senior undergraduate, honours, masters and/or doctoral level and any particular achievements in this

1 *Note that the College of Accounting has its own scholarship requirements which should be followed by staff from that department.*

regard (e.g. distinctions or awards obtained by students), teaching nominations and awards received, teaching initiatives or projects engaged in, etc.

**Leadership and Management:** A list of any leadership positions held (e.g. Section Head, Head of Department, Chair of one or more committees, etc.), course convening responsibilities, committee positions held, serving on or leading the executive committee of the Academics Union; organisation of academic conferences; writing and/or coordinating proposals for fundraising; establishing and/or directing research projects, groups and/or teams; participation in training courses on teaching and learning and mentoring of junior staff.

**Public and Professional Service:** Note that this category refers specifically to ways in which you have employed your academic skills to make a contribution to bodies outside of UCT. This could include serving as an active member of a professional society, serving on the editorial board of a research or professional journal, serving on committees or research bodies related to tertiary education, participating in public lectures, policy forums, media, etc.

# A completed HR174 and HR175 □

The HR174 is typically completed on a biennial basis (every two years). Should the time since your last successful promotion have exceeded this period, it is worth covering your activities in the different categories since then rather than focusing only on the last two years since your last review.

# A performance evaluation portfolio which should: □

* + be between 4 and 10 pages in length □

The page limit above should be strictly adhered to. Should you have appendices that may take you above this limit, ensure that they are kept to a minimum and add substantively to the ability of the committee to evaluate your performance.

Your portfolio should address the issues highlighted above in each of the categories, albeit in greater detail. A Template has been provided to give you guidance as to what should typically be included. Do note that the template is only a guideline and you may find it necessary to deviate from it depending on your particular situation. You should pay particular attention to the following:

It is useful to provide a synthesis of your teaching evaluations rather than just the raw evaluations themselves. The easiest way to do this is to provide your average scores for each of the primary questions responded to in the evaluation for each of your courses over time. It is also useful to highlight any particularly positive comments expressed by students in the evaluations.

You are required to provide evidence to assess the quality of your research contributions. This should include citations, journal rankings/ratings, h-index scores, impact factors, etc. Providing multiple measures will allow the committee to assess your research quality better. A Google Scholar report is ideal for this purpose. It is also useful for you to provide an indication of your contribution to the completion of the research output in question, e.g. principal on a research funding application or primary author on a journal article.

**Frequently Asked Questions**

1. **How do I know whether I should be applying for ad hominem promotion?**

It is important to benchmark your achievements and activities against the requirements set out in the Guidelines document provided when the call for ad hominem promotion goes out. The question of your prospects for ad hominem promotion should arise as a function of your HR174 and HR175 process with your HoD and your HoD should be able to provide you with guidance on whether the timing is optimal or not.

1. **Are ad hominem promotions decided by a faculty committee?**

Ad hominem decisions are determined jointly by the Faculty Performance Review Committee (FRPC) and an external panel. The FRPC comprises the Dean, the Deputy Deans and the HODs, while the external panel comprises of the DVC for Academic matters and two Deans from other faculties. Candidates are required to obtain approval from 2/3 of the members of the FRPC and 2/3 of the external panel in order to be successful.

1. **How is my application presented to the committee?**

Your HoD will present your case to the committee and it is therefore essential that he or she is fully briefed on your portfolio and other documentation. Following this presentation, the committee interrogates the information provided and seeks clarity from the HoD on any issues that may not be clear. Committee members then anonymously provide their own set of scores for you in each of the four categories (similar to the HR175) based on their views. The scores from each committee member are tallied and averaged (a simple average is used) with the committee able to round the scores up at its discretion, as per the Guidelines.

Note that these averaged scores for each category must meet the minimum scoring criteria as set out in the Guidelines – a minimum of 7 in at least three of the categories and an average across all categories of 8. For A/P and Professor there are additional requirements of a minimum of 7 and 8 for research, respectively.

Committee members then vote on whether they believe you should be promoted based on the evidence presented, and you require a 2/3 majority from both groups as indicated in (1) above.

1. **Do I have an opportunity to provide further information should the committee require it?**

Ideally, you should seek to ensure that your documentation is as complete as possible. However, the FRPC meets twice during the ad-hominem process. The first meeting comprises only the faculty members (the external panel is present only for the final meeting). This meeting is a dry run during which the full process as set out above is carried out, but the voting process is not final. This dry run serves the purpose of giving HoDs an indication of where their candidates stand. HoDs are able to refer any questions from the committee back to applicants to request additional information or further clarity that might better their cases.

1. **Am I able to have my case reviewed should the outcome not be favourable?**

Applicants may request to have their unsuccessful cases reviewed. This is done via the Dean and the DVC for academic matters. Details of the appeals process can be found at <http://www.hr.uct.ac.za/hr/performance/management/academic_staff/performance_planning>