**A policy framework on performance assessment for academic staff**

**24 November 2010**

1. **Background and Overview**

In June 2003 the UCT Council approved a new remuneration policy framework for academic staff. The new policy was implemented with effect from January 2004. The change in the approach to performance review was accompanied by a substantial increase in levels of remuneration.

The performance criteria were reviewed in 2006 and changes directed at making the process more objective, effective and transparent were implemented. A revised set of criteria came into effect in January 2007.

Council in 2008 proposed that the extant remuneration policy be reviewed, and a task team was constituted for this purpose. The brief of the Review Task Team, a management advisory body reporting to the Vice-Chancellor, was to consult on and review the efficacy of the current academic remuneration system, referred to colloquially as the rate for job (RFJ) system, and on the basis of this review to make recommendations with particular reference to

1. *assessment of performance:* in particular, criteria for assessment, and alignment of these criteria with the ad hominem promotion system; and the process of assessment, including the means for determining remuneration levels, and communication between heads of department, deans and staff members
2. *reward systems:* in particular, the market positioning and alignment of salaries, including considerations as to which market, and which position in that market, would be appropriate; whether to make use of a range, notches, or a single rate; provision for payment on grounds of scarcity, and the criteria for determining such payments; considerations of cost and their relationship to value and effectiveness; and the link between reward structures and desired performance, and the nature of such rewards

The task team comprised two representatives from each faculty, including CHED, the Executive Director for Human Resources, the Human Resources staff member responsible for conditions of service, a representative of the Deans, and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor responsible for academic matters.

The Review Task Team submitted a final report to the Vice-Chancellor in October 2009. Following consultations with deans, the Vice-Chancellor put the following recommendations to Senate at its March 2010 meeting:

1. that, rather than requesting Senate to approve a set of generic performance criteria, with faculty-specific criteria to be developed at a later stage, faculty boards develop faculty-specific performance criteria for incorporation into a final proposal to be considered by Senate;
2. that those sections of the report dealing with remuneration not be considered at this stage as they would form part of a parallel process of consultation and negotiation with individuals and the Academics’ Union.

It was accepted that aspects of pay policy are not a matter for Senate, but that Senate has an interest in such matters. The Vice-Chancellor’s recommendations were therefore accepted, with the proviso that ultimately the set of recommendations on performance assessments be brought to Senate for its adoption, but only after progress is made in determining an agreed basis for academic salaries.

At the meeting in August 2010 the SEC considered the draft policy framework and identified the need for further work before it could be submitted to Senate. In particular it asked that a shared understanding be reached as to what the expected level of performance should be and following that what reward systems would be put in place for excellent performance.

The purpose of this document is to present the set of recommendations with particular reference to the matter of performance assessment and management, and a system for rewarding excellence, but excluding recommendations pertaining to the remuneration structure and it’s relationship with the market. The set of performance criteria contained in this proposal were initially developed by the task team, and have been further developed in close consultation with deans and faculty boards. These take the form of a generic framework accompanied by a set of faculty-specific criteria, the criteria for each faculty being aligned with its ad hominem promotion criteria.

At the meeting in November 2010, Senate adopted the report and its recommendations with–

1. some changes and a number of recommendations for further considering and investigation; and
2. the amendment that it be reviewed after one year rather than after a full four year cycle.
3. **Key strategic considerations**

UCT aspires to being a research-led institution. This implies an expectation that academic staff members be engaged in research and scholarship of high quality, as determined through appropriate national and international norms. The aspiration implies also that teaching and learning, and social responsiveness, rather than being regarded as completely independent arenas of activity, will benefit from, and to varying degrees be shaped by, the range of research activities in which academic staff members are engaged.

The University of Cape Town is committed to transformation. In the context of a remuneration policy for academic staff, a key transformational objective is that of “building a diverse staff profile and creating a fulfilling work environment”.

UCT’s mission and strategic objectives should be given substance through, inter alia, the implementation of a remuneration policy which reflects the values of the institution, and which attracts, retains and rewards staff of high quality who contribute to their realisation. The policy should promote recruitment and retention that are consonant with the Employment Equity Policy of the university, and with the goal of ensuring an inclusive institutional culture, and an environment in which academic staff can succeed in achieving their objectives.

Equity and fairness in the remuneration policy are essential, as are incentives to encourage and reward excellent performance, on the basis of agreed-upon criteria.

The policy introduced in 2004 has resulted overall in significant changes in the approach by academic staff members to their work. The definition in the performance criteria of what constitutes the work of an effective academic staff member, and the direct relationship between performance assessment and reward systems, are believed to have led to a marked improvement in performance, particularly in the area of research.

However, the current policy has shortcomings. In particular, there is a patent lack of flexibility in the current performance criteria, with a resultant constraining effect on heads of department and staff members in relation to the setting of objectives in an optimal manner.

For the reason that high-quality universities require a range of competencies in the academic staff in order to meet contemporary needs in higher education and research, a central goal in the work of the task team has been to ensure that academic staff roles that are valuable or essential to the university but which have not been adequately recognised will in future be recognised. This entails providing for flexibility in the manner in which objectives are set and contributions assessed within and across key performance areas. The recommendations in this document accommodate for greater flexibility of application.

Since performance norms and expectations differ substantially across faculties and disciplines, the revised policy includes a set of faculty-specific criteria which are aligned with a generic framework, and which properly address such differences, including those relevant to what constitutes scholarship, and the means by which research is assessed in terms of both quality and quantity.

Expectations in respect of performance are to a great extent captured in the faculty ad hominem promotion criteria, in each of the main pillars of activity, viz. research, teaching, leadership and administration, and social responsiveness. The faculty-specific criteria capture expected performance levels in a manner that is closely aligned with the ad hominem promotion, thus making it clear that advancement through promotion, or reward, for example through the receipt of a merit award, will require performance at levels considerably higher than the expected levels. A proposed mechanism for the reward of excellent performance is detailed in the document.

The recommendations in this report also include a general formalisation and streamlining of the system of performance assessment and management of academic staff, including staff on probation, with the role of heads of department being clarified considerably.

1. **Findings and recommendations of the Review Task Team**

The Task Team consulted widely on the current remuneration policy and system, soliciting and receiving comment from academic staff members, including heads of department, deans, and the Academics’ Union. Earlier versions of the review report have been presented to faculty boards, to the deans, and to Senate. The body of the report identifies those recommendations which were approved by Senate at its May 2009 meeting.

***Recommendation on performance management***

The process of consultation has highlighted a generally held view that the current RFJ system is an effective tool which conveys successfully to staff the scope and quality of activities that should characterise the work of an academic staff member.

The Task Team **recommends** that the remuneration policy continue to be based on a system of performance management. Furthermore, for the purpose of setting objectives and assessing performance, the standard academic position should constitute a combination of responsibilities related to teaching and learning, research, administration and leadership, and, in most cases, social responsiveness*.*

**4. Recommendations on performance criteria and objectives**

**Flexibility in performance criteria** – aimed at enabling the university to carry out all its core academic responsibilities effectively – has emerged as the central criteria-related issue. Performance criteria should reflect the values and the full range of purposes of the university, and should therefore be in line with the university’s main strategic goals. Insofar as different faculties have different goals and priorities (within the broader institutional ones), and manifestations of scholarship, there need to be faculty-specific criteria that reflect these differences.

The purpose of a performance assessment is to ensure that expected standards are met and to promote good scholarship, teaching and social responsiveness activities.

While the importance of disciplinary expertise is acknowledged and confirmed, systematic knowledge of and competencies in all the core academic functions are prerequisites for a modern successful university. Not all academic staff have the same strengths, and many departments and faculties have always relied on differing strengths among their academic staff to enable them to carry out their full range of responsibilities. However, the unitary nature of the current RFJ criteria has not recognised, let alone supported, the full range of strengths and ‘specialisations’ that are needed.

The current review attempts to correct this position by introducing into the composition of workloads of academic staff the **flexibility to apply differing weights** across the areas of activity. Provision is made for the weighting of a staff member’s contribution to vary across the main performance areas, in accordance with departmental (or faculty) needs and the expertise of the staff member. Thus, for example, it may be agreed that a staff member will devote an unusually high proportion of time (for a fixed or indefinite period) to responsibilities such as convening a complex programme or leading substantial curriculum design, with a corresponding reduction in expectation of research production. Similar considerations would apply with respect to a weighting of contributions in favour of research. Decisions in this regard will however be exceptional, will rest with the head of department, and will be conditional on clear operational need as assessed by the head of department, on the staff member’s agreement. In contemplating such arrangements, due consideration must be given to, and the staff member must be consulted on, the possible implications of any significant variation from standard responsibilities for the staff member’s academic career. Any such variation from standard responsibilities must be approved by the dean of the relevant faculty.

The criteria take the form of a generic framework, which sets guidelines for expected standards, valid across the university, and accompanied by detailed **faculty-specific criteria** which are aligned with the ad homimen promotion criteria. The link to ad hominem promotion criteria is important in providing further guidance as to what would constitute the expected performance at each rank in a particular faculty, in relation to the criteria for advancement by promotion.

While the criteria address some of the **transformation goals** of the university, faculties should develop further criteria relevant to these goals across all of the categories, and ensure proper recognition for such activities. Examples would include the mentorship of young and new staff, and service as an employment equity representative on a selection committee. In the domain of teaching and learning, contributions to transformational aspects of curriculum design would be an important activity and criterion. A further example is an expectation that staff members who are course convenors will formulate strategies and targets for students from designated groups, and make a demonstrable effort aimed at meeting these targets.

The revised criteria address two further concerns about the current set: in the case of criteria for research, there is a greater emphasis on impact and quality, as opposed to the generally quantitative nature of the current criteria; and second, with regard to teaching and learning, there is an emphasis on the importance of evidence of good practice, and explicit reference to the determination of appropriate teaching loads; these considerations were absent from the earlier set of criteria.

A summary of the faculty specific criteria are presented in **Annexure 1**, and the detail for each faculty as approved by the relevant faculty board is contained in the attached document. The background to these criteria follows.

**TEACHING AND LEARNING**

A range of forms of education-related responsibilities are recognised as being valid contributions and can thus form part of the teaching workload. Decisions on variation from standard teaching are made by the Head of Department in accordance with departmental (or faculty) needs and the expertise of the staff member. Recognised variants to standard lecturing teaching include significant one-off or ongoing contributions that (a) improve the educational effectiveness of a department or programme or help to meet strategic goals, and (b) go beyond the regular leadership, management and administration responsibilities of the rank.

Faculties may periodically consider how various teaching contributions are measured to ensure fairness in distribution of work. Agreement on the weighting of different types of contribution enables workloads to be determined objectively. Alternatively, the weighting of special contributions can be done on a case-by-case basis.

Quality and effectiveness can be routinely assessed by means of external examiners’ reports and course evaluations but a wider range of evidence should be available for consideration at the end of each assessment cycle. [Further to the SEC discussion in September 2010, all faculty criteria must include explicit reference to course evaluations as a measure of students experience of an academic staff member’s teaching].

**RESEARCH**

Research criteria are based on the philosophy that, as a leading research institution whose academic staff are expected to undertake research at a high level, the criteria for assessing research performance should be heavily weighted in favour of quality and impact, as opposed to quantitative measures.

Quantities in output vary vastly between disciplines, even within a single faculty. While these quantitative measures do serve some purpose, any process of a largely quantitative nature aimed at assessing research performance will fail to distinguish between works having a major impact and those of a more pedestrian nature. Furthermore, the impact of works appearing as journal articles, say, and monographs, some of which may have required many years of investigation and writing, cannot be meaningfully compared by reduction to simplistic weightings based on the notion of a unit output.

The research criteria have therefore been revised within the set of ad hominem promotion criteria to reflect a greater reliance on impact and quality of research outputs in the form of journal articles, books, chapters in books, and works in conference proceedings. Provision continues to be made for the assessment of research in the creative and performing arts, and in various professional disciplines, in which conventional peer-reviewed written work is not the generally accepted avenue for disseminating research and scholarship.

**LEADERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION**

The leadership, management and administration criteria were not viewed as particularly problematic and consequently there have been no fundamental changes made to the 2006 criteria.

**SOCIAL RESPONSIVENESS**

Social responsiveness performance criteria recognise the Senate-approved stipulation that social responsiveness must have an intentional public purpose or benefit with external, non-academic constituencies and should be linked to the core processes of the university, namely research, teaching and learning. This is in line with leading universities internationally, which are embracing public service as a core element of their activities, and links to the goal of increased impact in research and quality of teaching. Social responsiveness is defined as the production and dissemination of knowledge for public benefit. It constitutes a fourth and separate category in the framework for ad hominem and standard academic salary processes and covers activities that relate to how the university engages with broader society at multiple levels including, international, national, provincial, local and community level.

Social responsiveness activities include the production and dissemination of knowledge for public benefit or the public good; public policy dialogue and advice; service learning and community-based education; and professional and disciplinary engagement with non-academic constituencies. Examples might include: strategic and contract research and consultancies for public benefit; patents, artefacts and instruments; maps and plans; policy document preparation and review and submissions to government; involvement in continuing education courses and service learning programmes; public dialogue through the media; knowledge transfer through accessible research dissemination or the production of learning materials.

The importance of UCT’s engagement with external constituencies for public benefit or public good is a strategic goal, and deans of faculties and heads of department are expected to report annually on the socially responsive activities in the areas for which they are responsible, and to ensure that such activities are encouraged and given proper recognition in assessments and in ad hominem promotion procedures.

The demonstration of social responsiveness through teaching and learning, research and/or public service is required of all faculties. It is recognised however that some disciplines lend themselves more easily to social responsiveness activities than others, and that these activities vary widely, and do not align in any simple way to academic seniority or rank. For these reasons the faculty criteria in many cases provide for flexibility through a weighting system in assessing activities related to social responsiveness.

**5. Recommendations on management of staff and related support**

Experience with the current system of performance management has emphasised the need for clarification of the role of heads of department in the process of setting and approving performance objectives, and in carrying out assessments. Likewise, the current system has highlighted the need for a clearly defined process of communication of expectation and feedback.

The following sections give details of recommendations in respect of the management of performance objectives and related communication.

***5.1 Recommendations on management of performance objectives***

1. The purpose of assessments is to ensure that expected standards are met in respect of the major areas of responsibility of academic staff, and furthermore to promote good scholarship, teaching, and social responsiveness beyond the minimum levels.
2. Deans should advise heads of department on expectations with respect to academic staff workloads and performance levels, and of allowable nuances in applying the performance criteria.
3. Heads of department should engage actively and regularly with their dean (at one end) and staff members (at the other end) around performance expectations, with objectives for each cycle being agreed at a meeting called for this purpose.
4. Decisions on performance by the head should be seen and understood as recommendations by the head to the dean, and should be supported by relevant documentation.
5. The expected performance level for a member of the academic staff will be based on the criteria used for ad hominem promotions in each faculty, using applicable weightings for each category where allowed by the relevant faculty, and taking rank into account. An evaluation of performance every four years will be undertaken by the head of department or, where requested, by the head and a senior colleague, with the member of staff concerned and an aggregate score or range calculated. In the case of the Faculty of Health Sciences the role of the head of department may be assumed by the head of division.
6. Non-standard allocation of academic duties based on operational need and agreed in advance by the staff member, head of department and dean is possible within this performance management structure for academic staff. In such cases, the evaluation of performance and scores will be based on the agreed set of duties.
7. The cycle of major assessments is proposed to be **four years**. Biennial reviews will be conducted on the basis of the completed HR174 form by staff members. An interview will take place in any year if requested by the head or staff member. An interview meeting should take place with any staff member who is likely to be a candidate for promotion in that year. Face-to face interviews should take place at least twice in a four-year cycle: in the fourth year, and ideally midway, that is, in the second year.
8. Staff should have recourse to request a review, by the dean, of a head’s recommendation on performance. Staff members who are unhappy with the outcome of the review may lodge an appeal in accordance with the approved appeal or review procedures.

***5.2 Recommendations on communication***

1. It is proposed that heads of department hold an academic staff meeting early in the year (and early in the tenure of the headship), and at this meeting clearly articulate expectations with regard to performance, in a manner consistent with the approved set of criteria.
2. There need to be clear (but perhaps broad) guidelines with respect, particularly, to teaching loads and expectations in a department – these will vary from department to department, and should be transparent and agreed to in a staff meeting. In order to assist the head in managing this process, generic or average teaching loads need to be understood at the university or faculty level.
3. Heads should be required to meet with each academic staff member at least once every two years to discuss performance, so that there are no surprises at the four-yearly exercise.
4. During the period between successive formal evaluations, academic staff must be provided with annual guidance by heads to address any perceived shortcomings.
5. Academic staff assessed as underperforming need clear guidelines (in writing) to recover performance over the ensuing cycle, and should have regular meetings with the head of department in this regard, in line with the current set of procedures applicable to underperforming staff.
6. Given that that the criteria are in respect of expected performance, no formal letters should be sent to staff who meet these criteria. Staff assessed as not meeting the criteria for expected performance should receive an appropriate, and carefully and sensitively worded letter.
7. It is proposed that the Academic Heads Working Group develop a system of induction for heads of department, to ensure that heads are fully conversant with the set of responsibilities associated with performance management.

**6. Recommendations on rewards for excellence**

The expected level of performance is set at a standard of good and solid performance which, at UCT, is of a high standard. The level of expected performance is linked to and defined in terms of the ad hominem promotion criteria for each faculty.

It is further acknowledged, given the definition of expected performance, there is a need to recognize and reward performance which is significantly higher than expected performance. Given this need, it is proposed that a system of merit awards be introduced at the academic ranks of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and Associate Professor. The purpose of these awards will be to reward meritorious achievement in two or more of the categories in which staff are assessed. Decisions on merit awards should form part of the brief of faculty promotion and remuneration committees, and will based on faculty ad hominem promotion criteria. At the rank of professor, it is proposed that the current two-tier system of excellence awards continue. The lower tier would reward excellent performance, while the upper tier would recognise truly outstanding performance.

***Further details of the merit awards and excellence payments***

1. A proposed guideline for the quantum for merit awards is a rand value derived as a percentage of the standard CoE package (proposed amount for 2011 being between R18k and R26k), to be determined annually. The award will be made for a period of two years, with effect from the year following that in which the assessment is made. Merit awards will be paid as a lump sum annually, and will be non-pensionable. The awards apply at the current rank of the staff member, and fall away on promotion to a higher rank.
2. It is envisaged that a steady state of about 10% of academic staff receive the merit award. In order to facilitate this, a fixed budget (part of the overall budget associated with academic salaries) will be allocated to faculties on a proportional basis and application for merit awards will be competitive.
3. The faculty has the discretion to award different numbers of merit awards at the different academic ranks (i.e. the percentage of academic staff in receipt of merit awards in one rank may be higher or lower than that in another rank) but the allocated faculty budget for merit awards may not be exceeded.
4. In the introduction of excellence payments in 2004 it was envisaged that about 5% of Professorial staff would be eligible for and receive payments for excellence. This number has fluctuated over the years but has not risen above 5%. It is proposed that a steady state of 3-5% of excellence awards for Professors be the target. Excellence awards are paid monthly and are pensionable, and would usually be applied for four years.
5. Faculties will develop faculty specific criteria for deciding on merit awards (applicable to ranks of Lecturer to Associate Professor) and payments for excellence (applicable to rank of Professor). The criteria will be based on the faculty ad hominem promotion criteria and be guided by the following generic conditions:
	1. Excellent performance must be demonstrated in at least two performance categories of which one must be either Teaching & Learning or Research.
	2. As a guideline the total score must generally be within 2-3 points of the score required for ad hominem promotion to the next rank. However, faculties have different structures of scoring and thus the faculty specific criteria must stipulate the required scores or bands.

***Process of nomination and application***

In order to assist heads of department in making decisions with potentially far-reaching consequences for remuneration, and to ensure fairness and transparency, three mechanisms for the consideration of merit awards are proposed:

*Route 1:* the cycle of performance reviews could result in the head of department nominating a staff member for a merit award. These nominations would be considered by the relevant Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee.

*Route 2:* the staff member makes application for a merit award with or without the support of the head of department. These nominations would be considered by the relevant Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee.

*Route 3:*The Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee could make recommendations for a merit award in cases where, for example, an individual is considered to have demonstrated excellent performance but still falls short of promotion. The rhetoric of a “failed promotion” should be actively countered with the notion of meritorious achievement.

The DVC accountable for academic matters holds final authority for the approval of merit awards and payments for excellence. There is no appeal process, however, if there is a breakdown in the process of application and assessment the case will be addressed on an individual basis.

***Implementation details for 2011***

1. It is proposed that in the first year of implementation (2011) the number of merit awards be limited to 7-8% of staff in the relevant ranks, with the balance of awards (2-3%) given in the following year (2012).
2. If the recurrent allocation for merit awards in a given faculty is not fully utilised in a given year, the balance from that year will form part of the surplus on ROT which will go into the prior year reserves. The amount will again be available in subsequent years for allocation.

**7. Implementational aspects of the recommendations**

It is recommended that

1. the processes of goal setting and assessment be aligned with the current performance cycle (2008 – 2010) and therefore the next performance cycle will be for the period 2011 – 2014. The round of assessments which took place in mid-2010 was based on the previously-approved set of criteria and performance was assessed over the preceding three years. Objectives for the next four-year cycle (2011 – 2014) will be set in accordance with the new sets of criteria;
2. current staff deemed not to be meeting the criteria for expected performance continue to be assessed against their individual plans and agreed objectives;
3. an implementation plan, with accompanying timetable, be developed under the oversight of the Committee of Deans. The plan should include details on training for Heads of Departments;
4. the new plan and policy be reviewed following the end of the first year (end of 2011)[[1]](#footnote-1).

**Annexure 1**

**Performance Criteria**

**Preamble**

Academic staff at the University of Cape Town are expected to undertake an appropriate teaching load as determined by the faculty and department. Besides conventional teaching, a range of educational responsibilities can be recognised as contributing to the teaching load. Staff are expected to meet the requirements of the Teaching and Learning Charter, and using a teaching portfolio as evidence, demonstrate effectiveness as a teacher of undergraduate students by incorporating relevant disciplinary developments in course teaching, analysing and commenting reflectively on student performance data and developing responses to unusually high or low success rates. There is an expectation to respond to course evaluations and external examiners’ reports, and to utilise professional development opportunities where appropriate. At higher ranks, there is an increased expectation for effective postgraduate student supervision, where opportunities exist. Quality underpins all teaching expectations.

Research expectations are similarly high and as a leading research institution a greater emphasis is placed on quality and impact of research rather than simple quantitative output. It is recognised that differences in research output quantity and nature vary vastly between disciplines, even within a single faculty, and may include journal articles, books and monographs, and creative and professional works in those disciplines where peer reviewed written work is not the generally accepted avenue for disseminating research. There is an expectation of increased national and international impact of research output (e.g. standing of journals or publisher, citation indexes, etc) as staff move through the ranks from lecturer to professor.

All staff are expected to contribute to the administration of the University, with the level of involvement and leadership increasing from departmental through to faculty and university levels, with progress through the ranks from lecturer to professor. At senior ranks a willingness to mentor more junior staff is expected. Efficient course administration is required at all ranks. Staff members at the rank of full professor are expected to be willing to serve as heads of department if so required.

The demonstration of social responsiveness through teaching and learning, research and/or public service is expected of all academic staff. It is recognised however that some disciplines lend themselves more easily to social responsiveness activities than others, and that these activities vary widely, and do not align in any simple way to academic seniority or rank. For these each faculty must determine the weighting of scores in the social responsiveness category in procedures for performance evaluations.

The above captures the general work ethos expected of academic staff at UCT and is expanded on in detail for each rank in the ad hominem promotion guidelines for each faculty. The expected performance level for a member of the academic staff will be based on the criteria used for ad hominem promotions in each faculty, using applicable weightings for each category where allowed by the relevant faculty, and taking rank into account[[2]](#footnote-2). An evaluation of performance every four years will be undertaken by the head of department or, where requested, by the head and a senior colleague, with the member of staff concerned and an aggregate score or range calculated. Non-standard allocation of academic duties based on operational need and agreed in advance by the staff member, head of department and dean is possible within this performance management structure for academic staff. In such cases, the evaluation of performance and scores will be based on the agreed set of duties.

**Performance levels**

There are three major categories of staff performance:

**Expected performance**, in the case of staff meeting expectations;

**Under-performance** refers to performance below the desired standard for the rank of the staff member. Under-performance which is not remedied once identified may be deemed in due course to be unsatisfactory;

**Unsatisfactory performance** refers to performance that is clearly below the level acceptable for the rank of the staff member.

In the case of both under- and unsatisfactory performance, staff in these categories will be subject to improvement plans with the aim of achieving performance levels by a designated time. In addition, staff members whose performance is deemed unsatisfactory will be subject to the poor performance procedures of the university.

**Faculty-specific performance criteria**

**Note: these criteria are to be read in conjunction with the ad hominem promotion criteria for the faculty concerned.**

Heads of Department may negotiate with individual staff members, in consultation with the dean, to vary the minima for teaching and research in order to meet temporary departmental operational requirements. In these cases the criteria for an expected level of performance must be clarified upfront with the staff member involved and signed off by the HoD and Dean.

**Centre for Higher Education and Development**

Staff in any rank will under normal circumstances be deemed to be performing at **expected** levels if they meet the criteria for expected performance (or higher) for both contributions to teaching & learning and research, and for one of the other categories.

Staff who fail to meet the criteria for expected performance for either contributions to teaching & learning or research will be deemed to be performing at **under-performance** level and will be placed on a performance improvement plan with respect to that particular area.

Staff who fail to meet the criteria for expected performance for both contributions to teaching & learning and research will be deemed to be performing at **unsatisfactory** performance level.

**Commerce**

Academic staff will be deemed to be performing at **expected** levels where a weighted averages score of 5 or above is achieved across the four categories of research, teaching and learning, leadership and management and social responsiveness. In addition, at the Professor level, a minimum of score of 5 must be achieved for research to be deemed satisfactory[[3]](#footnote-3).

Academic staff who fall slightly below this level but have weighted average score of at least 4.5 and in the case of Professor a minimum score of 4 for research, will be considered to be performing at **under-performance** level.

Academic staff with a weighted average scores of below 4.5, or in the case of Professor a minimum score of 4 for research, will be deemed to be performing at **unsatisfactory** performance level**.**

**Engineering and the Built Environment**

 The performance score is an aggregate score across the four categories of teaching, research, administration and leadership, and social responsiveness.  It is based on the ad-hominem promotion guide for scoring, including the weighting system.

 To allow staff to change the emphasis of their work in consultation with their HODs, the HOD may recommend a temporary deviation from the allowed weightings, provided that (a) the staff member is in agreement and (b) the HOD informs the Dean of the arrangement.

**Expected** performance levels are as follows:

Lecturer - weighted score of 45-50

Senior Lecturer - weighted score of 55-60

Associate Professor - weighted score of 65-70

Professor - weighted score of at 75-80[[4]](#footnote-4)

Staff who score *less* than the range for their rank are performing at **under-performance** level. Under-performance will be addressed via the procedures for addressing underperformance or unsatisfactory performance.

Scores in the following ranges will be deemed to be performing at **unsatisfactory** level.

 Lecturer - weighted score of less than 40

Senior Lecturer - weighted score of less than 50

Associate Professor - weighted score of less than 60

Professor - weighted score of less than 70

Unsatisfactory performance will be addressed via the procedures for addressing underperformance or unsatisfactory performance.

**Health Sciences**

Staff are assessed with reference to four categories of work: (1) teaching and learning; (2) research; (3) University leadership and administration; and (4) social responsiveness, and are based on the ad hominem promotion guide. This last category includes clinical service, community outreach and policy input. Staff are required to choose how to weight these four categories to reflect the balance of their own particular workload. Each category has a minimum and a maximum weighting as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | Weighting | **Points Score**  |
| Teaching and learning | 2 – 5 | 1 – 10 |
| Research | 2 – 5 | 1 – 10 |
| Leadership and administration | 1 – 5 | 1 – 10 |
| Social responsiveness  | 1 – 5 | 1 – 10 |

The chosen weightings **must add up to a total of 10**. The points scored by a candidate in the four categories are then multiplied by the weighting for that category. This results in a final score of between 1 and 100.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rank** | **Points Score**  |
| Full Professor | 80+ |
| Associate Professor | 70 – 80 |
| Senior Lecturer | 60 – 70 |
| Lecturer | 50 – 60 |

Performance will be based on the aggregate score. The weighting and scoring formula de facto dictates an automatic minimum score for each area of performance, while at the same time allowing for the flexibility necessary in a faculty with widely diversifying job descriptions and requirements.[[5]](#footnote-5)

Staff will be deemed to be performing at the **expected** level if they score within the range of their level. Staff scoring 5 points lower than the level point will be considered to be **underperforming**. Staff scoring more than 5 points below the minimum will be considered to be **unsatisfactory**.

**Humanities**

Staff in any rank will under normal circumstances be deemed to be performing at the **expected** level if they score in the range of 5-7 for teaching, 5-7 for research, and 5-7 in one of the other categories, giving a total score of 15 or more.

Staff who achieve a total score in the range 6-14 will be deemed to be performing at **under-performance** level.

Staff who score less than 6 overall will be deemed to be performing at **unsatisfactory** level.

*Guidelines to variations from the standard requirements for expected performance*

Heads of Department may negotiate with individual staff members, in consultation with the dean, to vary the minima for teaching and research in order to meet temporary departmental operational requirements. In these cases staff will be deemed to be performing at expected level if they achieve an overall score of 15 or more, made up of a score for teaching of at least 6, which is doubled, plus the score for research and one of either leadership and administration or public service. The same method of scoring will be used for part-time permanent staff employed on teaching-only contracts.

**Law**

To be eligible for the Standard Academic Salary Package academic staff at all levels of appointment *must* achieve the appropriate SASP score in each of the three categories: research; teaching; and leadership, management & administration (LMA). It is also *preferable* that academic staff are also active participants in socially responsive activities. NOTE: The SASP level in the first three categories differs according to the various ranks of academic appointment.

**Expected** performance

Academic staff achieving the required SASP level in teaching; research; leadership, management & administration; and, preferably, social responsiveness, over a four-year period as determined by the Departmental Performance Committee (Head of Department plus one or more senior staff as requested by the candidate) will be regarded as having met the performance expectations of his/her rank and receive the standard academic salary package applicable to the rank for the following four years.

Performance at the SASP level would normally be required for eligibility for any ‘scarcity’ lift-out in the Faculty.

Below expected performance

*Poor performance*

All academic staff who obtain a score of 0-19 for teaching; research; or leadership, management & administration (except in the case of flexibility of scoring research where teaching commitments are, for departmental reasons, substantially increased, see above) will be regarded as **underperforming** at the relevant rank, will incur possible financial consequences (still to be determined after consultation with all stake holders) until performance returns to the expected level as defined and must be put on a performance improvement plan.

***Unsatisfactory*** *performance*

Any other member of staff who obtains a score below SASP for teaching; research or leadership, management & administration (except in the case of flexibility of scoring research where teaching commitments are, for departmental reasons, substantially increased, see above) should be counselled by the Head of Department and *possibly* put on a performance improvement plan with the aim of achieving expected performance levels at the end of the cycle. A newly appointed, entry-level Lecturer who obtains a score below SASP level will need to be counselled by the Head of Department on what he/she needs to do to achieve SASP in the future.

**Science**

The threshold for **expected** performance is an aggregate score across the four categories of teaching, research, administration and leadership, and social responsiveness as follows:

 Lecturer – weighted score of at least 45

Senior lecturer – weighted score of at least 55

Associate Professor - weighted score of at least 65

Professor - weighted score of at least 70 [[6]](#footnote-6)

The weighting system used is that applicable to ad hominem promotions.

Staff who fall slightly below this level (for example, by less than 5 weighted points) will be deemed to be performing at **under-performance** level.

Staff will be deemed to be performing at **unsatisfactory** level if scores fall in the following ranges:

Lecturer – weighted score of less than 40

Senior lecturer – weighted score of less than 50

Associate Professor – weighted score less than 60

Professor – weighted score less than 65

1. This was proposed and accepted as an amendment to the motion put to Senate, which had been that the plan and policy be reviewed after a full cycle, i.e. at the end of 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Senate requested that faculties who have appointed academic staff as Research Officers and Research Chairs, specify the criteria for performance where they have been developed, and where they have not, to develop these criteria. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Senate requested that the Faculty of Commerce develop minimum research criteria for expected performance for the rank of Associate Professor to be approved by the Faculty Board [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Senate requested that the Faculty of Engineering and the Built Environment develop minimum research criteria for expected performance for the ranks of Professor and Associate Professor to be approved by the Faculty Board [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Senate requested that the Faculty of Health Sciences develop minimum research criteria for expected performance for the ranks of Professor and Associate Professor to be approved by the Faculty Board [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Senate requested that the Faculty of Science develop minimum research criteria for expected performance for the ranks of Professor and Associate Professor to be approved by the Faculty Board [↑](#footnote-ref-6)