

FACULTY OF SCIENCE

POINTS SYSTEM FOR THE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC STAFF

GUIDELINES FOR SCORING EACH CANDIDATE'S

1. University Teaching^{*1,2}
2. Research^{*1}
3. Leadership, Administration, and contributions to Scholarship and the enhancement of Science
4. Social Responsiveness and Engaged Scholarship

^{*1} Note: in these sections, qualifying adjectives to describe volume, e.g. number of postgraduate students, publication output, etc. should be read as "relative to the field".

^{*2} Note: Staff on Academic Teacher conditions of service must use the separate points scoring guidelines for Academic Teachers.

UNIVERSITY TEACHING

(Staff on Standard Academic conditions of service)

Score

- | | |
|---------|--|
| 9 to 10 | <p><u>Course Teaching:</u> Consistently excellent student evaluations. Plays a leadership role in course and curriculum development, reflecting his/her research activities in course design and teaching where appropriate. Record of successful leadership of academic development initiatives. Probably a recent recipient of a University or National Teaching Award. Well established reputation among staff and students for excellence in all aspects of teaching, in the field and in the classroom.</p> <p><u>Student Supervision:</u> Has successfully supervised many Master's and PhD students (relative to the field) who are themselves making a scientific impact. Has a sustained record of excellent postgraduate student feedback. Recognised as amongst the most successful supervisors in the Faculty as reflected by the number of research Master's and PhD students graduated, external examiner reports, and student feedback. Readily and frequently contributes to the advancement of postgraduate students.</p> |
| 7 to 8 | <p><u>Course Teaching:</u> Consistently very good student evaluations. Independently involved in course and curriculum development, reflecting his/her research activities in course design and teaching where appropriate. Where appropriate plays an active role in academic development activities. Clearly one of the better teachers in the department and in the upper echelon of teachers in the Faculty.</p> <p><u>Student Supervision:</u> Good track record of graduated Master's and PhD students. Recognised as a dedicated and effective postgraduate supervisor as reflected by external examiner reports and student feedback. Among the better supervisors in the Faculty. Regularly serves as external examiner of postgraduate theses.</p> |
| 5 to 6 | <p><u>Course Teaching:</u> Student evaluations are generally good. Involved in course and materials development. Contributes to academic development of undergraduate students where appropriate. Meeting expectations of a teacher in the Department.</p> <p><u>Student Supervision:</u> Has successfully graduated several postgraduate students at Master's and/or PhD level. Examiner reports and student feed-back attest to quality of supervision.</p> |
| 3 to 4 | <p><u>Course Teaching:</u> Student evaluations are generally poor. There is little evidence for involvement in course and materials development.</p> <p><u>Student Supervision:</u> Beginning to establish a postgraduate supervision record reflected in supervision of Honours projects and/or Master's level students.</p> |
| 1 to 2 | <p><u>Course Teaching:</u> Student evaluations are very poor. Teaching is not satisfactory. Largely ineffective as a teacher of undergraduate students by temperament or general ineptitude. Does the minimum teaching required by contract.</p> <p><u>Student Supervision:</u> No record of postgraduate mentorship or supervision, or general involvement with postgraduate students.</p> |
| 0 | <p>Totally inadequate and ineffective as a teacher of undergraduate or postgraduate students.</p> |

Candidates should score course teaching and student supervision separately, and combine the separate

scores into a single Teaching score using weightings between 0.7 and 0.3 (total = 1).

UNIVERSITY TEACHING

(Staff on Academic Teacher conditions of service)

Score

- 9 to 10 Consistently excellent student evaluations. An all-round outstanding teacher, recognized as an expert who has influenced and inspired other teachers in their field within the Faculty and in the external context. Plays a leadership role in course and curriculum development, reflecting own research activities in course design and teaching. Record of successful leadership in educational development initiatives at institutional level as well as national level. Well established reputation among staff and students for excellence in all aspects of teaching, in the field and/or in the classroom. Probably the recent recipient of a University or National teaching award.
- 7 to 8 Consistently very good student evaluations. Clear evidence that candidate's teaching is able to facilitate high quality student learning. Able to show a track record of the development of teaching and curricula at both course and programme level. Has successfully executed teaching innovations in a course and/or programme curriculum. Able to articulate a sophisticated and coherent teaching philosophy. Recognised in the Department, in the Faculty, and possibly externally for teaching expertise. Making a contribution to teaching and learning beyond the candidate's own course(s).
- 5 to 6 Student evaluations are generally good and fulfils teaching requirement. Shows evidence of an appropriate approach to teaching for their context, using student feedback, evaluations and exploring different teaching ideas. Shows some involvement in discussions around teaching in their Department and possibly in the Faculty. Typically an adequate teacher with substantial experience or a good teacher with limited experience.
- 3 to 4 Student evaluations are generally poor. There is little evidence for involvement in course and materials development. Contribution to teaching is below the expectation of the post; this may be in calibre, teaching load, experience or a combination thereof.
- 1 to 2 Student evaluations are very poor. Teaching is not satisfactory. Largely ineffective as a teacher of undergraduate students by temperament or general ineptitude. Does the minimum teaching required by contract.
- 0 Totally inadequate and ineffective as a teacher of undergraduate or postgraduate students.

RESEARCH

Score

- 9 to 10 Among the leading researchers in their field internationally. Highly productive in terms of research output, with work having a major international impact as assessed by, amongst others, exceptional total citation record, H-factor, and/or excellent book reviews, and very strong referee reports reflecting on international leadership in the field. Usually NRF A-rated, possibly B1-rated. Frequently invited as plenary or keynote speaker at major international conferences in the field. In the top group of researchers in the Faculty.
- 7 to 8 Certainly one of the best known in their field nationally and with a wide reputation internationally. Very productive in terms of research outputs, which are having a significant international impact as reflected in a strong total citation record, H-factor and/or favorable book reviews. Referee reports confirm international reputation and impact of work. Usually B-rated by NRF, possibly C1-rated. Regular conference participant, often by invitation, to top international meetings. Among the best researchers in the Faculty.
- 5 to 6 Steady research output. Recognized in his/her field, and work regularly cited, with some evidence of international recognition. Usually C-rated (or Y1-rated) by NRF. Conference participation is regular, mostly local, with some international participation.
- 3 to 4 Shows evidence of potential and recent research productivity - some publications, at least, in international journals. Not yet rated by the NRF. Infrequently contributes to scientific conferences.
- 1 to 2 Dabbles in research, and has produced few papers in the past. Very seldom contributes to scientific conferences.
- 0 Does no research at all. Does not participate in scientific conferences.

LEADERSHIP, ADMINISTRATION, CONTRIBUTIONS TO SCHOLARSHIP AND THE ENHANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Score

- | | |
|---------|--|
| 9 to 10 | Impressive and sustained leadership role in the Faculty/University. Consistently excellent track record in Departmental, Faculty and University administration, innovation and decision-making. Outstanding leadership and organisational ability as Deputy Dean, Head of Department, head of a major research group or university structure. Consistent and respected contributions to learned societies for e.g., as President/ Chairperson/ Executive Officer/Editor. Influential role in National and International scientific committees and scientific organisations. Leader in initiatives to advance Science outside of the confines of UCT. In the top 5-10 % of leaders and administrators in the Faculty. |
| 7 to 8 | Above average reputation for leadership and respected as an effective contributor to administration at Faculty/University level, and to the general well-being of the Faculty or Department. Recognised nationally for role in the advancement of science outside of UCT. Demonstrated leadership and organisational ability as a Deputy Dean, Head of Department or as the head of a research group. |
| 5 to 6 | Above average reputation at Departmental level for contributions to leadership and administration, and to the general well-being of the Department. Possibly some contributions at Faculty level. Actively contributes to the advancement of science outside of UCT. |
| 3 to 4 | Moderate to minor contribution to Departmental leadership and administration or advancement of science outside UCT. |
| 1 to 2 | Seldom contributes to Departmental administration. Track record of ineffectiveness. |
| 0 | Makes no contribution to leadership, innovation, administration, or decision-making in the University, Faculty or Department, or to the enhancement of Science outside the University. |

SOCIAL RESPONSIVENESS AND ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP

Score

- | | |
|---------|---|
| 9 to 10 | Very strong and well-developed interactions with industry, professional, governmental and non-governmental sectors which enhance engaged scholarship in the Faculty. Frequently consulted as a specialist adviser by local or international industrialists and public-sector organizations. Serves on private-sector or governmental committees and organisations as an expert in their field of scholarship. Influential in decision-making and policy-making by community organisations, government, commerce and industry, as evidenced by adoption of major policy reports. Highly respected outside the University as a leading figure in his or her field of expertise and for contributions to the wider society. Amongst the leaders in the Faculty with regard to social responsiveness and industrial interactions. |
| 7 to 8 | Strong industrial interactions and/or regularly consulted by industrial, private or governmental organizations. Respected as an expert in their field of expertise. Involvement with communities, industry or governmental organizations attracts funding and students to UCT, enhances scholarship at the University and makes a contribution to the University's research capacity. Clear evidence of impact through influencing of policy. In the upper 20% in the Faculty with regard to social responsiveness and industrial interactions. |
| 5 to 6 | Has developed some worthwhile interactions with industry or other constituencies outside of UCT which are to the benefit of scholarship at our University. Has been consulted as a source of expertise. Gaining a reputation in the wider community as an authority, and as a productive contributor, in his or her field of work. Good reputation for extra mural teaching where appropriate. |
| 3 to 4 | Limited or irregular interactions with industry or other constituencies outside of UCT. These interactions make limited contributions to scholarship at UCT. Not yet with a well-established reputation as an expert in his or her field of work. |
| 1 to 2 | Few and/or spasmodic contributions to industry and wider society. These interactions and consultancies make little contribution to scholarship at UCT, attract few students and hardly contribute at all to the University's research capacity. |
| 0 | No track record of private or public sector involvement that has contributed to scholarship or research at UCT. |