Faculty of Engineering and the Built Environment

2024/2025

Guidelines for *Ad hominem* Promotion

+ Merit and Excellence Awards

Invitation from the Acting Dean

Academic Staff in the Faculty are invited to apply for, or to nominate colleagues for, ad hominem promotion, merit awards, or excellence awards.

Academic staff on standard conditions of service, staff and academic staff on teaching conditions of service, are eligible.

This process is crucial to the success of our vision of highly motivated staff, confident that their efforts will be acknowledged and rewarded. I want to assure members of staff that every effort is made to treat each case with fairness and care.

The point system adopted by the Faculty to assist in the evaluation of performance is intended to be an aid to the Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee (the 'Committee') in its deliberations and not definitive in its conclusions. A recommendation on an applicant's rating in the cases of (i) Teaching, (ii) Research, and (iii) Social Responsiveness will be made to the Committee by the Working Groups set up for this purpose. These groups act in an advisory capacity. They may also interview an applicant to gather more information. In the area of Management, Leadership and Administration, the applicant's Head of Department (HoD) may, where necessary, be asked to provide a recommendation. The Committee evaluates all these inputs, as well as referees' reports and other relevant information, in coming to a final decision. Voting in the Committee is by secret ballot.

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

An application for Ad Hominem promotion from an applicant who, on 30 June of the year of application, has been in their current academic rank for less than three years, will not normally be considered. An exceptional case will have to be made to the Dean by the applicant's Head of Department, at least one week in advance of the closing date for applications.

Staff funded by research or non-GOB funds are to note that the costs for the promotion are borne by the source of funding or grant holder as such, promotion may be contingent on available funds.

Thank you for your contribution to EBE and the University.

Sincerely

Acting Dean Malibongwe Manono, Assoc Professor and Deputy Dean of UG Studies: Faculty of Engineering & the Built Environment

Where and When to Apply/Nominate

Intention to apply/nominate

Prospective applicants, please provide notification of intention to apply and supply suitable referee information via email to mel.scheepers@uct.ac.za by no later than **Wednesday, 21 May 2025.**

Application deadline

Full and final applications should be sent via email to mel.scheepers@uct.ac.za by no later than **Friday, 20 June 2025**.

In the case of a nomination, the nominator should have the consent of the nominee. Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee (**PaRC**): (henceforth called 'the Committee') will meet at the end of August 2025.

For the composition, terms of reference and procedures of PaRC, please see Appendix B.

Definitions and Weightings: Comprehensive Track, Teaching Track and Research Track

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

The Comprehensive Track

This track expects a balance between teaching and research. It is the track for all eligible academics on standard conditions of service <u>and</u> for staff on the teaching and research tracks applying for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor (although the weightings differ).

The Teaching Track

This track considers staff on teaching track conditions of service.

Academics on the teaching track applying for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor will be evaluated according to the criteria of the comprehensive track.

The Research Track

This track considers staff on the research track conditions of service for promotion through the ranks of research officer, senior research officer, chief research officer and principal research officer.

Academics on the research track applying for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor will be evaluated according to the criteria of the comprehensive track.

The positions in each track and the associated weighting of scores are detailed below:

Comprehensive Track	Teaching Track	Research Track
Professor	Not applicable	Principal Research Officer
Associate Professor	Not applicable	Chief Research Officer
Senior Lecturer	Senior Lecturer	Senior Research Officer
Lecturer	Lecturer	Research Officer

Point Scores and Weightings

The points system serves as a guide for relevant assessors or committees in evaluating academic attributes, which allows for comparison of academic staff at different ranks and in different disciplines, and it facilitates consistency in assessments from year to year.

The points system is an aid in the assessment of academic excellence which is reflected through achievements in scholarship (mainly Teaching and Research) and in contributions to Management, Leadership and Administration, and in Social Responsiveness and contributions to Public and Professional Service.

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

There are four broad areas (categories) for judging academic excellence:

a) Teaching,
b) Research and equivalent Creative and Professional Work,
c) Management, Leadership and Administration,
d) Social Responsiveness and contribution to Public and Professional Service.

Each category is scored out of 10 in the points allocation system. Within categories, applicants' performances are holistically assessed.

The Faculty has adopted a 'weighting' system which allows individual members of the academic staff to choose, within limits (see table below), how they would like their academic performance to be evaluated. By choosing an appropriate weighting in each of four categories, the applicant may increase their overall score.

WEIGHTING	Comprehensive Track	Teaching Track	Research Track
Teaching	2 –5	5 – 8	1 – 4
Research	2 – 5	0 - 3	3 – 6
Admin, management and leadership	1 - 4	1 - 4	1 - 3
Social responsiveness	0 - 3	0 – 2	0 - 3

Comprehensive Track

This track expects a balance in teaching and research and applies to academic staff on standard conditions of service.

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

Chosen weighting factors must add up to a total of 10. The point scores in each category are then multiplied by the weighting for that category, resulting in a total score between 0 and 100.

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

Lecturer: 45 to 50 points

Senior Lecturer: 55 to 60 points

Associate Professor: 65 to 70 points

Comprehensive & Teaching Track: A minimum of 6 for both teaching and research.

Research track: A minimum of 5 for teaching and 7 for research.

Professor: 75 to 80 points

Comprehensive & Teaching Track: A minimum of 7 for both teaching and research.

Research track: A minimum of 6 for teaching and 8 for research.

It is implied that a strong performance in both Teaching and Research/Creative Work, as well as in contributions to Management, Leadership and Administration are Faculty expectations for academics at Associate Professor and Professor levels. The Faculty recognizes that Scholarship, Research and Innovation can be expressed, and internationally respected, through significant advances in teaching-learning and programme development.

Merit Awards & Excellence Awards

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

Associate Professor, as well as award at the Excellence 1 and 2 categories for Professors:

Lecturer:	52 points and above. Awarded on a competitive basis.
Senior Lecturer:	62 points and above. Awarded on a competitive basis.
Associate Professor:	72 points and above. Awarded on a competitive basis.
Professor Excellence 1:	scoring 80 points or above, with an additional demonstrable 'standout' performance or defining achievement.
Professor Excellence 2:	scoring 80 points or above, with an additional demonstrable 'standout' performance or defining achievement of a standard substantially higher than excellence 1.

Teaching Track

This track expects academic staff on teaching-only conditions of service to contribute to teaching and academic development. This track is for the ranks of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer.

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

Chosen weighting factors must add up to a total of 10. The point scores in each category are then multiplied by the weighting for that category, resulting in a total score between 0 and 100.

The Faculty has approved the following **guidelines** for score ranges (out of a maximum of 100) with respect to promotion to lecturer/senior lecturer:

Lecturer:	45 to 50 points with a minimum of 5 for teaching.
Senior Lecturer:	55 to 60 points with a minimum of 6 for teaching.

Merit Awards

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

Lecturer:	52 points and above with a minimum of 6 for teaching. Awarded on a competitive basis.
Senior Lecturer:	62 points and above with a minimum of 7 for teaching. Awarded on a competitive basis.

Research Track

This track is for Research Officers, Senior Research Officers and Chief Research Officers who may apply for promotion to the rank of Senior, Chief and Principal Research Officer on the research track.

The criteria for promotion in this category are similar to the criteria for staff on standard conditions of service. However, recognition is given to the fact that focus is expected to be on research and post-graduate teaching activities, including supervision of post-graduate students.

Research output would usually have had a demonstrable impact in the area of specialization. Research Officers who are applicants 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 Chief Research Officer and 8 in the case of promotion to Principal Research Officer.

The category 'Administration' may include work performed in the context of the research group in which the applicant is located.

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

Chosen weighting factors must add up to a total of 10. The point scores in each category are then multiplied by the weighting for that category, resulting in a total score between 0 and 100.

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

Research Officer: 45 to 50 points with a minimum of 5 for research

Senior Research Officer: 55 to 60 points with a minimum of 6 for research

Chief Research Officer: 65 to 70 points with a minimum of 7 for research

Principal Research Officer: 75 to 80 points with a minimum of 8 for research

In the case of Chief and Principal Research Officer ranks, the promotion may also be considered in terms of the titles associated with the comprehensive track if the applicant demonstrates performance in terms of <u>both</u> knowledge creation (through research) and knowledge dissemination (through teaching). In other words, this may enable a successful applicant to be

promoted to the title of Associate Professor *(instead of Chief Research Officer)* or Professor *(instead of Principal Research Officer),* in accordance with the guideline score ranges below:

Associate Professor: 65 to 70 points with a minimum of 5 for teaching and 7 for research.

Professor: 75 to 80 points with a minimum of 6 for teaching and 8 for research.

Guidelines for Preparing Portfolios

Applicants must complete the portfolio in the format specified at the end of this document (Appendix A), highlighting achievements in *Teaching*, *Research and equivalent Creative and Professional Work*, *Management, Leadership and Administration*, and *Social Responsiveness*.

General Guidelines and Specifications:

- The documentation in a staff member's portfolio for evaluating teaching must include all items specified in the template, where appropriate.
- In establishing a score of a staff member, not all the criteria listed for a particular score need to be met.

Teaching

Documentation for evaluating teaching in an applicant's portfolio should give clear evidence of the teaching quantity and quality as well as educational development.

The Portfolio Template at the end of this document should be viewed in conjunction with the information in this section.

Guidelines and Specifications for the Teaching Portfolio (Section 3.1 in the portfolio template):

1. Section 3.1.3:
   - convey your performance in terms of the expectations of teaching in relation to your job description – this will differ depending on your Track (Comprehensive / Teaching / Research),
   - indicate if you had any extended periods of leave (e.g. sabbatical or sick leave), within the last three years, that impacted on your teaching hours. Here you may also highlight teaching challenges (e.g. large classes, high contact time, struggling students).
2. Section 3.1.14: Some items you may wish to include here are:
   - evidence of lecturing / attendance at staff development opportunities,
   - peer review feedback, awards and other forms of recognition,
   - cohort analyses of student data including retention, results, and throughput,
   - responding to course health watch data,
   - authorship of scholarly materials related to teaching such as textbooks and commentaries on teaching and learning,
   - education policy design and implementation, and/or
   - monitoring and development.

SCORE	TEACHING
10 9	An outstanding teacher, with growing recognition as an expert who has influenced and inspired other teachers in their field within the Faculty and increasingly in the external context. An effective supervisor of postgraduate students with a demonstrated commitment to developing students' scholarship (according to expectations of their conditions of service - 'track'). A growing role in educational development initiatives at institutional level as well as national level. The applicant's teaching practice continues to be at an excellent standard of innovation and effectiveness. Probably the recipient of a recognised teaching award.
8 7	An established and effective teacher; clear evidence that the applicant's teaching facilitates high-quality student learning. Able to show a track record of the development of teaching and curricula at both the course and programme level. Growing evidence of effective research supervision and mentorship of postgraduate students (according to expectations of their conditions of service). Has successfully executed teaching innovations in a course and/or programme curriculum. Able to articulate a sophisticated and coherent teaching philosophy. Starting to be recognised in the Department, in the Faculty, and possibly externally for teaching expertise. Makes a contribution to teaching and learning beyond the applicant's own course(s).
6 5	Carries a regular course teaching load (according to expectations of their conditions of service) and fulfils their teaching requirement adequately. Supervises some research students (including undergraduate Honours/final year projects). Shows some evidence of an appropriate approach to teaching for their context, using student feedback, and exploring different teaching ideas. Shows some involvement in discussions around teaching in their Department and possibly in the Faculty. An adequate teacher with substantial experience or a good teacher with limited experience.
4 3	The applicant is still growing in their contribution to teaching – usually a new academic; they may have a limited teaching load as a new academic or while they complete a higher degree in the discipline of their job description, **OR** is on the research track and therefore does limited teaching, **OR** requires intervention to facilitate improvement in teaching.
2 1	The applicant is on the research track and therefore does no teaching, **OR** is on the comprehensive or teaching track but is not involved in teaching – intervention may be required in such a case.

Research and Equivalent Creative and Professional Work

Documentation for evaluating research and/or equivalent creative and professional work in an applicant's portfolio should give clear evidence of quality, quantity and impact.

The Portfolio Template at the end of this document should be viewed in conjunction with the information in this section.

Guidelines and Specifications for the Research Portfolio (Section 3.2 in the portfolio template):

Consulting and involvement in practical projects of Architectural and/or Engineering design may be included, provided it can be clearly demonstrated that:

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

SCORE	RESEARCH AND EQUIVALENT CREATIVE AND PROFESSIONAL WORK
10 9	The applicant is likely to be a leader of a high-achievement research grouping and / or recognised as an exceptional researcher and a leader in their field. Outputs (peer reviewed and other): among the top researchers/creatives in their field internationally and very productive; often publishes in reputable refereed international journals; evidence of recognition is provided through research metrics etc. with work frequently cited or exhibited (citations, awards & rating, invitations, reviews, scientific committees). Creative works are well-recognized relative to the best in the field internationally. Usually A, B or P rated by the NRF. Frequently invited to speak or officiate at conferences of international status or to present creative work to international professional or academic audiences. Invited to be a member of the editorial board of international journals or specialised task or study groups of international bodies. Frequently used as a referee for high impact journals or a reviewer of professional creative work.
8	Participates as an effective researcher in a successful research grouping and is recognised as having a coherent research area. Outputs (peer reviewed and other): certainly one of the best known in their field within their region of operation and with some production of internationally recognised work; evidence of recognition is provided through research metrics etc. (citations, awards & rating, invitations, reviews, scientific committees).

7	Usually B, C, P, Y or L rated by the NRF.

Frequently invited to speak or officiate at local conferences or to present creative work to national professional or academic audiences. Otherwise has a growing international presence and is sometimes invited to international conferences.

Invited to be a member of the editorial board of national journals, or specialised task or study groups of national bodies. Often used as a referee for local journals or a reviewer of local professional creative work. Some invitations to act as a reviewer for internationally peer-reviewed journals. |
| 6

5 | Outputs (peer reviewed and other): steady research output, including refereed journal papers and creative work output; evidence of recognition is provided through research metrics etc. With work regularly cited or exhibited (citations, awards & rating, invitations, reviews, scientific committees)

Usually C, Y or L rated by NRF.

Plays an important and regular role in local conferences and/or occasionally contributes to international conferences.

Sometimes used as a referee for local journals or a reviewer of local professional creative work. Perhaps the occasional invitation to act as a reviewer for internationally peer-reviewed journals. |
| 4

3 | Likely to be a newly graduated PhD **OR** a new academic **OR** a staff member on the Teaching Track (carries a large teaching load and is therefore not focused on research at this time).

Outputs (peer reviewed and other): starting to become an active/independent researcher, demonstrated through research outputs including a refereed journal paper (or equivalent with respect to creative works etc.) over the rating period. Requires more time to build up research impact.

Evidence of growing recognition is provided through research metrics etc. (citations mostly) Not yet NRF rated.

Research outputs demonstrated through publication of a refereed journal paper (or equivalent with respect to creative works etc.) over the rating period. Typically, if not holding a PhD, close to completing. If holding PhD, has produced few conference papers or un-refereed journal papers in the past. |
| 2

1 | Registered for, and demonstrates active work towards obtaining, a PhD.
Research outputs are likely to be conference proceedings and reports.

Research outputs are limited to national conference proceedings and reports. Not yet an active researcher.
Does not have a PhD and is not registered for a PhD.
Not focused on research (possibly due to job description/track). Might have produced few papers or articles in the past but mostly not peer reviewed. Has not attended many conferences. Intervention may be required. |

Academic Citizenship (previously MLA)

Definition:
Academic Citizenship is a fundamental ethos that underpins the work of academic staff. It requires a strong commitment to academic integrity, service, engagement with the academic community, promotion of diversity and inclusion, and responsible stewardship of resources. It encompasses collegiality, respect, integrity and promotion of an inclusive environment.

By upholding these values, faculty members can make a positive impact on their students, colleagues, and the University as a whole.

Note: Academic citizenship should **not** overlap with teaching, research and social responsiveness.

Scope of academic citizenship activities:

CATEGORY A

All academic members are expected to demonstrate good citizenship, the norm for which will include such areas as:

- Attendance at and informed contribution to committees, staff meetings and wider University meetings.
- Attention to deadlines of all forms that will ensure the timeous completion and/or submission of marks, internal and external reports, budgets and proposals.
- Responsibility and/or participation in allocated activities such as tutor recruitment, allocation and management; time-tabling and internal venue allocation; and general workspace management.
- Responsibility and/or oversight for sub-division or sector activities within academic departments that include workshops, laboratories, libraries, specialist teaching venues and computer facilities.
- Active involvement in recruitment of students with particular emphasis on University and department open days.
- Promotion of best practices to ensure proper adherence to health and safety requirements.
- Promotion of inclusivity and integration of activities, particularly at department level.
- Active involvement in the support of the University's commitment to equality and diversity including employment equity representation.

CATEGORY B

- Responsibility for significant leadership, managerial and administrative roles, and performing these successfully.
- Streamlining administrative practices to improve quality and efficiency.
- Space renovation and equipment upgrades.
- Involvement with pastoral and co-curricular activities with students.
- Promotion of and involvement in University academic societies.
- Representation of colleagues in academic unions and cluster bodies.
- Collegial support (mentorship) and advocating for the needs of others.
- Promotion of and active engagement in environmental sustainability at the University.

Assessment and score card

Academic citizenship activities must show demonstrable benefit to the University. Claims must be supported by reliable evidence at every level which demonstrates effectiveness, scale, quality, impact and importance of achievements. Appropriate quantitative indicators will be valuable.

Where an applicant cites leadership roles they are currently undertaking, they are expected to demonstrate the contributions and successes they have already achieved and not merely to highlight roles they are about to or have recently assumed.

SCORE CARD

SCORE	ACADEMIC CITIZENSHIP (including Management, Leadership and Administration)
10 9	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 which is reflected by completion of tasks and deliverables timeously. Is intimately involved with Faculty/University policy and management formulation. Recognised as being in the top leadership echelons in the Faculty/University.
8 7	The applicant is a very solid performer according to criteria in level 5-6 and has gained a good reputation for leadership, innovation, and decision-making within the department and the Faculty, and possibly also at University level. The applicant has considerable experience in serving on University Committees at policy formulating and leadership level. Serves as a good and effective HOD or equivalent. The applicant is recognized for their highly active and effective contribution to promoting the equality and diversity agenda and they play an active role in staff development.
6 5	All requirements in level 3-4 are met and there is evidence that contributions are aimed at adding improvements to existing initiatives. Good balance between academic citizenship activities and academic work which has permitted extension of academic citizenship to include some activities described in **Category B**, as well as participation in committees and/or working groups at University level. Leadership is often demonstrated by promoting new ideas and revisions to existing systems. In cases where the applicant occupies a significant leadership role in the department or Faculty they should score at a minimum of level 6 on condition that there is sustained performance over a period of at least 2 years.
4 3	Effective discharge of departmental responsibilities which implies engaged and effective participation in assigned departmental administrative activities and committees as described in **Category A**. Where appropriate, reporting is comprehensive and deadlines are generally always met. Active engagement in a Faculty committee and regular report back to the department will assist in scoring at level 4-5.
2 1	The applicant is required to be highly focused on developing their research and/or teaching tracks and hence they are not able to devote significant time to contribute towards good academic citizenship. However, they do actively participate in compulsory department meetings and complete minor administrative tasks as required. Performance at level 2 is indicated by demonstrating keen willingness to engage and assist in as much as time allows.

Social Responsiveness and contribution to Public and Professional Service

Documentation in a staff member's portfolio for evaluating social responsiveness and contribution to public and professional service should give clear evidence of contributions in the public sphere.

The Portfolio Template at the end of this document should be viewed in conjunction with the information in this section.

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

- contributions to industry or one's profession;
- contributions to the formulation of state policies and frameworks;
- contributions to the provision of services for the public sector and/or civil society and/or industry (including innovations, systems development or community outreach);
- engaged scholarship with the public sector, industry or civil society constituencies for the purpose of coproducing knowledge; or
- information dissemination in the public domain.

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

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

- their engagement with external, non-academic constituencies,

- how their consultancy work is informed by their scholarly activities (whether research or teaching activities), and
- how their consultancy work contributes to public purpose, public interest, social benefit or the enhancement of professional practice for wider-public benefit.

Guidelines and Specifications for the Social Responsiveness and contribution to Public and Professional Service Portfolio (Section 3.4 in the portfolio template):

In establishing a social responsiveness score, a candidate must demonstrate: (1) Their engagement with external, non-academic constituencies; (2) how their engagements are informed by their scholarly activities (that are based in their departments, schools or research units); (3) how their social responsiveness activities feed back into their more formal research and/or teaching activities; (4) how their engagements contribute, in some way, to public purpose/interest, social benefit or the enhancement of professional practice for wider public benefit; and (5) in what form their social responsiveness activities are captured as outputs.

In establishing a social responsiveness score, it is not expected that a staff member will have made a contribution in more than one of the five identified categories of social responsiveness. However, where a staff member has made contributions in more than one category, they can motivate for a score one point higher than the highest individual category score.

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

Category 1: Industry or the engineering and built environment professions

This category entails direct application of specialised knowledge, expertise, scholarship or research findings in a professional setting beyond the University. It might include:

- contributions to industry or professional societies as a specialist advisor (research or innovation),
- being called on by industry/societies to take part in their policy or management formulation processes,
- actively serving on committees, boards or councils of local/international organisations or non-academic societies that are external to the University,
- facilitating Continuing Professional Development (CPD) courses or conferences/workshops for non-academic audiences, and/or
- working with (non-academic) public and private sector constituencies for the purpose of enhancing professional practices that, in turn, have a wider-public benefit.

Category 2: Formulation of State policies and frameworks

This category entails direct contributions to, or influence on, public policy development. This might include:

- undertaking requested policy research, for example in the form of short written briefs or carefully considered verbal advice,
- being contracted or consulted by the State to write or contribute to public policy,
- submitting substantive policy or technical briefing papers to government,
- making evidence-based submissions to Parliament or Parliamentary structures,
- participating in the drafting of policies, frameworks or guidelines, and/or

- actively participating in public policy review and amendment processes.

Category 3: Provision of services for the public sector and/or civil society and/or industry (including innovations, systems development or community outreach and development)

The purpose of this category is to contribute to public-sector/industry-provided services and/or to support the needs of community-based organisations (CBOs), non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and others through the delivery of innovative solutions, service-learning or community outreach initiatives/activities.

This category entails direct application of professional knowledge, expertise, scholarship, research findings or experiential teaching activities (including student service- learning programmes as part of a UCT formal curriculum).

This category might include:

- systems development,
- the production of popular materials,
- the provision of technical support or advocacy services in a public-sector or community setting,
- the monitoring and evaluation of implemented services, modes of delivery, and/or materials, and/or
- facilitating workshops, delivering CPD-type courses (or other forms of knowledge transfer) for state and/or community and/or industry partners.

Category 4: Engaged scholarship with the public sector, industry or civil society constituencies for the purpose of coproducing knowledge

This category of social responsiveness is underpinned by values of participatory democracy for the intentional purpose of enhancing engaged scholarship. Engaged scholarship, in turn, assists us in generating coproduced knowledge, as well as new methods of teaching, learning and collaborative research with external, non-academic constituencies.

This category entails knowledge-sharing, mutual-learning and reciprocity during various phases of an engaged scholarship initiative (conceptualisation, design and implementation). Participatory action research methods or teaching and learning methods appropriate for community-university engagements (as part of the UCT formal curriculum)—are most likely employed.

Contributions to category must include:

- the coproduction of knowledge with public sector constituencies and/or industry and/or civil society (including community-based organisations (CBOs), non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and others).

Category 5: Information dissemination in the public domain

This category entails direct application of professional knowledge, expertise, scholarship and/or research findings to inform, shape or challenge public discourses and debates at local, national and international levels beyond academia. This public information dissemination might include:

- media interviews,
- writing articles or opinion editorials for print media,
- sustained and purposeful engagement on social media,

- participation in public debate panels, and/or
- public lectures.

SCORE	SOCIAL RESPONSIVENESS AND CONTRIBUTION TO PUBLIC AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICE
10	*Contributions result in significant enhancements of—and advancements from—the status quo. These contributions also have wider-public benefits.* *Is a demonstrable output-driven contribution with high impacts that concern excellence.* **Contributions to industry or the profession:** Very strong interactions with local/international organisations or associations. Regularly invited by industry to make significant contributions to professional organisations/associations as a highly respected specialist. Regularly invited by industry/organisations/societies to take part in their policy or management formulation processes. Actively serves on committees, boards or councils of local/international organisations as the President, Chair or Executive Officer of these organisations – this leads to a significant enhancement and advancement of professional practices with wider-public benefits. Facilitates successful, high impact CPD courses, conferences or workshops for professional organisations. The applicant should demonstrate how a transfer of knowledge leads to a significant enhancement of industry or the profession, and how these social responsiveness activities are captured as significant, high-quality outputs. **Contributions to the formulation of State policies and frameworks:** Very strong and regular contributions to, or influence on, public policy development. Identified by the State as a highly respected specialist, the applicant is regularly invited by the State to take part in policy formulation, review and amendment processes. Makes regular, high-impact submissions to Parliament. Frequently submits substantive policy or technical briefing papers to the State. The applicant should demonstrate how these contributions significantly enhance and advance State policies/frameworks, and how these contributions are captured as significant, high-quality outputs. **Contributions to the provision of services *for* the public sector and/or civil society and/or industry:** A very strong application of professional knowledge, expertise, scholarship or teaching activities (as part of the formal curriculum)—as well as regular and high-impact contributions to non-academic constituencies—for the purpose of significantly enhancing and advancing State, civil society and/or industry services, towards addressing development challenges.

	The applicant should demonstrate how high-impact innovations, systems development, service-learning courses, community outreach initiatives, popular materials, technical support and/or advocacy services led to a significant enhancement and advancement of State, civil society and/or industry services with wider-public benefits.

Regularly facilitates high impact workshops (or other forms of knowledge transfer) for non-academic constituencies.

The applicant should demonstrate how workshops led to a significant transfer and advancement of knowledge with wider-public benefits, and how these social responsiveness activities are captured as significant, high-quality outputs.

Engaged scholarship *with* the public sector, industry or civil society for the purpose of coproducing knowledge: A very strong application of research and/or teaching activities (as part of the formal curriculum) for the explicit purpose of coproducing <u>new</u> knowledge *with* non-academic constituencies.

The applicant should demonstrate the following:

- How engagements are grounded in values of participatory democracy, and how engagements enable power-sharing (as opposed to knowledge transfer alone) and reciprocity (namely, how engagements have significant benefits for <u>all</u> participants of a project).

- How mutual learning takes place during each phase of a collaborative project (conceptualisation, design and implementation).

- How applied research methods, participatory action research (PAR), or teaching methods are employed to significantly advance engaged scholarship, and how these are captured as significant, high-quality outputs.

Information dissemination in the public domain: Very strong and regular contributions (based on scholarly activities) to public discourses at local/national/international levels beyond academia. The applicant should demonstrate how such contributions have a significant impact on shaping and, if relevant, challenging public opinions, discourses and debates.
Regularly used as a specialist advisor for media interviews, opinion editorials, social media engagements, public debate panels, public lectures, and the like.
The applicant should demonstrate how these contributions enhance, advance and alter public discourses, and how these social responsiveness activities are captured as significant, high-quality outputs. |
| 9 | |

8	*Contributions improve the status quo with wider-public benefits. Contribution is demonstrated to be output-driven and concerns excellence.* **Contributions to industry or the profession:** Strong and consistent interactions with local/international professional organisations or associations. Invited to serve as a specialist advisor. Invited by industry/professional societies to take part in their policy or management formulation structures. Actively serves on committees, boards or councils of local or international organisations/associations that are external to the University. Active involvement in these organisations/associations leads to an improvement of professional practices with wider-public benefits. Facilitates successful CPD courses, conferences or workshops for professional organisations/associations. The applicant should demonstrate how a transfer of knowledge leads to an improvement of industry or the profession with wider-public benefits, and how these social responsiveness activities are captured as high-quality outputs. **Contributions to the formulation of state policies and frameworks:** Strong and consistent contributions to, or influence on, public policy development. Called upon by the State to participate in policy formulation, review and amendment processes. Makes submissions to Parliament. Submits substantive policy or technical briefing papers (based on your scholarly activities) to the State. The applicant should demonstrate how these improve State policies/frameworks (for the purpose of wider-public benefits), and how these social responsiveness activities are captured as high-quality outputs. **Contributions to the provision of services *for* the public sector and/or civil society and/or industry (including innovations, systems development or community outreach):** Strong application of professional knowledge, expertise, scholarship or teaching activities (as part of the formal UCT curriculum)—as well as consistent contributions to non-academic constituencies—for the purpose of improving State, civil society and/or an industry's services. Improvements address societal challenges. The applicant should demonstrate how innovations, systems development, service-learning courses, community outreach initiatives, popular materials, technical support or advocacy services led to an improvement of State, civil society and/or an industry's services with wider-public benefits. Regularly facilitates successful workshops (or other forms of knowledge transfer) for State, industry and/or community partners. The applicant should demonstrate how workshops led to a transfer of knowledge with wider-public benefits, and how these social responsiveness activities are captured as high-quality outputs.

	Engaged scholarship *with* the public sector, industry or civil society for the purpose of coproducing knowledge: Strong application of research and/or teaching activities (as part of the formal UCT curriculum) for the explicit purpose of coproducing knowledge *with* non-academic constituencies. Coproduced knowledge might include establishing alternative (but not necessarily new) methods of teaching, learning and/or collaborative research. The applicant should demonstrate the following: • How engagements are grounded in values of participatory democracy, and how such engagements enable power-sharing (as opposed to knowledge transfer alone), mutual-learning and reciprocity (namely, how engagements have benefits for <u>all</u> participants of a project). • How mutual learning takes place during the conceptualisation, design and implementation phase of a collaborative project. • How applied research methods, participatory action research (PAR), or teaching and learning methods are employed to improve engaged scholarships. • How these engagements are captured as high-quality outputs. **Information dissemination in the public domain:** Strong and consistent contributions (based on scholarly activities) to public discourses and debates at local/national/international levels beyond academia. The applicant should demonstrate the following: • How information dissemination has an impact on public opinions, discourses and debates. • Evidence of media interviews, opinion editorials, social media engagements, public debate panels, public lectures, and the like. • How these social responsiveness activities are captured as high-quality outputs.
7	

6	*Your contributions are aimed at adding improvements to existing initiatives.*

As such, you have established solid foundations—and you have built quality relationships—with non-academic constituencies.

Contributions to industry or the profession: Consistent and deliberate interactions with local/international professional organisations or associations. Invited to serve on committees, boards or councils of local or international organisations/associations that are external to the University. Facilitate well-received CPD courses, conferences or workshops for professional organisations or associations.

The applicant should demonstrate the following:

- How contributions to industry or the profession improve existing knowledge/initiatives.
- The development of solid, quality industry/professional relationships.

How these social responsiveness activities are captured as quality outputs.

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

The applicant should demonstrate the following:

- How these contributions improve existing State policies and/or frameworks.
- The development of solid, quality relationships with State bodies/organisations
- How these social responsiveness activities are captured as quality outputs.

Contributions to the provision of services *for* the public sector and/or civil society and/or industry (including innovations, systems development or community outreach): Deliberate application of professional knowledge, expertise, scholarship or teaching activities (as part of the formal UCT curriculum) for the purpose of supplementing or adding improvements to State, civil society and/or an industry services for the purposes of addressing development challenges.

The applicant should demonstrate how existing innovations, systems development, service-learning courses, community outreach initiatives, popular materials, technical support or advocacy services are supplemented and so led to an improvement of State, civil society and/or an industry services.

Facilitates well-received workshops (or other forms of knowledge transfer) for non-academic partners.

The applicant should demonstrate the following:

- How facilitated workshops add improvements to existing services.
- How solid foundations have been established.
- The development of solid, quality relationships with non-academic constituencies. |

	• How these social responsiveness activities are captured as quality outputs. **Engaged scholarship *with* the public sector, industry or civil society for the purpose of coproducing knowledge: D** eliberate application of research and/or teaching activities (as part of the formal curriculum) for the purpose of aiming to coproduce knowledge *with* the public sector, industry or civil society. The ultimate goal of your engagements is to facilitate mutual-learning and reciprocity (namely, to facilitate equal benefits for <u>all</u> participants of a project). The applicant should demonstrate the following: • How engagements are grounded in values of participatory democracy. • How mutual learning takes place during most (but not, necessarily, all) of the phases of a collaborative project. • How engagements aim to corroborate, supplement or add improvements to existing knowledge on engaged scholarship. The development of solid, quality relationships with non- academic constituencies, and how these social responsiveness activities are captured as quality outputs. **Information dissemination in the public domain:** Consistent and deliberate contributions (based on scholarly activities) to public discourses and debates at local/national/international levels beyond academia. The applicant should demonstrate the following: • How information dissemination has some impact on public opinions, discourses and debates via contributions to media interviews, opinion editorials, public lectures, and/or via regular blog updates/tweets/etc. • The establishment of a solid foundation for information dissemination in the public domain. • How these social responsiveness activities are captured as quality outputs.

4	*Your contributions are aimed at supporting existing initiatives.*
	As such, you are starting to build good relationships with non-academic constituencies.

Contributions to industry or the profession: Participates in a few interactions with local/international professional organisations or associations external to academia. Invited to participate in professional activities (fora, debates, workshops) hosted by local or international organisations/associations. Facilitate CPD courses/workshops for professional organisations or associations external to a c a d e m i a .

The applicant should demonstrate the following:

- How contributions support industry and/or the profession.

- The start of building good relationships with industry and/or the profession.

- How these social responsiveness activities are captured as outputs.

Contributions to the formulation of State policies and frameworks: Some contribution to public policy formulation, review and amendment processes.

The applicant should demonstrate the following:

- What these contributions are.

- How the contributions aim to support existing policies/frameworks.

- The start of building good relationships with State bodies/organisations.

- How these social responsiveness activities are captured as outputs.

Contributions to the provision of services *for* the public sector and/or civil society and/or industry (including innovations, systems development or community outreach): Application of professional knowledge, expertise, scholarship or teaching activities (as part of the formal curriculum) for the purpose of supporting existing State, civil society and/or an industry's services with the aim of addressing development challenges.

The applicant should demonstrate how support of existing innovations, systems development, service-learning courses, community outreach initiatives, popular materials, technical or advocacy services contributes to the maintenance of State, civil society and/or an industry services.

Facilitates workshops (or other forms of knowledge transfer) for non-academic partners.

The applicant should demonstrate the following:

- How facilitated workshops support existing services.

- The start of building good relationships with non-academic constituencies.

- How these social responsiveness activities are captured as outputs.

Engaged scholarship *with* the public sector, industry or civil society for the purpose of coproducing knowledge: Applies research and/or teaching activities (as part of the formal

3	curriculum) for the purpose of aiming to coproduce knowledge *with* non-academic constituencies, and for the purpose of supporting their existing initiatives. The applicant should demonstrate the following: • How engagements aim to enable some form of knowledge transfer. • How engagements aim to support the existing initiatives of the public sector, industry or civil society. • The start of establishing quality relationships with non-academic constituencies, and how engagements are captured as outputs. **Information dissemination in the public domain:** Some contributions (based on scholarly activities) to public discourses and debates at local/national/international levels beyond academia, and some of these contributions are <u>starting to have</u> an impact on public opinions, discourses and debates via media interviews, contributions to opinion editorials, participation in public lectures, or via blog updates/tweets/etc. The applicant should demonstrate the following: • The start of establishing a solid foundation for information dissemination in the public domain How these social responsiveness activities are captured as outputs.
2 1	Limited contribution to activities that are external to the University, including limited contributions to industry, the profession, public policy formulation, engaged scholarship, or information dissemination in the public domain. No demonstrable contribution to any of the five social responsiveness categories. Intervention may be required.

Application/Nomination Checklist

An application or nomination requires the submission of **two files** with the following in each file:

File A	File B
The applicant submission document in the standard format (App A) with *all sections completed*. This should include the **completed HR 174** form in Section 2 of the portfolio template: http://forms.uct.ac.za/	The completed HR 175 form http://forms.uct.ac.za/ The names and email addresses of three (3) contactable referees. Notes: 1. Applicants must indicate their relationship with each referee and the reason for their nomination. 2. Applicants are required to ensure that the referee has been alerted and has been sent a copy of the completed portfolio in the standard format. 3. The Faculty Office will contact the referees for a report. 4. In applying for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, at least some of the referees should be from outside South Africa. The University has agreed that the Committee may reserve the right to approach independent referees where necessary.

Appendix A: Portfolio Template

Save this portfolio template below into a new document for editing:

✂ ··

Portfolio of Evidence
Confidential

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING & THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

PROMOTION AND REMUNERATION COMMITTEE

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.

Where promotion to Professor is sought, this should be extended to a **SEVEN-YEAR** period.

1.   PERSONAL DETAILS

Name:	Department:
Position:	**Track:**
Period of employment:	**Permanent/Contract:**
	Type of contract:

2.   HR174

Import your completed and signed HR174 form here.

3.   PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

3.1 TEACHING

**(PERIOD OF REVIEW -   LAST FIVE YEARS: MERIT, SEN. LECT, A. PROFESSOR;
                              LAST SEVEN YEARS: PROFESSOR)**

3.1.1   Teaching awards

State whether you have been asked to submit documentation for the Distinguished Teacher Award and whether you have ever received a Distinguished Teacher Award at UCT. State any other teaching awards you have received.

3.1.2   Teaching load

Year	Course Code	Convenor/ lecturer?	Number of students	Your contact hours only		Your assessment hours	**Total**
				Number of lectures	Studio/ tutorials/ practicals/ fieldwork/ workshops/ seminars etc.		
						Grand Total:	

3.1.3   Please comment on your teaching load relative to others in your department/division e.g. nuances of your teaching that are not reflected in the table above (200-word limit):

....

....

....

....

3.1.4   Student throughput in the past academic cycle for taught courses

Replicate the table below to produce one for each course in which you are involved.

Course code and name		Pass rate:	
Challenges			
Proposed solutions			

Course code and name		Pass rate:	
Challenges			
Proposed solutions			

3.1.5 Masters thesis supervision as a component of taught programmes

Name:	Thesis credits	Primary supervisor	Co-supervisor(s)	Year/month of registration:	Year/month of graduation:

3.1.6 Masters by research supervision

Name:	Primary supervisor	Co-supervisor(s)	Year/month of registration:	Year/month of graduation:

3.1.7 PhD supervision

Name:	Primary supervisor	Co-supervisor(s)	Year/month of registration:	Year/month of graduation:

3.1.8 Teaching statement

A maximum 1000-word summary that may address the following: your teaching philosophy (undergraduate and postgraduate), teaching development initiatives at institutional/faculty/department/course levels where appropriate, addressing the attainment of graduate attributes, contributions towards accreditation with professional bodies, where applicable, innovative practices in teaching, contributions to teaching and learning beyond UCT (external examination, short courses, etc.), addressing diversity, decolonization etc. through teaching, assessments of student learning/graduate outcomes, student mentoring, tutor training, staff teaching development support, if applicable.

Your statement will provide a framework for the Teaching Working Group to assess other evidence in the portfolio.

3.1.9 Teaching quality – student course evaluations (undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes)

Please provide (where possible) the following evidence of recent student course evaluations in Appendix 4.5:

- an evaluation from a course in which the feedback was generally positive,
- an evaluation from a course in which there was some critical feedback, and
- an evaluation from a course in which you have responded to previous critical feedback.

3.1.10 Teaching quality summary from student course evaluations (undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes)

Course Code	Year		Year		Year		Year		Year	
	Course score	Lecturer score	Course score	Lecturer score	Course score	Lecturer score	Course score	Lecturer score	Course score	Lecturer score

1: poor; 5: excellent

Summary	Course score	Lecturer score
5-year average		
7-year average (for Professor)		
Average since joining UCT		

3.1.11 Addressing feedback in undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes:

Students:

Provide four/five student comments on your course administration and lecturing. A few good and a few more critical comments should be provided where these are available. State how you have approached critique in the student reviews.

External examiners:

Provide four/five external examiner comments. A few good and a few more critical comments should be provided where these are available. State how you have approached critique in the external examiners' reviews.

3.1.12 Addressing feedback for masters by research and doctoral supervision:

Students:

Provide four/five student comments from your masters/doctoral graduate feedback reports where applicable. A few good and a few more critical comments should be provided where these are available. State how you have approached critique in the student reviews.

External examiners:

Provide four/five external examiner comments. A few good and a few more critical comments should be provided where these are available.

3.1.13 Teaching quality – learning materials

Vula/Amathuba:

Provide a link to one Vula/Amathuba course in which you play a major role. Contact Nurunisa Hendricks nurunisa.hendricks@uct.ac.za for a list of names of the Teaching Working Group. Add these people to your site (the same way you would add external examiners) prior to submitting this portfolio.

If this is not appropriate, you may refer to items in the Teaching Appendix where a maximum of 20 pages of evidence may be presented.

3.1.14 Other Notable Teaching Achievements

Describe any other aspects of your teaching that have not been requested above in a maximum of 300 words.

3.2 RESEARCH

**(PERIOD OF REVIEW -   LAST FIVE YEARS: MERIT, SEN. LECT, A. PROFESSOR;
LAST SEVEN YEARS: PROFESSOR)**

3.2.1 Research statement:

A maximum 1000-word summary which provides the Committee with an insight into **research** activity. The summary should focus on the **impact** of research nationally and/or internationally. The idea is to motivate and explain how all the quantitative details (numbers of publications, impact factors, citation record) add up to the qualitative research impact. Also, explain how your research aligns with your teaching and social responsiveness, as well as UCT's goals and strategy.

3.2.2 Rating

NRF Rating:	
h-Index:	
Other citation analytics (e.g. Web of Science, Scopus, Google Scholar, Publish or Perish):	
Professional projects/creative works citations:	

Are there any aspects of rating that are particular to your research domain?

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

3.2.3 Research outputs – EBE Point Scorecard (without postgraduate component)

	Type of Research Output (over the period of review)	Unit Points	Fractional contrib-ution*	Points earned
1	**Papers in peer reviewed ISI journals (as shown on IRMA).** Citation, impact factor and your contribution to the paper	1		
1a	**Papers in peer reviewed journals awaiting ISI/DNE recognition (show evidence of application).** Citation, impact factor and your contribution to the paper	0.8-1		
2	**Refereed Conference Proceedings with peer-reviewed full papers published (as shown on IRMA).** Citation	0.5		
3	**Peer Reviewed Extended Abstracts in Proceedings of international conferences.** Citation	0.25		
4	**Articles in non-accredited, non-peer reviewed professional journals or in popular publications or media articles.** Citation	0		
5	**Peer Reviewed Monographs.** Citation	1		
6	**Patents**	1		
7	**Books other than edited types or standard textbooks.** Citation	4.5		
8	**Chapters in scholarly books.** Citation	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) **for Projects, Regional/National, By Professional Bodies, For Buildings, etc.**	0-3		
	Points sub-total for the period under review			

* Fractional contribution is calculated as a percentage determined by the number of authors – 3 authors: contribution is 0.33; 2 authors: contribution is 0.5.

3.2.4 Invitations

Curated exhibitions:	
Present creative or professional work at other centres:	
Participate in formation of research-based policy:	

3.2.5 Scientific community activities:

Independent reviews, awards and other critical comment:	
Reviewing for international journals:	
Editor for international journal:	
Editorial board member for international journals:	
International body leadership role:	
International body activities:	

3.2.6 Funding Record over the period of review:

Grant	Monetary value	Collaborators

3.2.7 Invitations to local and international conferences

Name, place and date of conferences, attended over the period of review:

Conference name	Conference dates	Local	International
	Totals (local and international):		

3.3 ADMINISTRATION
(PERIOD OF REVIEW - LAST FIVE YEARS: MERIT, SEN. LECT, A. PROFESSOR;
LAST SEVEN YEARS: PROFESSOR)

3.3.1 Programme Convener

Year	Programme	Number of students

3.3.2 Departmental Duties

3.3.3 Faculty Committees:

3.3.4 University Committees:

3.3.5 National/International Committees:

3.3.6 Other:

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

(PERIOD OF REVIEW -   LAST FIVE YEARS: MERIT, SEN LECT, A. PROFESSOR; LAST SEVEN YEARS: PROFESSOR)

Please provide a detailed demonstration of your contributions to one (or more) of the following categories. Please refer to the relevant definitions and guidelines in the EBE Faculty document on *Guidelines for Ad Hominem Promotion and Merit and Excellence Awards*.

3.4.1 Social Responsiveness statement:

A maximum 1000-word summary which provides the Committee with insights into social responsiveness (SR) activities. Also, explain how your social responsiveness aligns with your teaching and research, as well as UCT's goals and strategy.

3.4.2 Contributions to industry or the profession:

3.4.3 Contributions to the formulation of state policies and frameworks:

3.4.4 Contributions to the provision of services for the public sector and/or civil society and/or industry (including innovations, systems development or community outreach):

3.4.5 Engaged scholarship with the public sector, industry or civil society constituencies for the purpose of coproducing knowledge:

3.4.6 Information dissemination in the public domain:

4. PORTFOLIO APPENDICES

Add further appendix material if you wish under the following categories. Note that a maximum of 20 pages of appendices per section is expected for appendices 4.1 – 4.4.

4.1   TEACHING APPENDIX

4.2   RESEARCH APPENDIX

4.3   ADMINISTRATION APPENDIX

4.4   SOCIAL RESPONSIVENESS APPENDIX

4.5   STUDENT COURSE EVALUATIONS (SEE INSTRUCTION IN SECTION 0)

✁ ┈┈┈

End of Portfolio Template

Appendix B: The Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee and Working Groups

The Faculty Promotion and Remuneration Committee (PaRC): Composition, Terms of Reference and Procedures

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

Composition of PaRC

Faculty Core Committee

The Dean (Chair)

A Deputy Vice-Chancellor nominated by the Vice-Chancellor

Two Deans from other faculties, nominated by the Vice-Chancellor Deputy Deans (x4)

Heads of Department (x6)

A member of the group of Lecturers/Senior Lecturers, nominated by the Dean

Other members

The Dean of CHED as a non-voting member

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

Servicing Officer: HR Practitioner

Terms of Reference

The Committee receives applications and nominations for ad hominem promotions, Merit Awards or Excellence awards and is to:

- consider these applications/nominations,
- recommend to the Vice-Chancellor the ad hominem promotion of the staff member, and
- recommend awards for Excellence awards or Merit Awards to the DVC responsible for academic matters, for approval by the meeting of the Deans.

Procedures

- The Committee meets once every year.
- The Committee is served by three Working Groups.
- The Working Groups meet as frequently as necessary prior to the meeting of the PaRC.
- Recommendations for ad hominem promotions require a two-thirds majority vote of the PaRC in

support. In addition, such recommendations require support of two from the group consisting of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and the two other Deans.

- Recommendations to the Vice-Chancellor on ad hominem promotions must contain a copy of the applicant's submission in the required Portfolio Template and the names and addresses of the referees consulted. In the case of a promotion to the rank of Professor, the recommendation must contain the Committee's assessment that it is satisfied as to the international standing of the applicant's scholarship.
- The PaRC must arrange for feedback to be given to successful and unsuccessful applicants and the relevant Heads of Departments (HODs). An unsuccessful applicant should be given reasons as to why his/her application was unsuccessful.
- The decision of the PaRC is final. If an applicant believes that there is evidence of unfairness, bias, prejudice or irregularity, an unsuccessful applicant may request a review of the decision by the relevant Deputy Vice-Chancellor via the Faculty Dean.

The Working Groups:
Purpose, Composition, Terms of Reference, Membership

There are Working Groups reporting to the PaRC:

a) Teaching Working Group
b) Research Working Group
c) Social Responsiveness Working Group
d) Academic Citizenship Group (to be decided)

Purpose

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

Composition: Teaching Working Group

Convener: Working group to nominate

HOD to nominate one departmental representative (6)

Dean to nominate a representative from the Research Officer Cohort

Dean to nominate a representative from the Academic Development Lecturer Cohort

Composition: Research Working Group

Convener: Working group to nominate

HOD to nominate one departmental representative (6)

Dean to nominate a representative from the Research Officer Cohort

Composition: Social Responsiveness Working Group

Convener: Working group to nominate

HOD to nominate one departmental representative (6)

Dean to nominate a representative from the Research Officer Cohort Each Convener services their own working group.

Terms of reference

- All members of the respective working groups will look at each application/nomination for their respective portfolios.
- The conveners will set up meetings with their working groups and may request additional information from the applicant/nominee as necessary.
- The working group will produce a score for each applicant based on the guidelines.
- The convener is to submit a report/summary, and the score for each applicant, to Faculty HR. This will be tabled at the Faculty Core Committee and the PaRC.
- Conveners will present the score for each applicant, together with a motivation for this score, to the Faculty Core Committee and to the PaRC.

Membership

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