Personal Promotion of Academic Staff Policy and Procedures

Policy Volume	Human Resources
Policy Chapter	Remuneration Rewards & Recognition Policies
Responsible Committee/Unit/Division/Faculty	Human Resources Division
Responsible Chairperson/Director/Manager	Director: HR
Dates of First and Subsequent Council Approvals	December 2009; 23 June 2011; 1 June 2012; 21 June 2013, May 2019
Policy Approval Pathways (e.g. committee, Senex, Senate, Council)	HR Division -> Vice-Chancellor -> Council
Revision History: Approved Reviews	2009; 2011; 2012; 2013, 2019
Review Cycle (e.g. every 2/5/7 years etc)	Every 5 Years
Next Review Date	2024

1. POLICY PARTICULARS

1.1. Policy Title	Personal Promotion of Academic Staff Policy and Procedures
1.2. Policy Statement (State in a single paragraph the policy mandate and how this relates to the University Mission and Vision)	This policy recognises the need to encourage the continued pursuit of learning and scholarship within the areas of teaching and learning, research and community engagement. Sustained excellence is achieved, in part, through a robust and fair system that recognises and rewards academics for this excellence. This policy reflects the expectation that the majority of academic staff will progress during the course of their time at Rhodes University, that over the course of the career of the academic there is likely to be an increase in the quality and effectiveness of their teaching, an increase in the quality and impact of their research or creative endeavour, a growing community engagement involvement, an enhanced qualitative contribution to the discipline or profession and an increasing assumption of leadership roles within the institution. This policy acknowledges the need to recognise such progress and excellence.
1.3. Reason for Policy (What this policy aims to achieve)	
1.4. Policy Objective/s (What are the measurable objectives of this policy)	This policy aims to ensure: (a) A mechanism of recognising the contribution of academic staff that is perceived as fair and just by the majority of academics; (b) Fair and consistent assessment of academics for promotion; (c) Appropriate criteria that are seen to support: • The pillars of the University namely, teaching, research and community engagement and • The future strategic direction of the institution; (d) Transparency as regards the assessment criteria and processes recognising that documents have limitations in conveying what is a complex process using expert judgement; and (e) Processes that meet the labour legislative requirements.
1.5. People affected by this Policy (e.g. All units of the University)	All academic staff
1.5. Who should read this Policy (People who need to heed this policy to fulfil their duties)	All academic staff
1.6. Implementers of this Policy (Who will manage the implementation of this policy)	HR Division with the Faculty Deans
1.7 Website address/link for this Policy	

2. RELATED DOCUMENTS FORMS AND TOOLS

(University Policies, Protocols and Documents (such as rules/policies/protocols/guidelines related to this policy)

Relevant Legislation (Legislation/Regulatory requirements/Organisational Reports – name these)
• The Labour Relations Act, No. 66 of 1995 (as amended)   • The Employment Equity Act, No. 55 of 1998 (as amended)   • The Basic Conditions of Employment Act, No. 75 of 1997   • The Employment Services Act, No. 4 of 2014   • Promotion of Equality and the Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act, No 4 of 2000 (pending input from the Institutional Forum)
Related Policies
• Remuneration Policy for Permanent Academic and Support Staff   • Recruitment & Selection Policy   • Induction Policy   • Job Evaluation Policy
Related Protocols
• Protocol for Merit Awards
Forms and Tools (documents to be completed in support of this policy implementation)
• Policy template

3. POLICY DEFINITIONS

(Technical or Conceptual terms used in the policy)

No	TERM	DEFINITION
3.1	Adverse impact	Defined as a substantially different rate of selection in hiring, promotion, or other employment decision, which works to the disadvantage of members of the designated groups.
3.2	Designated group	Black, women and disabled (or in the context of the Rhodes University Staff Disability Policy: people with impairments).

3.3	People with impairments	The following definitions are consistent with the Social Model of Disability and the Employment Equity Act and/or the Code of Good Practice on Key Aspects of
		
		 Disability in the Workplace:
		
		Only people who satisfy all the following criteria are regarded as persons with impairments:
		
		   (a) Long-term or recurring: the impairment has lasted or is likely to persist for at least twelve months including progressive conditions at such time as the condition
		
		   becomes substantially limiting;
		
		   (b) Where the impairment is physical (including sensory such as hearing or sight impairments) and/or mental (a clinically recognised condition or illness that affects a
		
		   person's thought processes, judgement or emotions); and
		
		(c) The impairment is substantially limiting and cannot be addressed through medical treatment or other means to limit the adverse effects and where in the absence of reasonable accommodation, the person either would be unable to do a job or would be significantly limited in doing the job.
		
		Conditions that are not regarded as impairments include those self-inflicted for example, through the use of substances, those that go against public policy and norms e.g. compulsive gambling, sexual disorders and normal deviations in height, weight and strength.

3.4	Reasonable Accommodation	Any action on the part of the employer to reduce the impact of the impairment in such processes as recruitment and selection, performance assessments including promotion, training and development and employee benefits and conditions as well as within the work environment and in terms of the job. Such action must be reasonable and not impose an unjustifiable hardship on the institution.

4. PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THIS POLICY

OVERVIEW
Rhodes University strives to carry out the following, as far as is reasonably practicable:
4.1.
4.2.
4.3.

5. DIRECTIVES FOR IMPLEMENTING THIS POLICY

(Actions and processes by which the objectives of the policy will be achieved.)

5.1. The Decision-Making Process

5.1.1 No Budgetary Restrictions

The institution's philosophy as regards personal promotion is that merit above all else must drive the recommendation as to whether or not to promote a staff member. That said, the impact of personal promotions within the budget must be managed given that the promotion of an academic staff member may result in the department exceeding their Student Cost Unit allocations. For further information refer to the document "Staffing Model and Considerations for Academic Departments" approved by Senate on the 1/06/2007.

5.1.2 Use of criteria for promotion to senior lecturer, associate professor or professor

This policy and procedural document outlines the process of promotion for those motivating for promotion to either senior lecturer, associate professor or professor. In considering each application, the template and criteria for the appropriate academic rank, as outlined in the Procedural document are used (as described in the remainder of this document).

5.1.3 Promotion to lecturer

In the case of staff who are appointed at the level of junior lecturer, promotion to lecturer will take place as follows:

(i)   Appointment to the post of junior lecturer (and not lecturer) will normally be as a result of the individual not having the required qualification for appointment to the level of lecturer;

(ii)   Promotion to the post of lecturer will take place once the individual has acquired the necessary qualification;

(iii)   In the case of new staff, this will be handled within the probation process. Where the individual has acquired the necessary qualification and provided that there are no other concerns with the individual's contribution, the HoD as part of the probation process, will motivate for promotion to the level of lecturer. The person will still be required to serve the rest of the probation period. The report will follow the usual approval processes and once approved by Senate, the remuneration increase will take place from the 1st of the month thereafter;

(iv)   In the case of staff who have already been permanently appointed, a motivation can be made directly to the Dean by the HoD and once approved by the Administrative Sub-Committee of Council, the HR Division will implement the appointment to the level of lecturer.

5.1.4 Nomination to Distinguished Professor

Rhodes University recognizes academic staff of outstanding scholarly reputation and productivity, who have brought great distinction to the university through their academic work at Rhodes. The recognition takes the form of a Distinguished Professor academic rank.

This entire process is covered in point 5.3 of this document.

5.1.5 Additional considerations

In addition, the following are regarded as important principles in guiding decision-making:

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

(i)   Promotion is made on the basis of merit, not potential;

(ii)   Only evidence is considered, not the possibility of what may come to pass. For example, only those Masters and PhD students who have graduated shall be considered as evidence of supervision experience, articles that are forthcoming are not considered as part of the research track record. Articles in press (i.e. accepted and awaiting publication) are however regarded as part of the research track record. A review application (usually submitted in late October) may be updated to include any articles in press, recently accepted and which were not therefore included in the initial application (usually submitted in mid-July) or any articles that were in press but have subsequently been published;

(iii)   The Academic Personal Promotions Committee is required to weigh up the evidence before it, and to make a value judgement guided by the category template scoring process contained in this policy. In cases where reports are not aligned with each other or with the committee's view of evidence provided by the candidate, the committee should not allow a single outlying report to tip the result without further corroborating evidence. The role of the committee is to take all evidence into account and triangulate. No single submission enjoys more importance than any other submission, and no single source of information determines the final decision to the exclusion of other evidence.

(iv)   Those staff who have been on probation for more than one year at the time of application may apply. At least one probation report must have been submitted by the HoD and viewed by the relevant senior officials. In addition, the application needs to meet all the criteria for promotion to the next academic rank. In this instance, the Academic Personal Promotions Committee will be provided a copy of the individual's probation report;

(v)   Consideration is given to what has been achieved since the last promotion or appointment to a particular level as well as the total achievements to date. Candidates who re-apply soon after an unsuccessful promotion attempt should emphasise in their submission what has been achieved since the previous promotion application;

(vi)   Double category promotions (e.g. from lecturer to associate professor): This is not a tick box exercise and double category promotions will not automatically be granted based upon a particular template score achieved. If the personal promotion scores add up to a category of promotion higher than the candidate has applied to, the committee will apply its mind about whether a double jump is warranted, and should only be considered where the case is very strong (i.e. the decision relatively easily made). As part of such a consideration the external assessor should have been explicitly asked to comment on the higher level of promotion being considered (either because the candidate has applied for a double promotion, or because the committee has gone back to the assessor).

(vii)   Where the completion of a further degree is the only short-coming in an application for promotion, the Personal Promotion Committee may recommend the promotion of the individual once the degree is conferred and provided this happens by 31 December of the following year;

(viii) Years of service, even exemplary service, are not sufficient for promotion on their own;

(ix)   If the applicant is on a research contract (usually covering the salary of the person concerned) which involves research of a contract nature, this shall be regarded as equivalent to more traditional forms of research;

(x)   If an applicant has motivated for promotion to a particular level but the Committee is of the view that a higher level of promotion should be considered, the Committee shall ask the HoD for an opinion in this regard. Furthermore, if the promotion is being considered at the associate professor level as opposed to the senior lecturer level, external assessor reports will need to be accessed. In this case, evidence shall be tabled at the second meeting of the Personal Promotion Committee. Should the Committee decide to not promote to the higher level, no review process takes place and the person would then be promoted to the level applied for in the first instance; and

(xi)   The teaching evidence for the personal promotion process requires reviewer reports. The Personal Promotion Committee will not consider the reviewer reports that were submitted as part of the probationary process. New reports must be accessed.

(xii) Community engagement: the essence of community engagement is that it is transformative, and evidence of a sustainable difference is what is most valued. Evidence that overlays community engagement with research and teaching is encouraged. Attention is drawn to the attached guide to developing a community engagement section of a promotion application.

(xiii) Externally Remunerated work: In the categories of Professional Involvement and Leadership, Management & Administration, the earning of responsibility allowances or honoraria are not considered when weighing up evidence, it is the contribution to the discipline and capacity building that is weighed up. However, applications should acknowledge remunerated evidence which goes beyond the accepted level of an honorarium. While remunerated work for an external organisation is not usually counted as a contribution towards Community Engagement, motivated exceptions can be made.

(xiv) Transformation objectives – Evidence of contribution towards the transformation objectives of the institution are particularly encouraged, and should be worked into the personal promotion evaluation categories as appropriate to the case being made by the applicant. Examples are curriculum review and teaching approaches that place equal emphasis on African and Global knowledge, research impact that has a direct or potential policy or societal impact on marginalized communities, high quality engaged research, African and Global South collaborations, effective building of a new generation of academics and support staff that promotes under-represented groups, advancing diversity in research groups, promoting multilingualism and support for students and more junior staff who are working or studying in a non-mother-tongue language, and so on.

(xv) The requirement that academic staff at the Senior Lecturer level and higher should be in possession of a doctoral qualification is a strategic objective of the university, and applications which seek to make a case that other contributions outweigh the requirement of a doctoral qualification in the discipline need to be very convincing.

RESEARCH CONSIDERATIONS

(i) Honours supervision is of consequence when considering the research track record of a candidate. However, as the academic progresses, one would want to see evidence of the person graduating students at the Masters and then PhD levels. As such, the Committee is likely to be concerned about an application where the academic seeking promotion at the higher levels of promotion had a track-record dominated by Honours supervision;

(ii) Consideration should be given to the inter-play between post-graduate students and research outputs. In some disciplines, post-graduates at the Masters and PhD levels may be limited, in which case increased research publications would be expected. In other disciplines, high Masters and/or PhDs students may impact the time available to produce research publications. In other disciplines, the number of research publications is correlated to the number of Masters and PhDs students. Irrespective of discipline, in an application to the rank of professor, the academic is required to demonstrate a standing within the discipline on the basis of own research, in addition to student research supervised. Bearing in mind disciplinary differences, this could mean that the individual has made a major contribution and played a leadership role in research projects and has been the lead author on publications or has demonstrated a consistent individual contribution in a number of publications (even where the individual has not been the sole author or even the lead author) over the course of their academic career. Where career context has skewed the balance of publications and postgraduate supervision, or scholarly style has subordinated an individual scholarly voice, a convincing argument must be made by the applicant for the guidance of the committee in assessing their overall research contribution in the face of a non-traditional track record;

(iii) In considering research output, consideration must be given to the nature of research and how long it takes to establish the necessary research. For example, in certain sciences, access to certain equipment and setting up of laboratories may compromise research output in the short-term;

(iv) In considering research output, the academic may participate in group or collaborative work. While applicants should not be penalised for working in groups, personal promotion still demands a level of independence and creativity in research. This can be demonstrated through playing a significant leadership role in research projects, being the lead author on publications or demonstrating ongoing leadership through consistent individual contribution in a number of publications over the course of their academic career;

(v) A first author on a publication does not necessarily mean that that individual was the major contributor or lead author;

(vi) While it is acknowledged that text books do not rate the same as publications in scholarly academic journals nor do they attract subsidies, they usually represent scholarship of synthesis (in contrast to scholarship of discovery) and their impact does need to be considered within the particular professional field. Furthermore, such text books may be research based and innovative. However, when considering applications to more senior levels, other types of scholarship are expected.

(vii) If the applicant has done research which is not accredited, the individual needs to argue for the value of such research in the application.

TEACHING CONSIDERATIONS

(i) Teaching is regarded as important but volume of teaching alone does not constitute a sufficient criterion for promotion;

(ii) The Academic Personal Promotions Committee uses four sets of data in assessing the teaching and learning activities of the applicant namely, the reviewers' reports of the teaching portfolio, the applicants response to the teaching portfolio reports (if submitted), the HoD's report, and the referee reports. These are seen as complementary sources but from time to time, may provide different and even conflicting perspectives. It is the Committee's task to navigate this sensitively with due consideration to the nature and purpose of each data source and if necessary, to access further investigation and/or information.

5.1.6 Employment Equity and Diversity considerations

The University vehemently rejects any form of unfair discrimination. Unfair discrimination within the personal promotion process can take place in two forms. Firstly, direct unfair discrimination where individuals are not promoted because of their race, gender, sex, disability status, sexual orientation, religion, age, pregnancy or marital status, ethnic or social origins, class, colour, family responsibility, HIV/AIDS status, conscience, belief or political opinion, culture, language or birth. Secondly, indirect unfair discrimination, more subtle and often not as easily recognisable, involves the application of policies and practices that are apparently neutral and do not explicitly distinguish between employees. However, in reality, they have a disproportionate and negative effect on certain individuals or groups. This is called adverse impact.

The following will be implemented to ensure employment equity and diversity within the personal promotion process and to minimise any direct or indirect unfair discrimination:

(i) Relevant labour legislation will be adhered to throughout the entire personal promotion process:

(ii) Promotion procedures and criteria must be clear, transparent and readily understood by applicants and their advisors. This is facilitated by:
- the criteria being readily available to applicants (such as in this document),
- applicants having access to the Dean of the Faculty (who sit on the Personal Promotion Committee) for guidance and advice as regards the template and criteria
- new staff orientating dealing with the personal promotion process;

(iii) No person shall be denied a personal promotion on an arbitrary basis (which would include but not be limited to race, gender, sex, disability status, sexual orientation, religion, age, pregnancy or marital status, ethnic or social origins, class, colour, family responsibility, HIV/AIDS status, conscience, belief or political opinion, culture, language or birth);

(iv) Academic staff members must be actively encouraged to prepare and apply for personal promotion. This is achieved through:
- the Head of Department – with the support of the Dean - engaging with academic staff members as regards their professional development and prospects of applying for personal promotion;
- The Dean identifying staff members and encouraging them to apply;

(v) Barriers to personal promotion must be identified and removed. In terms of this policy, this is the role of the Head of Department, the Dean and the HR Division;

(vi) Ensure that the Personal Promotion Committee members understand the need to take into account different types of career profiles and tracks, periods of absence of applicants and part-time working situations. In this regard, the Committee needs to ensure that the performance of individuals is assessed against the opportunities available for such performance. Achieving this understanding requires the training of Committee members on these issues and active discussion of these factors in the consideration of applications by the Personal Promotion Committee;

(vii) Ensure diversity of the Academic Personal Promotions Committee. This is achieved through firstly, careful consideration being given to the profile of the Faculty representatives and secondly, through the Vice-Chancellor being able to nominate a further three representatives to achieve better diversity;

(viii) Ensure that the Academic Personal Promotions Committee uses the criteria consistently across all applications and prior knowledge of applicants is appropriately managed;

(ix) Subject the promotion procedures, template and criteria to robust impact assessment (i.e. to identify any adverse impact). This is achieved firstly, through tracking the success rate within the personal promotion process of different race and gender groups; secondly, through ensuring that any change of policy and procedure is done through full consultation so that individuals and/or groups with special interests may provide necessary input and thirdly, through the Dean interacting with members of the Faculty as regards perceptions of adverse impact; and

(x) The provision of a complaints procedure to deal with allegations of unfair discrimination within this process. This will be handled by the Director: HR.

5.1.7 Voting and necessary conditions for making recommendations

The Personal Promotions Committee in recommending a candidate for promotion must note the following necessary conditions:

    (i)   A quorum for this meeting shall be at least 10 members with the following composition:
- At least one of the following: Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Academic and Student Affairs or Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Research and Development
- At least the Dean or Deputy Dean of each Faculty;
- At least three representatives from the various faculties;
- The Director: HR or his/her representative must be in attendance.

    (ii)   Consensus is desirable for all decisions but where this is not possible after much debate:
- A simple majority of the Committee present is required for deciding any aspect relating to the promotion of lecturer to senior lecturer;
- A two-thirds majority of the Committee present is required for deciding any aspect relating to the promotion to Associate Professor or Professor;
- For a double jump in promotion to be considered (e.g. Lecturer to Associate Professor), 80% of the Committee present is required to support all aspects relating to the double promotion.

5.2. Process of Application for promotion to Senior Lecturer, Associate Professor or Professor

(a) As early as possible in the new academic year

- Academics themselves may decide to apply for promotion. In these cases, they are strongly encouraged to discuss their application with their HoD and Dean;
- Heads of Departments may also identify suitable applicants and recommend that they apply for promotion;
- The Dean, in consultation with the Heads of Departments, must also identify potential applicants and propose that they submit an application. Where the Dean supports the application, such an application will be presented to the Personal Promotion Committee with his/her endorsement/nomination. Where a staff member has been encouraged to apply by the Dean, the necessary documentation must be prepared. The Committee requires this documentation in order to make a recommendation. If no documentation is submitted, no recommendation can be made.

(b) Academics intending to submit an application are encouraged to contact CHERTL for guidance in ensuring that they are able to provide the necessary evidence to demonstrate their accomplishments in terms of the Teaching & Learning area;

(c) The HR Division calls for applications, usually in May of each year with the following deadlines:

- Submission of teaching evidence, usually towards the end of May of each year;
- Submission of the completed application form usually by mid-July of each year.

This call for applications is done via hod-list (where HoDs are asked to remind staff of these deadlines) and top-list. Late applications cannot be considered.

Where an applicant has been unsuccessful and reapplies, provided this is within two years of the original application, new teaching evidence does not need to be provided, unless the applicant elects to do so (e.g. unsuccessful application in 2018, new teaching portfolio will need to be provided only for a new application in 2021). An updated application should be submitted which includes the feedback of the Committee from the previous application and why the applicant believes these concerns have been addressed;

(d) Academics who are intending to apply for promotion are asked to advise the HoD and Dean of their intention to do so. This will allow the Dean and HoD to follow up with staff who have not indicated an intention to apply and who may need to be encouraged to do so. Academics are also strongly advised to attend the advertised workshops on preparing evidence for personal promotion applications.

(e) The teaching evidence submitted by the applicant is sent by HR to the two reviewers identified by the Deans from the Faculty's pool of reviewers. The reviewer's report must comment on the teaching evidence making reference to the teaching and learning criteria as outlined in the personal promotion policy. The reviewer's report is sent to CHERTL which will determine whether the report is sufficient for the purposes of the Personal Promotion Committee. Where the report fails to provide adequate detail or no reference is made to the teaching and learning criteria, CHERTL will request

that the reviewer provide additional detail in the report. Where the reviewer fails to do so, the report will not be tabled and if there is sufficient time, another reviewer will be requested to assess the teaching evidence.

(f) For Associate Professor and Professor Applications, external assessors are identified by the Deans, in consultation by the Heads of Departments, usually by the middle of August of each year. Such assessors have agreed to assist Rhodes University. The HR Division will forward relevant applications and documentation to the external assessors who will be required to submit their reports, usually by the end of September of each year, assessing the candidate's scholarly contributions and standing, their professional contribution if possible, and any other categories that the assessor is able to comment on with authority.

Where an applicant has been unsuccessful and reapplies the very next year, the same external assessors will normally be used. They will be provided with the updated application of the academic. If the assessor indicates that their opinion has not changed, the same report will then be tabled. However, in this instance a further external assessor will also be accessed. Where the assessors used in the previous period provided insufficient information to the Personal Promotion Committee, new external assessors will usually be used.

(g) The HR Division will call for the Head of Department's report which will be due usually by early August of each year;

(h) Where the staff member has finished their probation in the last 18 months (i.e. as at 1 July of the year of application), a copy of the final probation report will also be tabled. Where the staff member is still on probation, the most recent probation report will be tabled;

(i) The HR Division will collate the following documentation for each applicant for personal promotion and will provide this documentation to each member of the Personal Promotion Committee:

- Individual's application
- One External Assessor's Report – if Associate Professor or Professor application
- Head of Department's Report and probation report in line with point (h) above
- Referee reports
- The listing of research outputs for that individual for the last five years as supplied by the Research and Development Office
- If relevant, the Dean's letter to the applicant where a previous application to the same level was unsuccessful.

   In addition to this, the following further information will be provided:

- Copy of this policy
- Guidelines as regards assessment of the material

Each member of the Personal Promotion Committee will receive this file usually by the end of September of each year.

(j) The Academic Personal Promotions Committee has its first meeting usually in mid October of each year. The first meeting shall be to consider all applications and to make a preliminary recommendation as regards the promotion (or not) of applicants.

(k) The recommendation of the Academic Personal Promotions Committee is then conveyed by the Dean to the Head of Department and to the individual, usually within three working days of the meeting. In the event of an unsuccessful application, reasons in writing are provided to the academic. The individual is also advised of the review process. The Deans write this letter, a copy of which is provided to the HR Division for keeping on the individual's personnel file. This is accessed and a copy thereof provided to the Personal Promotions Committee either for a review in the same year or in a subsequent year of application;

(l) Applicants can request a review of the Personal Promotions Committee's initial recommendation. Documentation should be provided that either:

- Focuses the committee's attention on certain evidence;
- Provides further evidence where the committee's recommendation was based on a lack of such evidence. Candidates should highlight what they consider to be new evidence, as distinct from evidence that might be repeated from the initial submission for the sake of argument or emphasis;
- Argues that the committee has not applied itself sufficiently to the application of the template, criteria and/or that the criteria are not applicable to the particular discipline or individual;
- Argues that the committee has not taken sufficient cognisance of employment equity and diversity considerations.

Review applications are submitted to the HR Division usually in early November of each year.

(m) The Personal Promotions Committee will meet again to consider the review applications before making its final recommendation. Applicants may present their case in person, and/or request their HoD to do so. In addition and only in the case of review applications to the rank of Professor, a telephonic interview between the external assessor and the Personal Promotions Committee will take place.

(n) The Dean will convey the final recommendation of the Personal Promotions Committee to the Head of Department and thereafter to the individual, usually within three working days of the Committee having met. In the event of an unsuccessful application, reasons in writing are provided to the academic and a copy of the letter provided to the HR Division;

(o) The recommendations of the Personal Promotion Committee are forwarded to Senate and thereafter to Council for final approval;

(p) Council at its meeting in December of each year shall consider the recommendations. Where Council approves these recommendations, the HR Division will confirm, in writing, the promotion and the corresponding level of remuneration. All promotions (with the exceptions of those that are conditional on the completion of a degree) shall be effective from 1 January of the following year;

(q) Where an individual's promotion is conditional on their completing a degree, as soon as there is evidence of the degree being conferred, this should be forwarded to the HR Division. The personal promotion shall be effective from the 1st of the month after conferment. Where documentation related to the conferment is delayed, the promotion shall still apply from the 1st of the month after conferment and back-pay (at the cost to company rate at the new remuneration level) for these months will be paid.

Where the individual does not get promotion by the 31st of December of the following year of application (as per 5.1.3 (iv)), the individual will be required to re-apply for promotion.

5.3. Process for consideration of academics to rank of Distinguished Professors

(a)   Nature of the appointment

Rhodes University recognizes academic staff of outstanding scholarly reputation and productivity, who have brought great distinction to the university through their academic work at Rhodes. The recognition takes the form of a Distinguished Professor academic rank, with a higher remuneration scale than the standard Professor scale.

The rank is intended to be held until the academic retires or resigns from the university, at which point the title falls away. When a Distinguished Professor retires, (s)he will be eligible for appointment as a Professor Emeritus in the normal way; in addition, (s)he will be automatically nominated to the Honorary Degrees Committee for consideration for the Honorary title of Distinguished Fellow of Rhodes University.

Conditions of service and eligibility for academic leave will not be affected by such an appointment.

The criteria are based entirely on scholarly achievement, and not on management, professional, or community engagement accomplishments. The award is made sparingly, and only to truly meritorious recipients.

(b)   Criteria for decision

To be eligible for consideration, candidates should normally have been employed as full-time academics at Rhodes University for at least 5 years (the primary purpose of this rank is recognition, and not normally recruitment). Since it is intended to recognize a distinguished career as a scholar, the title is normally awarded to a scholar in the later part of their career.

In selecting candidates for the rank of Distinguished Professor, the institutional Personal Promotions committee will consider the following criteria, the majority of which should be clearly evident. Not all of these criteria apply to every discipline, but where a criterion can reasonably be applied to a discipline, the standard indicated should be present for appointment at this level.

- Is undoubtedly a leading researcher, producer of influential scholarly works around teaching and learning, or producer of creative work in his or her field, relative to peers both nationally and internationally, as evidenced by scholarly outputs, regular citation and review, or impact of exhibitions, compositions or performances;
- Has had a considerable influence upon the discipline in which they work, and is regarded as an leader in the field;
- Has been exceptionally productive over a sustained period in terms of quality and quantity of research or creative outputs;
- Has a substantial track record of producing research masters and doctoral graduates (e.g. several research students graduating each year consistently).
- Publishes peer-reviewed scholarly outputs in higher impact journals and related intellectual media on a very regular basis (well above the average for the discipline), or has produced several major research monographs, or has documented numerous creative projects which have received strong international acclaim that places the candidate clearly in the category of a distinguished scholar relative to peers;
- Authors books of a scholarly nature regularly[1] , which are consistently regarded as works of a substantial size and scholarly depth to be considered important works, and which attract the attention of serious minded peers internationally;
- Is frequently invited to present or officiate at conferences of international standing, and to act as a referee for highly prestigious journals or other forums appropriate to the discipline;
- Has an NRF rating in the A category, or, if not rated, is at the level of scholarly activity and influence in the opinion of the committee where an A rating would be deserved; B1 candidates may also be considered;
- Is within the top group of researchers in the university overall in terms of accredited (or equivalent, as agreed by the university from time to time) research outputs[2] .

(c)   Process

Consideration of appointment is by nomination only, not by application, where the office of the DVC: Research and Development makes a nomination after consultation with the VC, DVC: Academic and Student Affairs, and appropriate Dean.

The nomination is made at the review meeting of the Personal Promotions Committee. Due to the confidential nature of this process, the documentation is only made available at the meeting. At the meeting, the DVC: Research and Development shall make a verbal presentation to the Committee.

This committee makes a recommendation to the Executive Committee of Senate for approval on behalf of Senate, to ensure that the identity of a candidate under consideration remains confidential.

With the Executive Committee of Senate's approval, the recommendation will serve before the Executive of Council. This usually takes place by circular.

Where the Executive Committee of Council approves the recommendation, the decision is reported to Senate for noting, and to Council for ratification. The evidence of scholarly achievement should clearly stand on its own, and there is no consideration of appeals.

---

[1] In the Humanities, three to five or more substantial works should normally have been produced and received critical acclaim from a scholarly readership.

[2] In the Natural Sciences, normally 10 accredited outputs per year consistently over a period of time.

6. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(Roles and responsibilities of Key personal/Divisions/Faculties/Departments)

ROLE	RESPONSIBILITY
ROLE 1 Academics	Academics are encouraged to regard personal promotion as part of a larger developmental process. The requirements for the various academic ranks should be studied far in advance of any actual application, so that academics can have a realistic understanding of how they need to develop in order to be eligible for promotion, and begin building up the necessary evidence. The individual considering applying for promotion is encouraged to discuss the application with the Head of Department and Dean of the Faculty. Such individuals are able to provide guidance to the academic as regards the prospects of personal promotion as well as provide guidance as regards technical aspects of the application. Where the Dean and Head of Department think that the application for personal promotion is premature, guidance is given as to what aspects of the application require attention. Where the academic has received feedback that the application may be premature, an academic still has the discretion to make an application. In this instance, the individual should advise the Head of Department and Dean of this decision.
ROLE 2 Centre for Higher Education Research Teaching and Learning (CHERTL)	CHERTL ensures that new academic staff is advised on the personal promotion process as part of the orientation of such staff. To those academics applying for personal promotion, CHERTL provides guidance on constructing an argument and evidence for competence in the area of teaching. Given that such a document needs to be built up over time, it is important this guidance is sought as soon as possible. CHERTL also ensures alignment between this personal promotion process (in terms of the criteria used) and the objectives and direction of the institution in promoting a teaching and learning culture.
ROLE 3 Research and Development Office	The Research and Development Office shall provide the Personal Promotions Committee with the research output for the last five years for each applicant for promotion. The DVC: Research and Development shall guide the Personal Promotions Committee as regards viable benchmarks and accomplishments related to the academic's research track record at various levels of promotion. The Research and Development Office also ensures alignment between this personal promotion process and the objectives of the institution in promoting a research culture.
ROLE 4 Head of Department	The Head of Department engages with the academic staff member as regards their professional development and prospects of success for personal promotion. The Head of Department ensures that the academic is aware of support available to assist in preparing for personal promotion namely: • Discussion with the Dean; • Academic leave to allow for the completion of particular "milestones" that will be critical in the personal promotion application; and • Discussion with the Research Office as regards possible time-off (over and above academic leave) to complete the PhD or complete research. From time to time, there may be donor funding for this purpose. The Head of Department will submit a report on the contribution of the applicant within the department and on the academic's standing within the discipline. The Head of Department may be required to be interviewed by the Personal Promotions Committee.

	The Head of Department should also alert the Deans and Director: HR to any departmental or institutional barriers that undermine academic's prospects as regards personal promotion.
ROLE 5 **Dean of the Faculty**	The Dean of the Faculty, in consultation with Heads of Departments, identifies and approaches individuals within the Faculty that should be considering applying for personal promotion. In addition, the Deans provide guidance to individuals as regards the prospects of personal promotion as well as provide guidance as regards technical aspects of the application. The Deans, in consultation with the Head of Departments, are responsible for the identification of external assessors (see Role 7 below). The Deans, after advising the Heads of Departments, are responsible for communicating the recommendation of the Personal Promotions Committee to the applicants in the relevant Faculty. This is after the first as well as the review meeting. The Dean and the Director: HR discuss departmental or institutional barriers that undermine academics' prospects of personal promotion and where feasible, seek to address these. The Deans are also responsible for recommending changes, through consultation with the Faculty, related to the criteria for personal promotion. The Deans, or the Dean's representative, motivates for changes in Senate and Council.
ROLE 6 **Human Resources (HR) Division**	The HR Division ensures that a process exists to facilitate the recognition and advancement of meritorious academic staff. The HR Division, through the involvement of other parties, will ensure that such a process is equitable, meets the requirements of the labour legislation, is perceived as fair and equitable by staff and meets institutional needs for sustainability. The HR Division ensures the documentation of such a process into a policy document and the communication thereof to academic staff. The HR Division also handles the administrative and co-ordination processes linked to the annual application process, including the minuting of the meetings of the Academic Personal Promotion Committee. After approval of the recommendations of the Personal Promotion Committee (usually in December of each year), the HR Division will confirm this, in writing, with each individual.
ROLE 7 **External Assessors for Associate Professor or Professor Applications**	Each Associate Professor or Professor application is assessed by an external assessor. This person is identified by the Dean, in consultation with the Head of Department. The advisor is usually a senior academic working in the area of the applicant who is able to meaningfully critique the achievements of the applicant. The role of the assessor is to assess the application and not to make a case of promotion of the candidate. The external assessor is provided with the Rhodes University Personal Promotions criteria and submits a report for the Personal Promotions Committee. External reviewers will be requested to focus on the scholarly standing of the candidate, and only comment on other categories where they are able to in terms of independent evidence at their disposal. In general, external assessors will be expected to address the category of research, to some extent professional involvement, and occasionally other categories but only if the external assessor is informed enough to do so. The external assessor may be requested to be involved where an application to the rank of professor has been unsuccessful and the academic has asked for a review of the decision. At this review meeting of the Academic Personal Promotions Committee, a telephonic interview will be held with the external assessor. This is only for applications to the rank of professor, and only when the chair in consultation with the Dean deems it useful to do so.
ROLE 8 Academic Personal Promotions Committee	The Academic Personal Promotions Committee is responsible for considering all the evidence tabled for each applicant before making decisions that are fair, consistent and in line with this policy, template and criteria for personal promotion. The composition of the Academic Personal Promotions Committee is set in its Terms of Reference.

7. CONTACTS

Area of Concern	Division/Faculty/Department	Telephone	Email

8. POLICY REVIEW PROCEDURE

(Actions and processes by which the policy will be reviewed)

The Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellors and Deans are permitted to make minor procedural adjustments to this policy to ensure an efficient and effective process. Such changes should be noted to Senate. The entire policy and procedure should be reviewed every 5 years.
Communication of the review process
The HR Division will engage stakeholders through toplist@lists.ru.ac.za

9. POLICY CONTEXT: RELEVANT DOCUMENTS CITED/CONSULTED/ADOPTED

1	
2	

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1:

RHODES UNIVERSITY

Procedures for Personal Promotion of Academic Staff

INTRODUCTION

The Personal Promotions Policy aims to recognise an academic's increasing qualitative contribution to Rhodes University's vision of being an outstanding internationally-respected academic institution.

Academics are encouraged to regard **personal promotion as part of a larger developmental process**. The requirements for the various academic ranks should be studied far in advance of any actual application, so that academics can have a realistic understanding of how they need to develop in order to be eligible for promotion, and begin building up the necessary evidence. Academics are strongly advised to seek guidance from more senior and experienced colleagues.

Academics will be required to make the **best possible case** for their promotion arguing for their unique context and personal circumstances. This is an **evidence based decision-making process**. Academics are strongly encouraged to look at the guidelines for making an application. These guidelines include information that the Personal Promotion Committee needs in order to make a principled and considered decision.

While criteria and a framework is provided which guides decision-making, it needs to be noted from the outset that the personal promotions process **can never be reduced to a 'tick-box exercise'**, and that it will always involve meticulous motivation on the part of the candidate and rigorous debate and principled judgement on the part of the Personal Promotions Committee.

Careful attention should be given to the equivalence value of sub-criteria used to judge performance within categories, with due recognition that not all sub-criteria need to be met at the same level of achievement, but that an overall balance of performance at the desired level in the category needs to be achieved.

This document consists of the following:
1. **The Academic Template:** Candidates need to motivate their case for promotion bearing in mind this framework.

2. **Personal Promotion Criteria:** This outlines the specific evidence used to assess applications and to determine if the candidate is rated as outstanding, very good, satisfactory etc within the different areas of teaching, research, community engagement etc. This is not a tick-box exercise.

3. **Making an Application:** An application providing relevant information to the committee is required and can be found in this Appendix. Also included are guidelines to assist you in your application.

THE PERSONAL PROMOTION PROCESS

This process is described in detail in point 5.2 of the policy document. Some important pointers:
1. Academics themselves apply for promotion, but they are strongly urged to discuss their applications with their HoD and Dean for critical feedback and professional assistance;
2. HoDs and Deans may also encourage academics to apply for promotion and there are processes in place to facilitate this;
3. The dates in the process are strictly adhered to because of a variety of processes that need to be followed e.g. teaching evidence needs to be assessed, referee reports need to be solicited, external assessors have to be identified and asked for assessments. Late applications are not considered.

1. **THE ACADEMIC TEMPLATE** (see Table 1 below)
1.1. **Major areas**

This template gives an indication of the range and scope of academic achievements. The template consists of the five major areas in an academic's life:
- Teaching & Learning
- Research
- Community Engagement
- Professional Involvement
- Leadership Management & Administration.

In the case of research or instrumentation scientist staff, teaching and learning does not apply. The template is *not* a prescriptive document and does not imply that an academic should have accomplished any or all the possibilities. It is an attempt, in the first instance, to provide a framework on which academics can describe the nature and quality of their achievements. It is not exhaustive, and academics are free to motivate additions that are appropriate for them.

1.2 Levels of achievement

In making an application, the academic needs to describe themselves in the relevant areas of academic life. There are four levels of achievement: Outstanding, Very Good, Good, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory (corresponding to 4, 3, 2, 1, and 0 in terms on minimum qualifying scores).

Unsatisfactory	*Satisfactory*	*Good*	*Very Good*	*Outstanding*
This marks an unsatisfactory or non-existent level of achievement. While this might be understandable for new academics in some areas or for other more established ones in particularly specialised posts, this level does indicate an area in which an academic needs to improve.	This indicates a level of performance that is better than unsatisfactory but no more than what can be expected of an academic. It might, however, point to promise that might substantiate itself over time.	In this level are those achievements which are above average and more than is expected of an academic.	In this level are those achievements which, while not quite outstanding are significantly greater than the average.	This level describes the top achievements of academics in a particular discipline in South Africa. Here is where the most outstanding researcher will be placed, the top teaching in a Faculty, exemplary practice in community engagement, the most significant contributions to the disciplines outside of the University, and the most dynamic accomplishments in leadership, management and administration.
0	1	2	3	4

The five categories of achievement apply across all levels of promotion. Where the committee places a candidate on the scale of achievement is influenced by context - the context of the discipline, the length of time the person had been in the service of Rhodes University and of academia (rate of contribution), and what has changed since the last promotion. Generally speaking higher ratings (very good and outstanding) are awarded based on sustained contributions, and the lower ratings (satisfactory and good) on less long-term contributions. It is the responsibility of the Academic Personal Promotions Committee to manage the tension that sometimes arises from having a single performance scale for all academic ranks.

1.3 Making a case for oneself

For promotion to a particular academic rank, an applicant needs to meet at least ONE of the possible generic minimal requirements listed below (with reference to the Academic Template in Table 1), with the faculty-specific criteria either adding to them or modifying them.

Please note that in order to be considered as *satisfactory, good, very good* or *outstanding* in any category does NOT mean that one has to achieve all the accomplishments/evidence listed. It is recognised that within a category, there is a range of accomplishments. One might also want to add accomplishments not listed but appropriate to one's academic circumstances. The given descriptions are guidelines to the level of accomplishment required and against which academics can make a case for themselves.

Appendix 2:

TABLE 1: TEMPLATE/FRAMEWORK FOR PROMOTION TO SPECIFIC ACADEMIC POST LEVELS

Personal Promotion Requirements	Senior Lecturer
Focus	Emphasis on **Teaching & Learning**, with increasing quality and quantity of involvement in **Research** and other areas. **At least Good for Teaching & Learning and Satisfactory for Research.** At least two categories overall should be evaluated as Good.
Teaching & Learning	At least Good (2)
Research	At least Satisfactory (1)
Community Engagement	If Research is Satisfactory, then at least Good (2) in one of these categories;
Professional Involvement	Performance in these categories to be such that the overall achievement equals or exceeds a score of 6 in total.
Leadership, Management and Administration	
Personal Promotion Requirements	**Associate Professor**
Focus	Continuing development of academic competence and achievement, with emphasis on **Research.** **At least Good for Teaching & Learning AND Research.** At least three categories overall should be evaluated as Good, or at least two categories overall should be evaluated as Very Good. A minimum overall qualifying score of 9 should be achieved.

Teaching & Learning	At least Good (2)
Research	At least Good (2)
Community Engagement	At least Good (2) in one of these categories;
Professional Involvement	Performance in these categories to be such that the overall achievement equals or exceeds a score of 9 in total.
Leadership, Management and Administration	

Personal Promotion Requirements	Professor
Focus	Emphasis **on scholarship in Teaching & Learning, and Research**. Candidates must score at least good in Teaching & Learning, and Research, although scores of Very Good and Outstanding for one or both are more usual at this level. At least four categories overall should be evaluated as Good, or at least three categories overall should be evaluated as Very Good. A minimum overall qualifying score of 12 should be achieved.
Teaching & Learning	At least Good (2)
Research	At least Good (2)
Community Engagement	At least Good (2) in two of these categories;
Professional Involvement	Performance in these categories to be such that the overall achievement equals or exceeds a score of 12 in total.
Leadership, Management and Administration	

Personal promotion criteria	Senior Researcher	Associate professor	Professor	
Focus	Research is the main focus and teaching is not a core function. Where the researchers are on contract, raising funds for their own employment, contract research shall be regarded as equivalent to more traditional forms of research. In assessing the candidate's scholarship for promotion to Professor, consideration will be given to the total track record of the individual. While disciplinary differences are taken into account, the candidate does need to demonstrate a standing within the discipline on the basis of own research, in addition to student research supervised. This could mean that the individual has demonstrated leadership and made a major contribution in research projects and has been the lead author on publications or has demonstrated a consistent individual contribution in a number of publications over the course of their academic career			
Research	Very good (3)	Very good (3)	Very good (3) to Outstanding (4)	
Community Engagement	Performance in these categories to be such that the overall achievement equals or exceeds a score of 6 in total.	Performance in these categories to be such that the overall achievement equals or exceeds a score of 9 in total.	Performance in these categories to be such that the overall achievement equals or exceeds a score of 12 in total.	
Professional Involvement				
Leadership, Management & Admin				

Personal Promotion Requirements	Professor
Focus	Emphasis **on scholarship in Teaching & Learning, and Research**. Candidates must score at least good in Teaching & Learning, and Research, although scores of Very Good and Outstanding for one or both are more usual at this level. At least four categories overall should be evaluated as Good, or at least three categories overall should be evaluated as Very Good.
Teaching & Learning	At least Good (2)

Research	At least Good (2)
Community Engagement	At least Good (2) in two of these categories;
Professional Involvement	Performance in these categories to be such that the overall achievement equals or exceeds a score of 12 in total.
Leadership, Management and Administration	

INSTRUMENTATION SCIENTISTS

Instrument Scientist is not involved in standard curriculum teaching but has important responsibilities and the instrument training of users. The quality and extent of such training will be an assessment criterion.

Matrix of posts with related selection criteria, aligned to personal promotion criteria	Instrument Scientist (Rank and income level equivalent to Researcher)	Senior Instrument Scientist (Rank and income level equivalent to Senior Researcher)	Chief Instrument Scientist (Rank and income level equivalent to Associate Professor)
Qualification	Normally a PhD but an MSc may be appropriate in some instances	PhD	PhD
Experience: technical; maintenance and laboratory management (Dominant focus area)	• Substantial experience in the maintenance and use of the equipment; insight/ some experience in managing a laboratory. • Successful utilization of the instrument/ instrument class in research.	• Extensive experience in the maintenance and use of equipment, and of managing a laboratory. • Extensive utilization of the instrument/instrument class in research • Provision of good quality technical infrastructure (data production and data communication) for instrument users.	• Extensive experience in the maintenance and use of equipment and of managing a research active laboratory. • Extensive utilization of the instrument/instrument class in research • Innovative and novel use of equipment. • World-class service for internal and external laboratory users. • Local, national and international user community of the laboratory and numerous external collaborators.

Personal promotion criteria	Instrument Scientist (Rank and income level equivalent to Research Officer)	Senior Instrument Scientist (Rank and income level equivalent to Senior Research Officer)	Chief Instrument Scientist (Rank and income level equivalent to Associate Professor)
Academic/scientific qualification	• At least satisfactory track record as an analyst using the same or comparable equipment • Involvement in instrument training of post-graduate students or an ability to do so. • Demonstrated ability to produce quality publications related to utilization of the equipment.	• At least good track record in the production of published data. • Numerous co-authorships on user publications. • Presentations at national and international conferences (particularly on technical aspects of instrument utilization). • Very good record of training of postgraduate students. • Evidence of capacity for raising equipment funding. • Strong national and emerging international profile as an analyst.	• Excellent publication record of data produced in the laboratory. • Sought-after expert as analyst, nationally and internationally; • Presenter of key-note talks on analytical aspects of the instrument/instrument class. • Main author of successful funding applications for instrument upgrades and replacement. • Senior author on novel utilization of the equipment. • Excellent record of training of postgraduate students as analysts. • Possibly supervision of own research students/post-docs. • NRF rating.
Leadership, management and administration	• Satisfactory scientific and administrative capability of managing the laboratory • Involvement in department, Faculty and/or University is expected.	• Very good leadership, management and administration of the laboratory or facility in which the instrument/s are located. • Organisation of collaborative instrument training or utilization, or research collaboration between RU and other institutions as an analyst. • Attraction of industry contract work.	• Significant organisational and administrative contribution at the level of department and to some extent at level of Faculty and University. • Facilitation of collaboration between the laboratory and researchers outside the University (national, international; academic, industry). • Organisation of conferences and workshops.

Personal promotion criteria	Instrument Scientist (Rank and income level equivalent to Research Officer)	Senior Instrument Scientist (Rank and income level equivalent to Senior Research Officer)	Chief Instrument Scientist (Rank and income level equivalent to Associate Professor)
User Training (User courses at various levels, offered to staff, postgraduate students, researchers, etc.)	• Some experience in routine instrument training of postgraduate students and other local/national users or ability to do so. • Development of user courses covering the theoretical background and practical use of the instrument for RU staff and postgraduate students.	• A track record of organising successful user courses at a range of levels for local, regional and national participants covering theory and hands-on instrument operation.	• Excellent quality of user training. • Well developed ability to teach advanced aspects of equipment use and data analysis to users at advanced levels. • Good national and perhaps international attendance of such courses • Organisation of specialist courses and workshops.
Professional Involvement (lesser focus of application except at levels of CIS)	No involvement required at time of appointment	Satisfactory: • Service in professional field e.g. professional/academic bodies, in advisory capacity, journal service, reviews of instrument funding proposals or research reviews. • Representation of the laboratory at national and international conferences.	Very good: • Service in professional field e.g. professional/academic bodies, in advisory capacity, journal service, review of funding proposals, leading organizer of conference or symposia, development of policies. • Interaction with manufacturers of analytical instruments in the context if new instrument designs or capabilities. • External examination theses for RSA HEIs.
Community Engagement	Various opportunities exist for Instrument scientists to become involved in community engagement including the public understanding of science, the promotion of science and events such as SciFest or in collaboration with local schools. Ideally, at least satisfactory involvement in CE is expected at Instrument Scientist level with increasing evidence of involvement in community engagement at higher levels.		

FACULTY-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK and ASSOCIATED CRITERIA

Faculty	Senior lecturer	Associate professor	Professor
Humanities	PhD is normally required. It is recognised that particular disciplines do not require a PhD at the senior lecturer level and this can be motivated by the candidate and HoD. In such cases, a masters degree and 7 to 10 years of relevant experience is required.	Doctorate degree is a requirement	Doctorate degree is a requirement
Science	PhD is normally required. It is recognised that particular disciplines do not require a PhD at the senior lecturer level. This can be motivated by the candidate and HoD.	Doctorate degree is a requirement	
Education	PhD is normally required.	Doctorate degree is a requirement	
	The academic endeavour in the Education Faculty is primarily practice-centred. It is therefore important to take into account the close relationship between candidates' teaching and learning practice; research; and professional involvement when deliberating on their standing in the field. The dynamic nature of policy and practice in education places additional responsibilities on academics in universities, a factor which should also be considered when judging the research-practice relationship. Papers written for professional journals, and reports to national fora interpreting new developments in policy and practice in education, may therefore also be considered as research. In addition candidates may present written evidence of research-based participation in the evaluation and development of educational policy and practice, as contributions to educational research. In the current educational landscape in South Africa, research is often developmental and focussed on capacity building. Evidence of capacity building, including, for example, joint publications with students, should thus be considered together with evidence of the candidate's scholarly voice. Leadership in, and recognition for, capacity building in research should also be taken into account for progression to higher post levels.		
Commerce	Masters degree required	Economics, Information Systems & Management: Doctorate degree is a requirement Accounting: Either CA + Masters Degree, or PhD	Doctorate degree is a requirement
	In the Department of Accounting, (i) updating of teaching to incorporate regular legislative and professional requirements is seen as spanning both teaching and research; and (ii) Papers written for professional journals and public presentations interpreting new developments will be considered as research. In the Department of Information Systems, (i) updating of teaching to incorporate the latest ICT systems is a vital component of teaching evaluation and (ii). The provision of written evidence evaluating systems development projects developed or supervised by individual staff members in terms of their novelty, workability and impact will be assessed as research.		

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

In the Department of Accounting, (i) updating of teaching to incorporate regular legislative and professional requirements is seen as spanning both teaching and research; and (ii) Papers written for professional journals and public presentations interpreting new developments will be considered as research.

In the Department of Information Systems, (i) updating of teaching to incorporate the latest ICT systems is a vital component of teaching evaluation and (ii). The provision of written evidence evaluating systems development projects developed or supervised by individual staff members in terms of their novelty, workability and impact will be assessed as research.

Senior lecturer		Associate professor		Professor	
LLM, PhD (preferred)	Usually 7 years to 10 years relevant experience	LLM, PhD (usually)	Usually 10 or more years relevant experience	LLM, PhD (usually)	Usually 20 years relevant experience
For those applicants who have pursued an academic career trajectory:					
Teaching experience at the undergraduate and post graduate levels required. **In addition:** Research supervision of Masters' degrees or equivalent required. Emerging national profile in discipline.		Considerable teaching experience. Has taught at the undergraduate and post graduate levels required including Masters and PhD levels. **In addition:** Research supervision of Masters and PhD degrees required. National + emerging international profile (if appropriate to disciplinary focus) in discipline.		Extensive teaching experience. Has taught at the undergraduate and post graduate levels required including at Masters and PhD levels. **In addition:** Research supervision of Masters and PhD degrees required. International profile in discipline, if appropriate to disciplinary focus. If area has local relevance, then expert profile nationally.	
For those applicants who have NOT pursued an academic career trajectory, information and evidence must be provided of:					
Good professional track record. Strong track record of training and mentoring of junior staff.		Excellent professional track record. Excellent track record of training and mentoring of junior staff.		Excellent professional track record. Excellent track record of training and mentoring of junior staff.	

Supervision of junior staff including candidate attorneys. Preferably some teaching experience in a University context. **In addition:** Demonstrated research supervision ability, for example, research project editor and research coordination of relevant legal research. Emerging national profile in discipline.	Strong record of supervision of junior staff including candidate attorneys. Some teaching experience in a University context. If there has been the opportunity, has supervised Masters and/or PhD students. **In addition:** Demonstrated research supervision ability, for example, research project editor and research coordination of relevant legal research. National + emerging international profile (if appropriate to disciplinary focus) in discipline.	Excellent record of supervision of junior staff including candidate attorneys. Some teaching experience in a University context. Has taught at the postgraduate and undergraduate levels. If there has been the opportunity, has supervised Masters and/or PhD students. **In addition:** Demonstrated research supervision ability, for example, research project editor and research coordination of relevant legal research. International profile in discipline, if appropriate to disciplinary focus. If area has local relevance, then expert profile nationally.

2. PERSONAL PROMOTION CRITERIA

In the tables below, the evidence, based criteria are listed. This is not a tick-box exercise for the Personal Promotions Committee. It is not expected that an academic will achieve all accomplishments listed. It is also understood that academic careers differ between disciplines and even within disciplines. For this reason, the academic is required to make the **best possible case** for their promotion arguing for their unique context and personal circumstances. The categories below are applicable at all levels of promotion. The trajectory of an academic's career is recognised in that as one advances to higher level posts, the requirement moves from being very good in some categories to being very good or outstanding in most categories.

Table 2: CRITERIA FOR TEACHING & LEARNING

Level	Teaching practice	Scholarly engagement with teaching and learning	Curriculum practice	Leadership
Outstanding	• Engages students across a complete range of social, cultural and linguistic backgrounds in ways which inspire and give them confidence to learn. • Guides and supports students in the adoption of a broad range of learning practices appropriate to the discipline. • Draws on a broad and innovative range of teaching strategies (including the use of ICTs) appropriate to the discipline. • Uses outstanding disciplinary knowledge to inform teaching. • Supports and guides students into understanding how knowledge is constructed in the discipline in innovative and thoughtful ways at undergraduate as well as postgraduate levels. • Provides evidence of inquiry based teaching and learning across a range of levels. • The outstanding teaching practice described by these criteria is demonstrated across a broad range of undergraduate and postgraduate levels of study. • Offers supervision which guides and supports all students regardless of their social, cultural and linguistic backgrounds to produce rigorous	• A well-articulated philosophy of teaching and learning which demonstrates understandings of how students learn and the role of teaching in promoting learning and which acknowledge contemporary thinking related to teaching and learning in the discipline. • Demonstrates very high level of coherence between philosophy and practice. • Critical reflection on practice informed by relevant literature and evaluation data from a number of sources. • Evidence of how critical reflection informs enhancement of practice.	• Rigorous and substantial evidence of the use of sound course design principles (drawing on the literature?). • Regular and rigorous review of courses to ensure that courses are relevant to and up-to-date with local, international, global and disciplinary contexts. Review includes in depth- engagement with feedback from students, external examiners and peers and other external stakeholders. • Course design is highly responsive to diverse needs of a diverse student body • High levels of alignment with respect to purpose, outcomes, teaching & learning activities, assessment methods and criteria. • Assessment is used to guide and not only measure student learning. Criteria are clearly communicated to students and rigorous evidence of assessment against these criteria is provided. • Analysis of assessment processes and student assessment results to inform curriculum practice.	• Demonstrated in a formal role in respect of teaching and learning in a department/faculty and/or nationally. • Evidence of effective formal or informal mentorship of less experienced staff. .

Very good	• Engages students from a broad range of social, cultural and linguistic backgrounds through well designed and paced teaching which promotes understanding. • Guides and supports students as they acquire learning practices appropriate to the discipline. • Uses very good disciplinary knowledge to inform teaching. • Supports and guides students into understanding how knowledge is constructed in the discipline. • Provides evidence of inquiry based teaching and learning. • Very good teaching practice described by these criteria is demonstrated across a range of undergraduate and postgraduate levels of study. • Guides and supports a range of students to produce rigorous research or sound professional/clinical practice.	• A clearly articulated philosophy of teaching and learning which articulates understandings of how students learn and the role of teaching in facilitating learning and which acknowledges contemporary thinking related to teaching and learning in the discipline. • Very good coherence between philosophy and practice. • Critical reflection on practice informed by relevant literature and evaluation data from a number of sources. • Evidence of how critical reflection informs enhancement of practice	• Rich evidence of use of course design principles. • Regular and sound review of courses to ensure that courses are relevant to and up-to-date with local, international, global and disciplinary contexts. Review includes engagement with feedback from students, external examiners and peers. • Course design is responsive to diverse needs of a diverse student body • Very good levels of alignment between purpose, outcomes, teaching and learning activities, assessment methods and criteria. • Substantial evidence of assessment being used to guide, and not only measure, student learning. Criteria are communicated to students and assessment is against these criteria.	• Demonstrated in a formal role in respect of teaching and learning in a department/faculty. • Evidence of effective formal or informal mentorship of less experienced staff.

Level	Teaching practice	Scholarly engagement with teaching and learning	Curriculum practice	Leadership
Good	• Engages a range of students through well-paced, clear teaching • Guides students towards the use of a range of learning practices • Strong disciplinary knowledge evident in teaching • Some evidence of attempts to guide students into understanding how knowledge is constructed in the discipline. • Good teaching practice described by these criteria demonstrated across both postgraduate and undergraduate levels. • Some evidence of successful supervision of research projects.	• Sound teaching philosophy with explanations of ways students learn and show how teaching facilitates this learning. These explanations need not be linked to 'formal' educational theory. • Coherence between philosophy and practice. • Reflection on practice informed by evaluation data from a number of sources. • Evidence of how reflection informs enhancement of practice.	• Use of sound course design principles. • Courses are reviewed regularly to ensure that courses are relevant to and up-to-date with local, international, global and disciplinary contexts. Review includes some engagement with feedback from students, external examiners and peers and other stakeholders. • Course design is responsive to diverse needs of a diverse student body • Good levels of alignment between of purpose, outcomes, teaching and learning activities, assessment methods and criteria. • Evidence of assessment being used to guide, and not only measure, student learning. Criteria are communicated to students and assessment is against these criteria.	• Demonstrates some leadership (for example through course co-ordination or co-ordination of a tutorial programme).

Level	Teaching practice	Scholarly engagement with teaching and learning	Curriculum practice	Leadership
Satisfactory	• Clear and accessible teaching • Attempts to introduce students to productive learning practices. • Acknowledges diversity and produces evidence of dealing with it effectively. • Disciplinary knowledge appropriate to the level of qualification and experience achieved • Some awareness of need to guide students into understanding how knowledge is constructed in the discipline. • Satisfactory teaching practice described by these criteria demonstrated across a limited range of undergraduate and postgraduate levels of study. • Limited evidence of successful supervision of research projects or professional/clinical practice.	• Reasonable attempt at explaining how students learn and the role of teaching in this process. This does not need to include reference to 'formal' educational theory. • Some coherence between philosophy and practice.	• Some evidence of the use of course design principles. • Regular review of courses to ensure that they are relevant and up to date. Review considers feedback from students, external examiners and peers. • Responsive to diverse needs of a diverse student body. • Some evidence of alignment between purpose, outcomes, teaching and learning activities, assessment methods and criteria. • Some evidence of using assessment to guide and not only measure student learning. Assessment criteria are provided. Evidence of assessment against criteria.	• Evidence of supporting course or tutorial coordinators

Level	Teaching practice	Scholarly engagement with teaching and learning	Curriculum practice	Leadership
Unsatisfactory	• Narrow range of teaching strategies. • Little or no consideration of issues of diversity. • Limited disciplinary knowledge. • Evidence of teaching practice offered over narrow range of levels. • Little or no evidence of supervision of research projects or professional/clinical practice supervision.	• Poor explanation of the way students learn and the role of teaching in this process. • Little coherence between philosophy and practice.	• Little or no evidence of use of course design principles. • Some elements of the curriculum are misaligned. • Assessment is only used to measure and not guide student learning. Criteria are either poorly designed or not available. Assessment against criteria does not take place or no evidence is provided of this.	• No evidence of involvement in course or module co-ordination.

TABLE 3: RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ENDEAVOUR: Academics whose primary output is the published paper **and less often** a book

Level	Research Outputs Quality & Quantity	Postgraduates Quality & Quantity	Recognition and Reputation
Outstanding	Consistently produces outputs of the highest quality • Outstanding publication record in appropriate academic and/or professional journals, relative to others in the same field (nationally & internationally) • Regularly presents papers at international conferences • Author / editor of a leading work or contributions to a leading work • Uses the top journals in the field • Many papers with high citation, and/or research with high field-based impact • Public emanation of work	Consistently graduates PGs of the highest quality • Outstanding reputation for supervising at post graduate level • Assessment of supervision always excellent • Consistently attracts and graduates Master's and doctoral students within the minimum expected time • Excellent record of graduates who have become successful in their own right • Excellent track record of capacity building with students from disadvantaged educational backgrounds • Some students graduate with distinction • An excellent record of publications from student research • Evidence of high level of fundraising for research.	Recognised nationally and Internationally as a leader • Amongst the top researchers in the field nationally and internationally • Regularly invited to write review papers • Regularly invited to present plenary papers at international conferences • Invited to make contributions to major books as author or editor • Considered as a public commentator with particular expertise • NRF rating outstanding for the discipline (likely to be A, B or C1). • National and International awards for research excellence
Very good	Consistently produces outputs some of which are of a very high standard • Substantial research and publication record in appropriate academic and/or professional journals, relative to others in the same field • Regularly presents at national and international conferences • Contributes book chapters • Uses journals with good IF and sometimes high IF • Some papers with high citations and/or some evidence of high field-based impact	Consistently graduates PGs • Very good reputation for supervising at post graduate level • Assessment of supervision always very good • Graduates most Master's and doctoral students within the minimum expected time • Very good record of graduates who have become successful in their own right • Some students graduate with distinction • Significant evidence of capacity building with students from disadvantaged educational backgrounds • A good record of publications from student research • A well-developed ability to fund raise for research fundraising	Strong national & some international recognition • Strong national profile with some international recognition and a clear trajectory of an increasing international profile • Invited to write review papers for national and international journals • Invited to present at national and international conferences • Invited contributions to local books • NRF rating very good for the discipline (likely to be B, C2, or Y1) • National awards for research excellence

Good	Produces outputs some of which are of a high standard	Consistently graduates PGs	Good National recognition
	• A good research and publication record in appropriate academic and/or professional journals, relative to others in the same field • Regularly presents at national conferences • Contributes book chapters • Uses journals with good IF • Some papers with good citations and/or some evidence of field-based impact	• A good reputation for supervising at post graduate level • Consistently graduates Master's and may have graduated doctoral students within the minimum expected time • Assessment of supervision is good • Some evidence of capacity building with students from disadvantaged educational backgrounds • Some evidence of publications coming out of student research • Some evidence of fundraising for research	• Well known in the field nationally • Invited to present at national conferences • Has an NRF rating
Satisfactory	Steady research output of increasing quality • Evidence of ongoing involvement in research which may be for a PhD • A record of publications in academic and/or professional journals • Presents at national conferences • Uses journals with moderate IF • Some papers with some citations and/or some evidence of field-based impact	A contribution to PG training • Some success in initiating, managing and supervising postgraduate students, possibly as a co-supervisor. Preferably one Master's student graduated • Some evidence of research fund-raising, possibly as a junior or co-researcher	Nationally/locally recognised • Able to provide some evidence of local and preferably national recognition.
Unsatisfactory	Research outputs irregular and of low quality • Little or no research activity in the last 5 years or since the last promotion • Rarely publishes in refereed journals • No conference presentations	Plays little or no role in PG training • Little experience with postgraduate supervision • No evidence of research fund-raising • Has not graduated a Master's or PhD student in the last 5 years or since the last promotion	Little or no recognition • Unable to provide evidence of national or local recognition

TABLE 3: RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ENDEAVOUR: Academics whose primary output is in art practice as research

Level	Research Outputs Quality & Quantity	Postgraduates Quality & Quantity	Recognition and Reputation
Outstanding	**Consistently produces outputs of the highest quality** • Has had a substantial number of solo exhibitions, installations or performance art events in prestigious national and international venues • Has been selected for prestigious Art Festivals, Art Fairs, and/or Biennial exhibitions • Produces works that are the focus of academic articles and monographs (excluding self-initiated projects) as well as substantive reviews • Has works in a large number of public collections, including international collections. • Has undertaken substantial curatorial work for prestigious galleries and/or noteworthy exhibitions	**Consistently produces postgraduates of the highest quality** • Outstanding reputation for supervising at postgraduate level • Assessment of supervision always excellent • Consistently attracts and graduates Master's students within the minimum expected time • Excellent record of graduates who have become successful in their own right • Excellent track record of capacity building with students from disadvantaged educational backgrounds • Students frequently graduate with distinction	**Recognised nationally and Internationally as a leader** • Regularly receives prestigious invitations as guest speaker, participant, artist-in- residence, curator or exhibitor from national and international institutions • Invitations to contribute to funding selection and/or award commissions • Invited as peer reviewer by leading national and international institutions to review practice as research • Has received important national and international awards

Very good (top 20% of those in the field at universities)	**Consistently produces outputs of a very high standard** • Has had at least two substantial solo exhibitions, installations or performance art events and has participated in group exhibitions overseas. • Has had works be the focus of an academic article or monograph which is not self-initiated as well as substantive reviews. • Has works in a number of public collections nationally and possibly internationally • May have undertaken curatorial work for prestigious galleries and/or noteworthy exhibitions • May have published academic articles/chapters in books	**Consistently graduates postgraduates** • Very good reputation for supervising at postgraduate level • Assessment of supervision always very good • Frequently graduates Master's students within the minimum expected time • Very good record of graduates who have become successful in their own right • Students sometimes graduate with distinction • Significant evidence of capacity building with students from disadvantaged educational backgrounds	**Strong National and some international recognition** • Has received prestigious national and international invitations as a speaker, participant, artist-in-residence, curator or exhibitor • Some invitations to contribute to funding selection and/or award commissions • Invited as peer reviewer by leading national institutions to review practice as research • Has received national awards • Nationally recognised as a respected artist/authority
Good (top 40% of those in the field at universities)	**Produces outputs of a high standard** • Has had at least one substantial solo exhibition, installation or performance art event, and has participated in group exhibitions nationally • Has had work referenced, cited or discussed in an academic article which is not self-initiated, or in substantive reviews • May have works in a number of public, national collections • May have undertaken curatorial work • May have published academic articles/ chapters in books	**Frequently graduates postgraduates** • A good reputation for supervising at postgraduate level • Assessment of supervision is good • Frequently graduates Master's students within the minimum expected time • Some evidence of capacity building with students from disadvantaged educational backgrounds	**Good National recognition** • Has received some prestigious national invitations as a speaker, participant, artist- in-residence, curator or exhibitor • Some invitations to contribute to funding selection and/or award commissions • Growing national recognition as a respected artist/authority
Satisfactory	**Steady creative output of increasing quality** • Has a steady output of increased quality which may be for a Masters or PhD • Presents creative work locally	**Steady contribution to postgraduate training** • Some success in initiating, managing and supervising postgraduate students, possibly as a co-supervisor. Preferably one Master's student graduated in the last 5 years	**Nationally/ locally recognised** • Able to provide some evidence of local and preferably national recognition

Unsatisfactory	Research outputs irregular and of low quality	Plays little or no role in postgraduate training	Little or no recognition
	• Is not active in the making of art OR production of academic research articles • No research or creative activity in the last 5 years or since the last promotion	• Has not graduated a Master's student in the last 5 years or since the last promotion • Little experience with postgraduate supervision	• Unable to provide evidence of national or local recognition

TABLE 3: RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ENDEAVOUR: Academics whose primary output is musical performance processes and/or products (including the roles of soloist, ensemble musician, conductor, composer, or arranger) Research contributions require a peer review process to be considered as research outputs.

Level	Creative Outputs Quality & Quantity	Postgraduates Quality & Quantity	Recognition and Reputation
Outstanding	Consistently produces outputs of the highest quality • Musical performances regularly presented at prestigious festivals or venues nationally and internationally • Creative outputs published/distributed by publishing house • Participation as a major contributing artist in a collaborative project or concert programme nationally and internationally • Body of work is studied/researched by students and professionals in further/higher education nationally and internationally • Has published academic articles/chapters in books	Consistently produces PGs of the highest quality • Outstanding reputation for supervising at post graduate level • Assessment of supervision always excellent • Consistently attracts and graduates Master's and doctoral students within the minimum expected time • Excellent record of graduates who have become successful in their own right • Excellent track record of capacity building with students from disadvantaged educational backgrounds • Some students graduate with distinction	Recognised nationally and Internationally as a leader • Regularly receives prestigious invitations as guest speaker, participant, resident , curator or exhibitor from national and international institutions • Invitations to contribute to funding selection and or award commissions (such as the National Arts Council) • Invited as peer reviewer by leading national and international institutions to review practice as research • Has received important national and international awards

Very good (top 20% of those in the field at universities)	Consistently produces outputs some of which are of a very high standard • Musical performances regularly presented at prestigious national festivals or venues and less regularly at international venues • Compositions/arrangements/recordings published/distributed by publishing house in CD format etc. • Participation as a contributing artist in a collaborative project or concert programme nationally • May have published academic articles/ chapters in books	Consistently graduates PGs • Very good reputation for supervising at post graduate level • Assessment of supervision always very good • Graduates most Master's students within the minimum expected time • Very good record of graduates who have become successful in their own right • Some students graduate with distinction • Significant evidence of capacity building with students from disadvantaged educational backgrounds	Strong National and some international recognition • Has received some prestigious national and international invitations as a speaker, participant, resident, curator or exhibitor • Some invitations to contribute to funding selection and or award commissions (such as the National Arts Council) • Invited as peer reviewer by leading national institutions to review practice as research • Has received national awards • Nationally recognised as a as a public commentator

Good (top 40% of those in the field at universities)	Produces outputs some of which are of a very high standard • Musical performances presented at national festivals or venues • Compositions/arrangements/recordings published/distributed by publishing house in CD format etc. • Participation as a contributing artist in a collaborative project or concert programme regionally • May have published academic articles/ chapters in books	Consistently graduates PGs • A good reputation for supervising at post graduate level • Assessment of supervision is good • Consistently graduates Master's students within the minimum expected time • Some evidence of capacity building with students from disadvantaged educational backgrounds	Good National recognition • Has received some prestigious national invitations as a speaker, participant, resident, curator or exhibitor • Some invitations to contribute to funding selection and or award commissions (such as the National Arts Council) • Limited national recognition as a as a public commentator
Satisfactory	Steady creative output of increasing quality • Presents creative work locally • Has a steady output of increased quality which may be for a Masters or PhD	Steady contribution to PG training • Some success in initiating, managing and supervising postgraduate students, possibly as a co-supervisor. Preferably one Master's student graduated in the last 5 years	Nationally/ locally recognised • Able to provide some evidence of local and preferably national recognition.

| Unsatisfactory | Creative outputs irregular and of low quality
• Is not active in the making of music OR production of academic research articles
• No creative outputs in the last 5 years or since the previous promotion | Plays little or no role in PG training
• Has not graduated a Master's student in the last 5 years or since the last promotion
• Little experience with postgraduate supervision | Little or no recognition
• Unable to provide evidence of national or local recognition |

TABLE 3: RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ENDEAVOUR: Academics whose primary output is theatre performance processes and/or products
(including the roles of director, choreographer, Scriptwriter, theatre designer, dramaturge, and/or performer)

Level	Research Outputs Quality & Quantity	Postgraduates Quality & Quantity	Recognition and Reputation
Outstanding	Consistently produces outputs of the highest quality • Theatre productions regularly commissioned by prestigious festivals or theatres nationally and internationally.[1] • Curator /artistic programmer of major arts festivals or theatre events nationally and internationally • Theatrical processes and/or products have significant impact[2] • Regular participation as a major contributing artist to a collaborative project.[3]	Consistently produces PGs of the highest quality • Outstanding reputation for supervising at post graduate level • Assessment of supervision always excellent • Consistently attracts and graduates Master's and/or doctoral students within the minimum expected time • Excellent record of graduates who have become successful in their own right • Excellent track record of capacity building with students from disadvantaged educational backgrounds Some students graduate with distinction	Recognised nationally and Internationally as a leader • Amongst the top researchers in the field nationally and internationally • Regularly invited to write review papers • Regularly invited to present plenary papers at international conferences • Invited to make contributions to major books as author or editor • Considered as a public commentator with particular expertise • NRF rating outstanding for the discipline (likely to be A, B or C1). • National and International awards for research excellence

	• Body of artistic work is studied/researched by students and professionals at National or International universities. • Play texts or recordings of work are widely distributed.[4] • Has published academic articles/chapters in books		

Very good (top 20% of those in the field at universities)	Consistently produces outputs some of which are of a very high standard • Presents creative work nationally and internationally and may have one commission by a prestigious festival or theatre. • Curator /artistic programmer of major arts festivals or theatre events nationally • Theatrical processes and/or products have had an impact • Participation as a contributing artist to a collaborative project • Play texts or recordings of work that are fairly widely distributed. • May have published academic articles/chapters in books	Consistently graduates PGs • Very good reputation for supervising at post graduate level • Assessment of supervision always very good • Graduates most Master's students within the minimum expected time • Very good record of graduates who have become successful in their own right • Some students graduate with distinction • Significant evidence of capacity building with students from disadvantaged educational backgrounds	Strong National and some international recognition • Has received some prestigious national and international invitations as a speaker, participant, resident, curator or exhibitor • Some invitations to contribute to funding selection and or award commissions (such as the National Arts Council) • Has received national awards • Nationally recognised as a (as a) public commentator

Good (top 40% of those in the field at universities)	Produces outputs some of which are of a very high standard • Presents creative works nationally • Curator of national theatre events • Some works with some evidence of impact • May have published academic articles/chapters in books	Consistently graduates PGs • A good reputation for supervising at post graduate level • Assessment of supervision is good • Consistently graduates Master's students within the minimum expected time • Some evidence of capacity building with students from disadvantaged educational backgrounds	Good National recognition • Has received some prestigious national invitations as a speaker, participant, resident, curator or exhibitor • Some invitations to contribute to funding selection and or award commissions (such as the National Arts Council) • Limited national recognition as a (as a) public commentator
Satisfactory	Steady creative output of increasing quality • Presents creative works locally • Continually produces creative work such as theatrical processes and/or products, but the extent and impact of these works is developing. • Some participation as a contributing artist to a collaborative project or programme. • Creative work may be towards a postgraduate	Steady contribution to PG training • Some success in initiating, managing and supervising postgraduate students, possibly as a co-supervisor. Preferably one Master's student graduated in the last 5 years	Nationally/ locally recognised • Able to provide limited evidence of local and preferably national recognition
Unsatisfactory	Research outputs irregular and of low quality • Theatre work produced is irregular and has little impact. • Minimal or no participation within wider artistic community such as workshops, conferences and festivals in the last 5 years or since the last promotion	Plays little or no role in PG training • Has not graduated a Master's student in the last 5 years or since the last promotion • Little experience with postgraduate supervision	Little or no recognition • Unable to provide evidence of national or local recognition

Notes

1. A commission by a major national or international festival involves a rigorous and often competitive selection process. A theatre work which is selected to perform on the Main programme of a festival is chosen by a panel of experts who are responsible for ensuring, in part, an artistic programme which advances artistic knowledge by presenting work of excellence which may challenge artistic boundaries, ideas about form, content, or technical expertise. In this sense, such a commission involves a peer review process, often contributing to advancement of knowledge within the discipline, and such knowledge is further disseminated through reviews, recordings, academic articles, and audience attendance.

2. Not all theatre works will end up at prestigious venues or festivals. However, some work may have a significant impact, for example, a theatre project whichinterrogates important social issues and collaborates with an NGO to initiate debate within a local community. An artist/researcher would need to argue for

the significance and scope of the impact of a particular theatre project. Some kind of peer review mechanism is therefore necessary, to account for what can be considered 'quality' within a specific context. South African Drama departments are currently involved in an NRF funded research project which aims to investigate how theatre practice might be considered research. The criteria used to evaluate this are:

- How does the process/product relate to how it is framed as research (it was decided that a theatre process or product needed to be framed as research by providing a statement of intent, contextualisation within a body of theory or artistic practice etc.)
- Does it contribute to current practice and the advancement of knowledge in the discipline? How and to what extent?
- Does it reflect theatrical and/or dramatic accomplishment and a creative signature, relative to the particular nature of the project and its context?
- To what extent does the product or process impact upon the context, the discipline or the viewer (in scope/complexity/effect/affect)?

3. Most theatre artist roles form part of a collective creative process – ie – several artists collaborating to create a theatrical production. The onus should be on the artist/researcher to show the level of his/her contribution.

4. The term 'publication' has purposively been avoided as it is unrealistic to assume in the current publishing climate, that a text or an artist monograph or recording of work will be published by a major publishing house. However, if a researcher can provide evidence that his/her text is performed or used to inform artistic practice in different contexts, this might constitute 'distribution' and by implication, dissemination of original artistic knowledge. The context of invitations to adjudicate or present a workshop needs to be taken into account, in terms of impact on the discipline, participant, or context.

TABLE 3: RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ENDEAVOUR: Academics whose primary output is in the production of media (including print, broadcast and new media). Note: When applying for promotion based on media production as the primary research output the media products should be compiled into a portfolio of work with a brief narrative overview

Level	Media Outputs Quality & Quantity	Postgraduates Quality & Quantity	Recognition and Reputation
Outstanding	Consistently produces media outputs of the highest quality • Continues to produce media of the highest standard and that has a significant effect on the audience • Has consistently innovated in media productions over a period of time. • Creative products have significant impact • Has had work reviewed internationally. • Plays a leadership role in media productions. • Commissioned to produce media in field of expertise/invited to produce commentary of media production in field of expertise nationally and internationally. • Has published academic articles/chapters in book	Consistently produces PGs of the highest quality • Outstanding reputation for supervising at post graduate level • Assessment of supervision always excellent • Consistently attracts and graduates Master's and doctoral students within the minimum expected time • Excellent record of graduates who have become successful in their own right • Excellent track record of capacity building with students from disadvantaged educational backgrounds • Some students graduate with distinction	Recognised nationally and Internationally as a leader • Regularly receives prestigious invitations as guest speaker, participant, resident, curator or exhibitor from national and international institutions • Invitations to contribute to funding selection and or award commissions (such as the National Arts Council) • Invited as peer reviewer by leading national and international institutions to review practice as research • Has received important national

Very good (top 20% of those in the field at universities)	**Consistently produces media outputs some of which are of a very high standard** • Continues to produce media of a high standard which has an impact on the audience • Shows evidence of innovation in media productions. • Creative products have some impact • Plays a leadership role in media productions nationally. • Has had work reviewed in a South African publication and internationally • Has been commissioned to produce media in field of expertise/invited to produce commentary or analysis of media production in field of expertise in South Africa and internationally May have published academic articles/chapters in books	**Consistently graduates PGs** • Very good reputation for supervising at post graduate level • Assessment of supervision always very good • Graduates most Master's students within the minimum expected time • Very good record of graduates who have become successful in their own right • Some students graduate with distinction • Significant evidence of capacity building with students from disadvantaged educational backgrounds	**Strong National and some international recognition** • Has received some prestigious national and international invitations as a speaker, participant, resident, curator or exhibitor • Some invitations to contribute to funding selection and or award commissions (such as the National Arts Council) • Has received national awards • Nationally recognised as a as a public commentator
Good (top 40% of those in the field at universities)	**Produces outputs some of which are of a very high standard** • Consistently produces media some of which is of a very high standard • Some works with some evidence of impact • May have published academic articles/chapters in books	**Consistently graduates PGs** • A good reputation for supervising at post graduate level • Assessment of supervision is good • Consistently graduates Master's students within the minimum expected time • Some evidence of capacity building with students from disadvantaged educational backgrounds	**Good National recognition** • Has received some prestigious national invitations as a speaker, participant, resident, curator or exhibitor • Some invitations to contribute to funding selection and or award commissions (such as the National Arts Council) • Limited national recognition as a as a public commentator
Satisfactory	**Steady media output of increasing quality** • Has a steady output of good quality in reputable media contexts. • Continually produces creative work and the extent and impact of these works is developing. • Some participation to a collaborative project or programme. • Creative work may be towards a postgraduate degree	**Steady contribution to PG training** • Some success in initiating, managing and supervising postgraduate students, possibly as a co-supervisor. Preferably one Master's student graduated in the last 5 years	**Nationally/ locally recognised** • Able to provide limited evidence of local and preferably national recognition.

	Media outputs irregular and of low quality	Plays little or no role in PG training	Little or no recognition
Unsatisfactory	• No activity in the production of media in the last 5 years or since the last promotion	• Has not graduated a Master's student in the last 5 years or since the last promotion • Little experience with postgraduate supervision	•Unable to provide evidence of national or local recognition

TABLE 4: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Notes for the Personal Promotions Committee and Academics

As a university we are involved in knowledge generation and dissemination and we strive to place this knowledge and expertise at the service of our community for its benefit and the benefit of staff, students and the University as a whole.

Principles that guide community engagement:

1. **Community engagement is a planned intervention.** Academics are required to describe the planning process undertaken including discussion on outcomes and expectations.
2. **Community engagement initiatives include assessment strategies**. Describe the assessment strategies used in your community engagement initiative. To what extent were all parties involved in the initiative given the opportunity to reflect on the process and the assessment of the engagement?
3. **Community engagement initiatives are mutually beneficial.** Explain how the initiative benefits: a) the university, and b) the community partners.
4. **'Engaged' refers to the building of relationships and active participation by those involved.** To what extent were the community partners involved in the initiative as active participants?
5. **Community engagement initiatives are transformative – they promote social justice.** Describe the ways in which the initiative has been transformative. How has your initiative contributed to the goal of social justice?
6. **Ethical engagement is guided by Rhodes University community engagement, as well as human, animal and environmental ethics policies.** Have all policies and procedures for ethical clearance and community engagement been followed?

Performance is expected in one or more categories. All criteria in any one category must be met.

Level	Teaching and Learning (Service Learning- credit bearing)	Research	Community Engaged Learning (non-credit bearing)
Outstanding	- Demonstrates *Outstanding Leadership* by designing, establishing and leading a SL course - Has *embedded SL course into departmental*/discipline curriculum so that SL course is not dependent on the individual lecturer *Reciprocal*: This results in measureable growth of knowledge about area of work for the community partner and the discipline/ University - Evidence of effective formal or informal *mentoring* of less experienced staff in SL	- Conducts engaged research. This results in *reciprocal benefits*: Discipline knowledge and the knowledge amongst the community partner/s has been expanded (grown) through the research activities. - That knowledge generated has been *appropriately disseminated* at the various levels - Evidence of effective formal or informal *mentoring* of less experience staff or inclusion of them as an active member in the research team	- Demonstrates *Outstanding Leadership* by designing, establishing and leading a CE learning activity which is not dependent on an individual lecturer *Reciprocal benefits:* This results in measureable growth of knowledge about area of work for the community partner and the discipline/ University e.g. Publication or evidence of shifting practice - Evidence of effective formal or informal *mentoring* of less experienced staff in CE

Very Good	• *Demonstrates leadership* by establishing (or reshaping) and leading a SL course within the department • Involved in SL over at *least a two year* period • Has *involved other staff* members in the initiative • *Reciprocal:* Mutual benefits to both parties	• Conducts engaged research. This results in *reciprocal benefits*: Discipline knowledge and the knowledge amongst the community partner/s has been expanded (grown) through the research activities. • That knowledge generated has been *appropriately disseminated* at the various levels • Researcher is involved in an engaged research partnership that has grown *over at least a two year period*.	• *Demonstrate Leadership* by establishing (or reshaping) and leading a Community Engaged Learning initiative (discipline based) within the department • Involved in Community Engagement Learning over at *least a two year period* • Has *involved other staff* members in the initiative • *Reciprocal:* Meaningful benefits to both parties
Good	• *Co-coordinator* of a SL course run in the Department aligned to all the principles of good practice listed above • The SL initiative should have run for at least *one year* • *Reciprocal:* Mutual benefits to both parties	• Conducts engaged research. This results in *reciprocal benefits:* Discipline knowledge and the knowledge amongst the community partner/s has been expanded (grown) through the research activities. • That knowledge generated has been *appropriately disseminated* at the various levels • Evidence of at *least one year's* commitment to engaged research practices, and although the results of working with a community partner may not be measurable, there is evidence of the researcher working towards a sustainable engaged research model.	• *Co-ordinator* of a CEL initiative run in the Department adhering to all the Principles of good practice listed above • Involved in this CE initiative for at *least one year* • *Reciprocal*: meaningful benefits to both parties
Satisfactory	• *Participates* in a SL course run by the Department • Involved in the SL initiative for at *least six months*	• *Supervising at least one post-graduate student* who is utilizing engaged research models e.g. social learning groups • That knowledge generated has been *appropriately disseminated* at the various levels (student or academic)	• *Participates* in a CEL initiative run by the department and is disciplined based • Involved in the CEL initiative for *at least six months*

| Unsatisfactory | • Only has an *adhoc participation* in related teaching and learning projects or programmes in the community e.g. speaker /judge | • Top down extractive approach
• Only evidence of *ad hoc input* in workshops, radio interviews or publications
• *Offers advice* to organizations outside of the university, but does not follow up and has little to no evidence of how such knowledge was implemented. | • *Occasionally participates* in a departments volunteering activities but has no evidence of a continued sustained commitment to such activities.
• Involved in activities that are *not related to the lecturers field* and /or has no evidence reflecting sustained volunteering activities that benefit the lectures discipline or the Organization |

TABLE 5: PROFESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT

Level	Teaching Related	Research Related	Professional Field
Outstanding	**External Examining**: Distinguished record of external examining of taught courses Examines for international and SA Higher Education Institutions Examines advanced/specialised courses **Formal Curriculum Development** Leading contribution at provincial and national levels **Inter-university projects** Outstanding involvement	**External Examining**: Distinguished record of external examining of Masters and Doctoral theses Examines for international and SA HEIs **Journal Service** Outstanding contribution as member of editorial board or referee of leading journals **Research Reviews** ▪ Outstanding record of reviewing research proposals and publications	**Professional/Academic Bodies** Outstanding service on local and national bodies **Advisory Capacity** Highly sought after by NGOs, industry and/or Government **Formal Policy** Exceptional contribution at provincial, national and/or international level **Conferences/Exhibitions** Leading organiser at national and/or international level **Professional Service** Evidence of exceptional professional service that influences teaching, research and/or supervision. **Higher Education** Repeatedly serves as external reviewer/assessor of other HEIs.
Very good	**External Examining**: • Substantial record of external examining • Examines advanced courses **Formal Curriculum Development** • Substantial contribution at provincial and national levels **Inter-university projects** • Substantial participation	**External Examining**: • Substantial record of external examining of Masters and Doctoral theses • Examines for a range of SA Higher Education Institutions **Journal Service** • Substantial contribution as member of editorial board or referee **Research Reviews** • Substantial record of reviewing research proposals and/or publications	**Professional/Academic Bodies** • Substantial service on local and/or national bodies **Advisory Capacity** • Often sought after by NGOs, industry and/or Government **Formal Policy** • Substantial contribution at provincial, national and/or international level **Conferences/Exhibitions** • Organiser at national and/or international level **Professional Service** • Evidence of significant professional service that influences teaching, research and/or supervision. **Higher Education** • Has served as external reviewer/assessor of other HEIs.

Level	Teaching Related	Research Related	Professional Field
Good	**External Examining**: • Good record of external examining • Examines a range of courses/qualifications/institutions **Formal Curriculum Development** • Good contribution at provincial and national levels **Inter-university projects** • Good participation	**External Examining**: • Good record of external examining of Honours research projects and Masters theses • Examines for a range of SA Higher Education Institutions **Journal Service** • Good contribution as member of editorial board or referee **Research Reviews** • Good record of reviewing research proposals and/or publications	**Professional/Academic Bodies** • Good service on local and/or national bodies **Advisory Capacity** • Sought after by NGOs, industry and/or Government **Formal Policy** • Good contribution at provincial, national and/or international level **Conferences/Exhibitions** • Organiser at institutional, regional and national level **Professional Service** • Evidence of professional service that influences teaching, research and/or supervision.
Satisfactory	**External Examining** • Some external examining of taught courses at other HEIs **Formal Curriculum Development** • Some contribution at inter-institutional, provincial or national levels **Inter-university projects** • Participates	**External Examining**: • Some record of external examining of postgraduate theses. **Journal Service** • Some contribution as a member of editorial board or referee **Research Reviews** • Some record of reviewing research proposals and publications	**Professional/Academic Bodies** • Some service on local, regional and/or national bodies **Advisory Capacity** • Sometimes sought after by NGOs, industry and/or Government **Formal Policy** • Some contribution at institutional, provincial, national and/or international level **Conferences/Exhibitions** • Some contribution to organisation at an institutional, regional, national and/or international level **Professional Service** • Evidence of some professional service that influences teaching, research and/or supervision.

Level	Teaching Related	Research Related	Professional Field
Unsatisfactory	**External Examining** • Negligible or no external examining **Formal Curriculum Development** • No contribution at institutional, inter-institutional, provincial or national level **Inter-university projects** • Little to no participation	**External Examining**: • No record of external examining of postgraduate theses. **Journal Service** • No contribution as member of editorial board or referee **Research Reviews** • No record of reviewing research proposals and publications	**Professional/Academic Bodies** • No contribution to local or national bodies **Advisory Capacity** • Not sought after by NGOs, industry and/or Government **Formal Policy** ▪ No contribution at provincial, national or international level **Conferences/Exhibitions** ▪ No organisational contribution at institutional, regional, national or international level **Professional Service** ▪ No evidence of professional service that influences teaching, research and/or supervision.

TABLE 6: LEADERSHIP MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

	LEADERSHIP	MANAGEMENT	ADMINISTRATION
Outstanding	**Department** ▪ HoD who leads in an outstanding and inspiring way ▪ Academic who provides dynamic leadership in running of Department ▪ Outstanding record of contribution to transformation of the Department **Faculty** ▪ Dean who leads Faculty in an outstanding and inspiring way ▪ Deputy-Dean who has offered excellent leadership over an extended period in Faculty activities ▪ Academic who provides exceptional leadership in Faculty activities ▪ Outstanding record of contribution to transformation of the Faculty **University** ▪ Leads important University activities ▪ Chairs important University committees ▪ Has shown outstanding leadership in campus life and student affairs ▪ Outstanding record of contribution to transformation of the University	**Department** ▪ HoD with excellent management and people skills ▪ Academic who has expertly managed significant responsibilities in the Department over an extended period **Faculty** ▪ Dean with excellent management and people skills ▪ Deputy-Dean who has offered excellent managerial support to the Faculty over an extended period ▪ Academic who has expertly managed significant responsibilities in the Faculty over an extended period **University** ▪ Significant management contribution on University committees and/or campus life and student affairs over an extended period ▪ Excellent contribution to University committees and/or the residential system over an extended period	**Department** ▪ HoD with excellent administrative skills ▪ Academic who has evidenced excellent administrative responsibilities in the Department over an extended period **Faculty** ▪ Dean with excellent administrative skills ▪ Deputy-Dean who has evidenced excellent administrative responsibilities in the Faculty over an extended period ▪ Academic who has evidenced excellent administrative responsibilities in the Faculty over an extended period **University** ▪ Excellent administrative contribution to the University over an extended period

Level	Leadership	Management	Administration
Very good	**Department** ▪ HoD with good/very good ▪ leadership record ▪ Academic who provides very good leadership appropriate to academic level and experience ▪ Sustained record of contribution to transformation of the Department **Faculty** ▪ Dean who is a good/very good leader ▪ Deputy-Dean who often offers very good leadership in Faculty activities ▪ Academic who provides very good leadership in Faculty activities ▪ Sustained record of contribution to transformation of the Faculty **University** ▪ Is actively involved in University committees ▪ Has made a substantial contribution to campus life and student affairs ▪ Sustained record of contribution to transformation of the University	**Department** ▪ HoD with good/very good people and ▪ management skills ▪ Academic who has satisfactorily managed significant responsibilities in the Department over an extended period ▪ Academic who has expertly managed significant responsibilities in the Department over a short period **Faculty** ▪ Dean with good/very good people and management skills ▪ Deputy-Dean/Academic who has satisfactorily managed significant responsibilities in the Faculty over an extended period ▪ Deputy-Dean/Academic who has expertly managed significant responsibilities in the Faculty over a short period **University** ▪ Good/very good contribution to University committees and/or the residential wardening system over an extended period ▪ Excellent contribution to University committees and/or the residential wardening system over a limited period	**Department** ▪ HoD with good/very good administrative skills ▪ Academic who has evidenced satisfactory execution of significant administrative responsibilities in the Department over an extended period ▪ Academic who has evidenced expert execution of significant administrative responsibilities in the Department over a short period **Faculty** ▪ Dean with good/very good administrative skills ▪ Deputy-Dean/Academic who has evidenced satisfactory execution of significant administrative responsibilities in the Faculty over an extended period ▪ Deputy-Dean/Academic who has evidenced expert execution of significant administrative responsibilities in the Faculty over a short period **University** ▪ Good/very good administrative contribution to the University over an extended period ▪ Excellent administrative contribution to the University committees over a limited period
Level	Leadership	Management	Administration

Good	Department	Department	Department
	• HoD with a satisfactory/good leadership record • Academic who provides good leadership appropriate to academic level and experience • Record of contribution to transformation of the Department **Faculty** • Dean who is a satisfactory/good leader • Deputy-Dean who offers good leadership in Faculty activities • Academic who provides good leadership in Faculty activities • Record of contribution to transformation of the Faculty **University** • Is involved in University Committees • Makes a contribution to campus life and student affairs • Record of contribution to transformation of the University	• HoD with satisfactory/good people and management skills • Academic who has satisfactorily managed important responsibilities in the Department over a reasonable period • Academic who has competently managed important responsibilities in the Department over a short period **Faculty** • Dean with satisfactory/good people and management skills • Deputy-Dean/Academic who has satisfactorily managed important responsibilities in the Faculty over a reasonable period • Deputy-Dean/Academic who has competently managed important responsibilities in the Faculty over a short period **University** • Satisfactory/good contribution to University Committee and/or residential wardening system over a reasonable period • Very good contribution to the University Committee and/or residential wardening system over a short period	• HoD with satisfactory/good administrative skills • Academic who has evidenced satisfactory execution of important administrative responsibilities in the Department over a reasonable period • Academic who has evidenced competent execution of important administrative responsibilities in the Department over a short period **Faculty** • Dean with satisfactory/good administrative skills • Deputy-Dean/Academic who has evidenced satisfactory execution of important administrative responsibilities in the Faculty over a reasonable period • Deputy-Dean/Academic who has evidenced competent execution of important administrative responsibilities in the Faculty over a short period **University** • Satisfactory/good administrative contribution to the University over an extended period • Very good administrative contribution to the University committees over a limited period

Level	Leadership	Management	Administration
Satisfactory	**Department** ▪ Takes a leadership role at times ▪ Some contribution to transformation of the Department **Faculty** ▪ On occasion offers leadership in Faculty activities ▪ Some contribution to transformation of the Faculty **University** ▪ Has shown leadership in University life ▪ Some contribution to transformation of the University	**Department** ▪ Fulfils a competent management role in the Department **Faculty** ▪ Fulfils a competent management role in the Faculty **University** ▪ Serves on some University committees	**Department** ▪ Takes some administrative responsibilities in the Department **Faculty** ▪ Takes some administrative responsibilities in the Faculty **University** ▪ Takes some administrative responsibilities for the University

Unsatisfactory	**Department** ▪ Plays little to no leadership role in Department ▪ Little to no contribution to transformation of the Department **Faculty** ▪ Plays little to no leadership role in Faculty ▪ Little to no contribution to transformation of the Faculty **University** ▪ Plays little to no leadership role in the University ▪ Little to no contribution to transformation of the University	**Department** ▪ Fulfils little to no management role in Department **Faculty** ▪ Fulfils little or no management role in the Faculty **University** ▪ Does not serve on any University committees	**Department** ▪ Takes little to no administrative responsibilities in the Department **Faculty** ▪ Takes little to no administrative responsibilities in the Faculty **University** ▪ Takes little to no administrative responsibilities in the University

Appendix 3:

3. THE APPLICATION

The Human Resources Division will call for applications via top-list and hod-list in the second term. Information is also available on the HR website.

Please bear in mind the following:
- It is in your best interests to work through the guidelines and pay attention to the kind of information that is helpful to the Personal Promotions Committee (see page 41 to 42);

- The application shouldn't exceed 25 pages (excluding appendices), and all pages are to be numbered, typed on A4 paper;

- Applications need to include the covering application form (see page 40);

APPLICATION FOR PERSONAL PROMOTION: ACADEMIC STAFF

Title:		First Names:		Last Name:	
Academic Department:			**Faculty:**		
Office hours tel:			**E-mail:**		
Nature of your current contract at Rhodes	**Full-time/Part-time**		**If part-time, indicate the % of contract and the date of commencement of this contract**		
Current Post level			**Date of appointment/promotion to current post level**		
Are you still on probation?	Yes/No		**Have you completed at last one full year of service?**	Yes/No. If no, please note you are not eligible for promotion.	
This application - Promotion to level of			**Have you previously applied for promotion to this level?**	Yes/No. If yes, indicate date of application:	
Motivation in terms of academic template in Personal Promotion Policy (see Table 1):					

With reference to Table 1, please indicate under which category you are applying: A, B, C, D, E or F						
Category	A	B	C	D	E	F

In the policy, each category i.e. A,B, C or D specifies the requirement (e.g. outstanding, very good etc) for teaching and learning, research, community engagement etc. In the column (a) below please write in the policy requirements for the category under which you are applying. Then in column (b) indicate your assessment (e.g. outstanding, very good etc) of your application in terms of the different areas of teaching and learning, research, community engagement etc.

	(a) Policy requirements for category identified	(b) Your own assessment of your application
Teaching and learning		
Research/creative endeavour		
Community engagement		
Professional Involvement		
Leadership, management & admin		

Please provide the names of two referees. Your Head of Department will act as the 3rd referee.			
Details needed	**Referee 1**	**Referee 2**	**Referee 3**
Relationship to you	Head of Department (if applicant is HoD, then a senior member of department)		
Title and name			
e-mail details			
telephone details			

Appendix 4:

4. Guidelines and suggestions for applications

4.1 General comments

- While the Promotions Committee will usually focus on achievements since the academic's previous promotion, the applicant may argue for a more long-term overview. If this is the case, the applicant needs to also be explicit about what has been achieved since the last promotion.
- It needs to be stressed that while the Committee will be guided by the Criteria and the Academic Template, applicants are encouraged to motivate for flexibility should they feel that their academic, professional and/or personal circumstances deserve it. Such motivation will obviously need to be well argued to be convincing.
- Applicants should strive to make it as easy as possible for the Personal Promotions Committee to see evidence of their accomplishments.
- While applicants are free to structure their applications as they consider most appropriate, they might find it useful to consider the guidelines described below.

4.2 Specific guidelines

(a) TEACHING & LEARNING

You will have submitted a portfolio of teaching evidence. The assessors' report will be sent to the Personal Promotions Committee. This Committee however will not see your teaching evidence. It is therefore in your best interests to provide a narrative as regards your teaching and learning activities.

This narrative can include the philosophy of your teaching (you can use that provided in your teaching evidence submission), scope and nature of teaching at undergraduate and post-graduate levels including a statement on teaching load relative to others in the department; brief overview of evaluations by peers and students demonstrating the effectiveness and impact of the one's teaching; involvement in or contribution to course and program design and delivery at both undergraduate and post-graduate levels; initiatives taken to address weak and disadvantaged students.

In addition, it is helpful if your CV/application covers:
- Major teaching achievements e.g. invitations to present at teaching and learning conferences, teaching awards;
- Initiatives taken to develop a scholarly approach to teaching and learning;
- Events, experiences and/or roles assumed within the department/faculty/institution in which leadership in teaching and learning has been demonstrated; and
- **Own attendance and participation in learning and teaching development activities.**

(b) RESEARCH

It is helpful to the Committee if you provide a narrative of your research or creative endeavours. This narrative
Would provide a broad overview of:

- the nature of research/creative endeavour in your discipline and acceptable output rate (remember that some of the Personal Promotions Committee members may be unfamiliar with your discipline);
- Your research/creative endeavour activities, highlighting which you regard as your major achievements.

For specific outputs, the following is useful:

- Supervision: number of post-graduates supervised indicating date of registration and where applicable, date of completion and role you played e.g. sole supervisor, main supervisor or co-supervisor;
- Publication summary with information such as if the journal is peer-reviewed, the status of the journal within the discipline including its impact factor, citation for the paper
- Original Creative Endeavour outputs: For each original creative endeavour, indicating if exhibition is one-person exhibition and if not, role played in bringing creative output to fruition, venues for the display of original creative outputs indicating the status of these venues and having a display in such venues, outcome of such outputs and the inclusion of these in the application e.g. reviews, focus of academic articles and monographs (excluding self-initiated projects); other scholarly work such as curatorial work, publishing in academic articles/chapters in books.
- Original Creative Endeavour outputs, reputation and recognition where the primary output is musical performance processes and/or products: For each original creative endeavour, indicating the output/achievement e.g. musical performances, compositions, arrangements, recordings, if relevant, the venues for the original creative outputs indicating the status of these venues, if relevant, the publishing houses and the status thereof, outcome of such outputs and the inclusion of these in the application e.g. reviews, focus of academic articles and monographs.
- Original Creative Endeavour outputs, reputation and recognition where the primary output is theatre performance processes and/or products: For each original creative endeavour, indicating the output/achievement e.g. productions, curator/artistic programmer, major contributing artist to a collaborative project, play tests, artists' monographs, if relevant, the venues or commissioning body for the original creative outputs indicating the status of these venues or bodies, outcome and/or impact of such outputs and the inclusion of these in the application e.g. reviews, focus of academic articles and monographs (excluding self-initiated projects), body of work researched by students and professionals, impact on context, discipline, artistic community in terms of scope, complexity, effect or affect;

(c) COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

It is helpful to the committee to provide a narrative on your community engagement activities, your approach to these activities, and how the intersect with your teaching and research. Please refer to the attached guide to preparing a community engagement section.

(d) PROFESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT

It is helpful to the committee to provide a narrative on your professional involvement and the principles behind the choices you have made.

(a) LEADERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

Leadership and management achievement do not have to only constitute formal roles like HoD or Dean. It is acknowledged that leadership may be demonstrated in academic departments, within the discipline, within the Faculty and/or University in a variety of ways, and within the discipline at large. The Committee is open to your arguing your position in this regard.

(b) EQUITY and DIVERSITY CONSIDERATIONS

It is helpful to the committee if you provide a narrative as regards how your academic career has evolved in different ways to that of colleagues at Rhodes and in the discipline, and reasons for this and how you believe this should be taken into account.

Appendix 5:

RHODES UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
Developing the Community Engagement Section of your Professional Portfolio or Tenure/Personal Promotions Application: A Brief Guide

1. Introduction

In the changing landscape of higher education in South Africa (and globally), community engagement has increasingly become an important part of the professional portfolio for an academic when submitting an application for a post, tenure or promotion. Given the need to present a clear and well constructed section of your application around community engagement, this brief guide aims to provide some clear guidelines for documenting and reflecting on your community engagement practice as an academic. The process of developing this section of your professional portfolio will also provide space for you to reflect on your own personal development as a community engagement practitioner, which will hopefully allow you to grow and develop new ideas for the way you go about doing your community engagement work within your discipline.

It is important to note that when your community engagement section is being assessed the number of years that you have been involved in structured, strategic and planned community engagement activities will be taken into account.

It is also important to note that while we applaud volunteer activities of academics, we however, would encourage these activities to be relevant to or inform teaching and/or research practices. Community Engagement at Rhodes is conceptualized both as a process and collection of activities at South African HEI's whereby the goals of research, teaching and learning and community engagement as core functions are integrated. This means that there might be considerable overlap between either your research (in the case of engaged research projects) or teaching (in the case of service-learning courses) sections of your professional portfolios or applications. While your reader will expect some overlap to occur between these sections it will still be important for you to tease out and relate these overlapping aspects to your identity as a community engagement practitioner and the specific strategies you employ in your community engagement activities which you will describe in the community engagement section of your portfolio or application.

One of the key things you need to do in the community engagement section is to give your reader a clear sense of yourself as a community engagement practitioner – what kind of community engagement activities are you participating in, how you approach community engagement and why you do community engagement in the way you do it, that is, what is the philosophy that guides your practice. The headings below (2-5) should give you a guide for structuring the community engagement section of your portfolio or application, but it is not necessary for you to use these headings when writing the section up. Innovative and creative ways which showcase your work as a community engagement practitioner are encouraged, and, as with any assessment, it is imperative that you check your final document against the assessment criteria outlined in section 8.

2. Community Engagement Practice: An explanation of what community engagement activities you do and how you do them

This section of your portfolio or application could be structured in a number of different ways depending on the nature of your community engagement activities. You could present this information by listing your service-learning courses, engaged research projects or volunteerism activities and outlining the nature of your involvement in each of these activities. Alternatively you could structure this section around various thematic issues which you address as a community engagement practitioner, for example 'human rights', which run through a number of different engaged research, service-learning and volunteerism projects in which you are active.

Irrespective of how you choose to structure the section which outlines your roles and responsibilities in the community engagement projects which you are part of, you will need to explain to your reader the relationship between *what* community engagement activities you are active in and the *way* in which you approach those activities. Three things will be crucial for you to consider here. First, you should discuss the way you approach the mutually beneficial partnership established through the community engagement activities that you are involved in. What kind of partnerships have you sought to establish with the communities/community members with whom you have worked, and how have these relationships shaped the nature of your community engagement practice? Second, you should discuss the way you approach the involvement of staff and or students in your community engagement activities. Finally, you should discuss the developmental and transformative or potentially transformative (if the engagement is relatively recent or ongoing) aspects of your community engagement practice. To what extent are the community engagement activities in which you are involved transformative for the staff/students/communities and to what extent do the service activities lead to development for future community engagement/teaching/research work that you do?

In thinking about the way, you do your community engagement activities the following questions might be helpful to consider:

- How do you approach linking your discipline specific knowledge to service in the community?

- How do you communicate with your community partners?
- How do you involve your community partners in the planning and execution of your activities?
- Do you conduct reflection or feedback sessions with your community partners?
- What training or support do you give to students or staff who work in the community engagement activities?
- Do you give your students the opportunity to occupy leadership roles in the community engagement activities?
- Do you conduct reflection sessions with your students?
- What kind of feedback do you provide to students on their reflections?

This section should include:

- A description of your community engagement activities
- A discussion of the strategies employed to relate your community engagement activities to your discipline
- A discussion of the mutually beneficial nature of your community engagement activities
- Evidence of a reciprocal relationship with a community partner
- Evidence of the transformative nature of your community engagement practice
- Evidence where appropriate that community engagement activities have been used to enhance the learning outcomes of your students

3. Scholarship of Engagement: Why you do community engagement in the way you do it

Underlying your explanation of how you do your community engagement activities is an implicit philosophy and theory of why you do your community engagement activities in the way you do them. Whether or not your philosophy of community engagement is rooted in research on development theory or in the community engagement literature, which it might well be your community engagement section of your portfolio or application should give your reader a sense of why you have adopted the particular approach to community engagement which you have taken. The statement of your community engagement approach or philosophy will not necessarily be separate from the responsibilities in community engagement activities since in describing what you do and how you do it could lead naturally on from or in to the explanation of why you do it in the way that you do it.

If you have engaged in any research or formal training in community engagement or community development, participated in community engagement conferences/workshops/seminars/symposiums, or have been involved in the review of or publication of articles on community engagement you should discuss these activities. You are also encouraged to discuss the relevance of these to your current and future community engagement practice.

In thinking about why you do community engagement in the way you do the following questions might be helpful to consider:

- Is there a connection between the community engagement activity and your discipline, and to what extent does the activity that you undertake in your community engagement work lead you to reflect on the way you approach teaching/research in your discipline?
- Do your community engagement activities open up the opportunities for students to gain new learning's which would otherwise be impossible?
- Do your community engagement activities open up opportunities for the co-creation of knowledge which extend the boundaries of the traditional university space?
- Do your community engagement activities allow for interaction between theory and practice which might otherwise not be possible?

This section should include:

> - A clearly articulated philosophy of community engagement
> - Evidence of understanding how your view of community engagement impacts on your community engagement practice particularly in relation to teaching and research within your discipline
> - Evidence that community engagement activities have contributed to the production and dissemination of knowledge
> - Evidence of an understanding of the community engagement principles and Rhodes University Ethical Standards Guidelines

4. Monitoring and Evaluation

Effective monitoring and evaluation is crucial for the success of any community engagement initiative or project. Providing evidence of how you have implemented joint strategies of monitoring and evaluating your own community engagement initiatives will give your readers a clear sense of who you are as a community engagement practitioner, as well as the effectiveness of your community engagement initiatives in terms of the impact of your project, your partnership with the community and the sustainability of your project. The tools you have designed or chosen to implement for monitoring and evaluation are an important part of your community engagement practice and should be brought to the

attention of your reader. Describe the methodology utilised for the community engagement activity\ies and how these influenced your evaluation and monitoring strategy.

This section should include:

> - A clearly articulated discussion of your monitoring and evaluation strategies
> - A discussion of the extent to which your community partners have -participated in the monitoring and evaluation processes
> - A discussion of the extent to which the monitoring and evaluation process has informed the way your community engagement practice has been transformed and\or has progressed or developed
> - A discussion of whether students have been involved in the monitoring and evaluation process (if appropriate) and to what extent their feedback has shaped or informed your community engagement practice
> - Evidence of review of community engagement practice in response to monitoring and evaluation data

5. Leadership

This section will be heavily dependant on how far along you are in your development as a community engagement practitioner. If you are new to community engagement work you may not yet have taken up any significant leadership roles in community engagement. Leadership could be within your own community engagement project (such as being a project manager or coordinator); or own engaged research programs (such as the lead researcher in an engaged research project); or in your department (such as serving as a community engagement representative for your department or mentoring other members of staff in your department in engaged research projects or service learning-courses); or it could be in your faculty (such as serving as the community engagement representative for your faculty or serving on the community engagement management committee); or in your discipline or community space (such as serving on the board of an NGO or on a national community engagement body such as SAHECEF); or it could be in a leadership role in mentoring student lead volunteering projects.

If appropriate to your context, this section should include:

- Discussion of the relevant leadership roles you have occupied
- Discussion of feedback you have received on those roles and how you have responded to that feedback

6. Providing Evidence: How others experience your community engagement activities

In all of the above sections you will need to provide evidence for your discussion of your community engagement work and practice. Evidence for this can be gathered from a number of sources. Firstly, you might want to draw on the research that you have been doing into community engagement practice which informs the way you go about doing community engagement or you interaction with staff at the Community Engagement Division and NGO's or other community engagement practitioners. Secondly, you may want to draw on evidence you have gathered from your students or colleagues who have been involved in your community engagement projects such as engaged research work, service-learning courses or departmental volunteering projects. Finally, you will need to draw on your community partners for evidence of your engagement with them throughout your activities. What is most crucial in this section is that you should not only include, for example, a reference letter from a community partner thanking you for the work that you have done in your project *without* commenting on why you have included it. All the evidence that you include should be incorporated to showcase the developmental and mutually beneficial nature of the partnership. There should also be some evidence that feedback from your community partners has not only been given to you at the stage when you are now writing up your portfolio and have asked them for a reference letter – and here it is important to note that negative feedback from your community partner is only seen as problematic if it is something that you have not reflected on and something which has not informed your future practice and led to improvement. Evidence of ongoing contact with a community partner is more impactful for a reader than a once of reference from a community partner without any evidence of a genuine partnership having been formed through the process of engagement.

This section should include:

> - Evidence of reflection on communication with community partners
> - Evidence of reflection on feedback from peers and students
> - Evidence of reflection on community engagement practice

7. Resources and Support:

The Community Engagement Division offers support for all stages of development of any community engagement project and portfolio or application preparation. Please contact the Director of the Community Engagement Division Ms. Diana Hornby at d.hornby@ru.ac.za or one of our academic staff members Dr. Sharli Anne Paphitis at s.paphitis@ru.ac.za for further information or assistance.

8. Criteria Used for Assessment:

As a university we are involved in knowledge generation and dissemination and we strive to place this knowledge and expertise at the service of our community for its benefit and the benefit of staff, students and the University as a whole.

Guidelines for the community engagement portfolio:

1. **Community engagement is a planned intervention.** Describe the planning undertaken for your community engagement initiative. Show how you negotiated the engagement with the community partner. To what extent were the outcomes and expectations agreed upon by or discussed with the community partner? What exit strategies were put in place, and how was the exit strategy negotiated with the community partner?
2. **Community engagement initiatives must include assessment strategies**. Describe the assessment strategies used in your community engagement initiative. To what extent were all parties involved in the initiative given the opportunity to reflect on the process and the assessment of the engagement? Was the initiative evaluated in terms of its impact and the agreed upon outcomes?
3. **Community engagement initiatives are mutually beneficial.** Explain how the initiative benefits: a) the university, and b) the community partners.
4. **'Engaged' refers to the building of relationships and active participation by those involved.** To what extent were the community partners involved in the initiative active participants?
5. **Community engagement initiatives are transformative – they promote social justice.** Describe the ways in which your initiative has been transformative. How has your initiative contributed to the goal of social justice?
6. **Ethical engagement is guided by Rhodes University community engagement, as well as human, animal and environmental ethics policies.** Have all policies and procedures for ethical clearance and community engagement been followed?

For Teaching and Learning/Engaged Learning community engagement portfolios please provide information under the following headings while referring to the above guidelines and the criteria grid:

- Leadership/co-ordination/involvement
- Community involvement in planning, executing and evaluation
- Embededness in the curriculum (Service-Learning Portfolios)
- Community benefit

- Student/staff benefit (including research benefits)
- Transformation
- Assessment
- Staff mentoring and embededness in department
- Duration and sustainability
- Post-graduate mentoring
- Ethics

For Engaged Research community engagement portfolios please provide information under the following headings while referring to the above guidelines and the criteria grid:

- Community involvement in planning, executing and evaluation
- Community benefit
- Research benefits (how has the research been impacted on by the engagement activities?)
- Knowledge dissemination
- Transformation
- Assessment
- Staff mentoring
- Duration and sustainability
- Post-graduate mentoring
- Ethics

Performance is expected in one or more categories. All criteria in any one category must be met.

	Teaching and Learning (Service Learning- credit bearing)	Research	Community Engaged Learning (non-credit bearing)
Outstanding	• Demonstrates *Outstanding Leadership* by designing, establishing and leading a SL course • Has *embedded SL course into departmental*/discipline curriculum so that SL course is not dependent on the individual lecturer • *Reciprocal*: This results in measureable growth of knowledge about area of work for the community partner and the discipline/ University • Evidence of effective formal or informal *mentoring* of less experienced staff in SL	• Conducts engaged research. This result in *reciprocal benefits*: Discipline knowledge and the knowledge amongst the community partner/s has been expanded (grown) through the research activities. • That knowledge generated has been *appropriately disseminated* at the various levels • Evidence of effective formal or informal *mentoring* of less experience staff or inclusion of them as an active member in the research team	• Demonstrates *Outstanding Leadership* by designing, establishing and leading a CE learning activity which is not dependent on an individual lecturer • *Reciprocal benefits:* This results in measureable growth of knowledge about area of work for the community partner and the discipline/ University eg. Publication or evidence of shifting practice • Evidence of effective formal or informal *mentoring* of less experienced staff in CE
Very Good	• *Demonstrates leadership* by establishing (or reshaping) and leading a SL course within the department	• Conducts engaged research. This results in *reciprocal benefits*: Discipline knowledge and the knowledge amongst the community partner/s has been expanded (grown) through the research activities.	• *Demonstrate Leadership* by establishing (or reshaping) and leading a Community Engaged Learning initiative (discipline based) within the department

	• Involved in SL over at *least a two year* period • Has *involved other staff* members in the initiative • *Reciprocal:* Mutual benefits to both parties	• That knowledge generated has been *appropriately disseminated* at the various levels • Researcher is involved in an engaged research partnership that has grown *over at least a two year period.*	• Involved in Community Engagement Learning over at *least a two year period* • Has *involved other staff* members in the initiative • *Reciprocal:* Meaningful benefits to both parties
Good	• *Co-coordinator* of a SL course run in the Department aligned to all the principles of good practice listed above • The SL initiative should have run for at least *one year* • *Reciprocal:* Mutual benefits to both parties	• Conducts engaged research. This results in *reciprocal benefits:* Discipline knowledge and the knowledge amongst the community partner/s has been expanded (grown) through the research activities. • That knowledge generated has been appropriately disseminated at the various levels • Evidence of at *least one year's* commitment to engaged research practices, and although the results of working with a community partner may not be measurable, there is evidence of the researcher working towards a sustainable engaged research model.	• *Co-ordinator* of a CEL initiative run in the Department adhering to all the Principles of good practice listed above • Involved in this CE initiative for *at least one year* • *Reciprocal:* meaningful benefits to both parties
Satisfactory	• *Participates* in a SL course run by the Department • Involved in the SL initiative for at *least six months*	• *Supervising at least one post-graduate student* who is utilizing engaged research models e.g. social learning groups • That knowledge generated has been *appropriately disseminated* at the various levels (student or academic)	• *Participates* in a CEL initiative run by the department and is disciplined based • Involved in the CEL initiative for *at least six months*

Unsatisfactory	• Only has an *adhoc participation* in related teaching and learning projects or programmes in the community e.g. speaker /judge	• Top down extractive approach • Only evidence of *ad hoc input* in workshops, radio interviews or publications • *Offers advice* to organizations outside of the university, but does not follow up and has little to no evidence of how such knowledge was implemented.	• *Occasionally participates* in a departments volunteering activities but has no evidence of a continued sustained commitment to such activities. • Involved in activities that are *not related to the lecturers field* and /or has no evidence reflecting sustained volunteering activities that benefit the lectures discipline or the Organization