

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

ACADEMIC REVIEW AND SALARY SUPPLEMENTATION

IN THE

AUSTRALIAN SCHOOL OF BUSINESS*

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

EFFECTIVE 1st APRIL 2008

CONFIDENTIAL

This document details the academic review system in the Australian School of Business and includes the steps to be followed and information to be provided by members of staff.

***For the purpose of this document the terms Faculty and Heads of School will be retained as new terminology has yet to be finalised.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.INTRODUCTION	3
2.GUIDING PRINCIPLES	4
2.1. Applicability of Review	4
2.2. Rationale of Review	4
2.3. Assessment and Professional Development	4
2.4. Market and Performance-driven Supplementation	5
3.KEY CHARACTERISTICS	5
3.1. Eligibility for Salary supplementation	5
3.2. Responsibility for Salary supplementation	6
3.3. Changes in Circumstance	6
4.STEPS IN THE ACADEMIC REVIEW PROCESS	7
Step 1:	7
Step 2:	7
Step 3:	7
Step 4:	8
Step 5:	8
Step 6:	8
Step 7:	9
Step 8:	9
Step 9:	9
APPENDIX A	11
UNSW Definition of Research Active Status	11
ATTACHMENTS	
Data Collection Templates	
Guidance for Academic Review Criteria	
Individual Performance Review Report	

AUSTRALIAN SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ACADEMIC REVIEW SCHEME - EFFECTIVE 1st APRIL 2008

INTRODUCTION

This Academic Review scheme replaces the Performance Review scheme operating in the AGSM and the Salary Supplementation scheme operating in the Faculty of Commerce and Economics. Performance Review is distinct from Salary Supplementation - all academics will be reviewed but not all may seek or be eligible for supplementation.

There are two parts to the new scheme;

First, a biennial review at which salary supplementation levels will be set. The biennial review replaces the annual review in the year in which it occurs.

Second, mid-term reviews that take place in the year salary levels are not reviewed.

This document focuses principally on the biennial academic review. A separate document will be issued with respect to the mid-term review.

The attached document details a performance review and salary supplementation process that will come into effect on 1st April 2008.

1. This document details performance criteria across three activities - research, teaching and service to the University. These criteria conform broadly with criteria in use both at the AGSM and FCE for the period 2005-2008. However, there are some differences in emphasis. For example, in the current document obtaining research grants is required in order for senior faculty to achieve the 'Excellent' rank on research. Also, members of staff may have been explicitly directed towards different performance goals for the period 2006-2008 (for example, a focus more toward teaching). In these circumstances, members of staff will be evaluated against the performance goals and criteria that were set for them and operative for the period 2006-2008. That is, the performance criteria stated in the attached document will be varied depending on the terms of individual arrangements operating between 2006 and 2008.

2. All ex-FCE staff will receive at least their current level of supplementation until 30th April 2009 as per the conditions of the previous salary supplementation round.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The Academic Review scheme is based on the following principles:

Applicability of Review

All academic staff, whether full-time or fractional, and across all levels (A to E) should take part in an annual review in a manner that is consistent with the current enterprise agreement.

Currently, the enterprise agreement identifies the need for an employee to:

“meet annually with his/her supervisor in order to review his/her work in the past year, to discuss work in the future years and to discuss an employee’s own personal career development.”

Rationale of Review

An annual review is valuable as it provides an opportunity for staff to reflect and account for his or her activities, to plan for future career development and for Faculty to recognise and reward achievements. As such, a process of academic review reflects a key UNSW value – the belief in accountability.

A primary objective of the biennial review is for the determination of an appropriate level of salary supplementation that both rewards and motivates desired behavioural outcomes. Areas for development and future professional needs are also identified, thus leading to a structured and positive plan for change and personal/career development.

Assessment and Professional Development

The biennial review seeks to review academic performance in order to determine salary supplementation and to assist with professional development. In order to achieve this, academic performance should be reviewed against a set of defined criteria linked to the overarching strategic priorities of the Faculty and the University.

Consistent with UNSW’s position as a leading research-intensive (Go8) university, and except where there are specific contractual arrangements to the contrary, the Faculty expects all academic staff to contribute in three broad dimensions – teaching, research and administration/institution building or ‘service’. Each of these dimensions is important and successful institutions demonstrate superior performance on each. Typically, individuals contribute differentially in each of these areas at different stages of their career. Expectations of performance on each dimension differ across academic ranks.

A School-based Academic Review Committee (ARC – see Step 3 below) will rate an applicant’s contribution on each of the three dimensions – Research, Teaching and Service. For each dimension, the categories ‘Inadequate’, ‘Adequate’, ‘Good’, ‘Very Good’ and ‘Excellent’ are used. Entitlement to salary supplementation typically requires that an individual be rated by his or her ARC as research active (as defined by UNSW – Appendix A) ie ‘Good’ on research and as ‘Good’ on each of the other two dimensions.

Junior staff not identified as research active may be eligible for supplementation, provided they are identified as 'Very Good' on one of the remaining two dimensions (teaching or service) and 'Good' on the other remaining dimension. In the event that an applicant does not meet the above requirements, any supplementation remains at the discretion of the Dean on the advice of the Head of School.

Salary supplementation as well as workload mix (teaching versus research) will be determined by the academic review. Also, it is noted that effective review requires the operation of a simple, transparent and equitable workload allocation process.

Market and Performance-driven Supplementation

All supplementation is at risk and linked to performance, competitive market conditions and discipline-specific considerations. In determining appropriate discipline differentials each Academic Review Committee and the Dean shall have regard to international discipline relativities as expressed in the most recent AACSB (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) salary survey of doctoral awarding institutions, as well as the extent to which these salaries may need to be modified for local conditions. Where possible, supplementation should also be referenced to the salaries paid by defined international and local (in particular, the Go8 universities) competitors.

KEY CHARACTERISTICS

The biennial review will have the following characteristics:

- The amount of an individual's salary supplementation is determined as a dollar amount.
- The dollar amount remains fixed for the supplementation period (although provision is made for adjusting this - up or down - in exceptional circumstances).
- Effective April 1 2008 the supplementation period is set at two years.
- The base academic salary is subject to scheduled annual increases as set out in the operative enterprise agreement.

Eligibility for Salary supplementation

In general, only academic staff at Level B and above – fixed term or continuing, including fractional appointments – are eligible to participate in the salary supplementation scheme.

Staff at Level A

Level A staff are not normally considered for supplementation, however, there may be circumstances where supplementation is appropriate. Level A staff should seek advice from their Head of School as to whether it is appropriate for them to be considered for salary supplementation. They should also seek guidance as to expectations with respect to research, teaching and institution building.

Newly appointed staff

Staff appointed within 12 months prior to the commencement of the next salary supplementation period will be ineligible to apply for supplementation in the round immediately following appointment except in exceptional circumstances. These staff members will be deemed as having their supplementation determined at the time of their appointment with acknowledgement of their market position and due assessment of their qualifications in accordance with this policy.

Internal promotions

Internal promotion will not normally be regarded as grounds for a review of a previously agreed level of supplementation. Accordingly applicants who have been promoted internally are eligible for consideration in the next supplementation round.

Scientia Professor / UNSW Professorial Salary Supplementation Scheme

Any salary supplementation received as a result of Scientia Professorships lies outside the scope of the biennial review.

Responsibility for Salary supplementation

While their judgements are informed and assisted by the recommendations of the various Academic Review Committees and the Senior Associate Dean, salary supplementation decisions are ultimately the responsibility of the Dean and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic).

Changes in Circumstance

The Faculty's ability to pay supplementation is conditional on it continuing to generate an operating surplus. Circumstances may arise in which it is appropriate to review the level of supplementation granted for particular individuals or for the Faculty as a whole within a supplementation period. For example, depending on the Faculty's current and projected budgetary position, a change in academic salaries as a result of an enterprise agreement might require an adjustment downwards in the aggregated amount available for supplementation. Additionally, such circumstances would include (but are not restricted to) a collapse in the budget base for such supplementation. The collapse of the budget base might, for example, be brought on by severe and/or unexpected shifts in enrolments, or by a change in government policy that denied the Faculty fee-paying income. In such circumstances, supplementation arrangements in a particular School (or Unit) may also be reviewed by the Dean and, if necessary adjusted.

While supplementation levels normally apply for a two-year period there may be circumstances (including, but not restricted to a competitive offer from another institution) that warrant the Dean and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) reviewing and adjusting an individual's supplementation outside the normal review period. Also, individuals may be considered for 'out-of-rounds' promotion in particular circumstances.

STEPS IN THE ACADEMIC REVIEW PROCESS

Step 1:

The Head of School makes available to all existing members of staff and all eligible newly appointed members of staff as they arrive, a copy of these guidelines detailing the procedures to be followed with respect to the biennial review and salary supplementation process. Potential new hires will receive details of the scheme with their letter of offer.

Step 2:

During the review period, all members of the academic staff complete and submit information on the required templates (Refer attachment – Data Collection templates).

The information collected is designed to allow assessment of a faculty member's performance, their likely 'market position' vis-à-vis retention by UNSW and/or recruitment by other universities and/or the professional market at large. The review, and information requested, focuses on performance over the last six years with respect to:

- *Research* – including published research, ability to obtain peer reviewed competitive research grants and/or external research funding, performance as a mentor and/or supervisor of research students, academic recognition and standing, work-in-progress;

The review, and information requested, focuses on the last two years with respect to:

Teaching – evidence of reflective practice, impact on student learning through teaching and/or curriculum development, mentoring and development activities, scholarship; and

Service – in the sense of collegial engagement, contributions and/or leadership to the development of the School, Faculty and/or University; professional involvement, in the sense of contributions to relevant professional bodies and professional activity in the wider community that brings benefit to the School, the Faculty and/or the University.

The reason for the difference in period reviewed is to accommodate the uneven flow of research outcomes that can only properly be assessed over a longer-term horizon.

Step 3:

Each application is considered and assessed by an Academic Review Committee (ARC). For most staff members, the ARC will comprise the Head of School and a Professor / Associate Professor from the School and the Senior Associate Dean or her/his nominee. A largely school-based committee would be most familiar with the disciplinary field of applicants from that particular school.

Supplementation for Heads of School will be determined by the Senior Associate Dean and the Dean.

Salary supplementation of Associate Deans will be considered by the Dean.

Supplementation for the Presiding Member of the Australian School of Business will be determined by the ARC of the relevant school to which the Presiding Member belongs.

The primary task of the ARC is to evaluate the contributions of a member of staff to research, teaching and service using a five point scale that ranges from 'Inadequate', 'Adequate', 'Good', 'Very Good' and 'Outstanding' (Refer attachment – Guidance for Academic Review Criteria).

Step 4:

A recommended supplementation appropriate to each staff member will be determined by the ARC, having regarded to:

The Faculty's current and likely budgetary position as indicated in information provided by the Dean;

The market conditions prevailing in the discipline;

The performance of the staff member on each of the dimensions (research, teaching, service) based on the information provided in the application;

The performance goals set for the applicant since the last biennial review; and

The particular rank, career stage and employment status occupied (for example, performance expectations would be adjusted appropriately for junior, early career and fractional appointments); and any substantial interruptions to staff members work (such as periods of extended leave).

Step 5:

Each ARC provides a report and recommendation to the Dean with respect of salary supplementation in the School/Unit. The recommendation includes the following information:

Summary Sheet (Refer attachment - Individual Performance Review Report) including:

Employment information for each staff member in the School (Name, Staff ID, Rank, FTE)

Supplementation amount in the previous period, if applicable;

Recommended amount for the current supplementation period;

Summary of ARC assessment on each dimension (research, teaching and service);

Individual Supplementation Applications should be attached.

Step 6:

Following the deliberations of each ARC, the Dean will determine the total amount available for salary supplementation from approved sources for the relevant supplementation period.

Step 7:

The Dean will meet with the ARC to review their recommendations and will make a final determination having regard to the recommendations of the ARC (Step 5) and the budgeted amount available for salary supplementation (Step 6). The Dean will forward to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) for consideration and approval the recommended supplementation amount in respect of each individual. In the situation where the Deputy Vice-Chancellor is unable to approve individual, School or the Faculty supplementation, the recommendation will be referred back to the Dean for further review and recommendation.

Step 8:

Each member of staff is advised in writing by Human Resources of his or her supplementation amount. Approved salary supplementation will normally apply for a designated period of two years, subject to the caveats in 3.3 Change in Circumstance noted above.

Heads of School will discuss the outcomes of the academic review in a meeting with the individual member of staff. The meeting should acknowledge achievement as well as provide constructive feedback on how to improve performance in the future. The meeting should also focus on future career development plans.

A written report will be provided to each member of staff, stating his/her ranking on the three dimensions of research, teaching and service. The report should also note individual strengths and areas for development and improvement (Refer attachment – Individual Review and Feedback).

Step 9:

Following finalisation of supplementation amounts, the Dean will prepare a report on each supplementation round setting out the profile of supplementation in each School or Unit. The report will show:

The total amount expended in the School or Unit in the previous twelve months;

The number of staff in each School or Unit receiving supplementation – as noted, however, supplementation is fixed, not as a percentage of salary, but as an absolute dollar amount;

The number of staff in each School or Unit and the assessment recorded ('Inadequate', 'Adequate', 'Good', 'Very Good' and 'Outstanding' on each dimension (research, teaching, service);

This report will be available to the Faculty Senior Management Group and to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic).

It should be noted that, except to an individual's Head of School, the Dean, Senior Associate Dean and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), no report produced as a part of the academic review will identify individual information such as supplementation amount and assessment on the performance dimensions. However, information about the salary supplementation process, and the aggregated reports about supplementation amounts and performance on each of the three dimensions, may be produced for purposes such as accreditation.

Academic Review and Salary Supplementation
Australian School of Business at the University of New South Wales
Effective 1st April 2008

Prepared by Wai-Fong Chua
Senior Associate Dean, Australian School of Business

Approved by Alec Cameron
Dean, Australian School of Business
DATE ___/___/___

Approved by Richard Henry
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
DATE ___/___/___

APPENDIX A

UNSW Definition of Research Active Status

1. Three (3) publications over the last three (3) years

(publications in this respect must satisfy the requirements set by, and reported to, DEST in the HERDC collection (Categories A1, B1, C1, E1) , or a combination of at least three (3) refereed designs, patents, creative works or major exhibitions as defined in DEST (H, I, J1)

OR

2. At least one (1) DEST publication as defined above in the last 3 years

AND EITHER

2a Supervised to successful completion at least one (1) research higher degree student in the last four (4) years as defined and reported to DEST, or

2b. Received at least one (1) external grant of more than \$5000 from a competitive grant scheme or industry in the past (3) years, as defined and reported to DEST.

Academic Review and Salary Supplementation

DETAILS

Applicant Name:	
Level of Appointment:	
Full time Equivalent:	
Highest Degree & Year Earned:	
Year of Appointment to Faculty:	
School:	
Head of School:	

OVERVIEW (NO MORE THAN 3 PAGES)

This overview should summarise your performance since your last review. It should focus on your achievements in research, teaching and institution building.

Please ensure that you complete the publications table located on the first page of the summary of research output.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attach required and relevant information for Teaching, Research and Service as per the format/guidelines provided
- Attach additional information, if appropriate.

Academic Review and Salary Supplementation

TEACHING

Please delete all sections that are not relevant, and add or delete lines in tables as appropriate.

Add further comments below the tables if you wish.

You may also provide information on courses taught as 'above load'. Please indicate clearly which courses are taught 'above load'.

Teaching evaluated using CATEI

1. I participate regularly in the CATEI process Yes / No
2. I regularly provide CATEI course evaluation summary reports to HOS/Program Head each time courses are evaluated by students or as requested by HOS/Program Head Yes / No
3. I provide individual evaluation reports to HOS annually or as requested by HOS School/Program Head Yes/No

Undergraduate Teaching Information based on CATEI

Subject	Year / Term	No. of Lecture Weeks	% of Satisfaction*

Subject	Year / Term	Seminar ID	Seminar Size	% of Satisfaction*

If you were a LIC, please provide LIC summaries for that course

* % of Strongly Agree and Agree on Overall Question

**Academic Review and Salary Supplementation
TEACHING**

Postgraduate Teaching Information based on CATEI

Subject	Year / Term	Seminar ID	Seminar Size	% of Satisfaction*

If you were a LIC, please provide LIC summaries for that course

* % of Strongly Agree and Agree on Overall Question

Full-time MBA

MBA classes

Subject	Year/Term	Number in class	% approval lecturer	% approval subject

EMBA program

GMQ and GDM facilitator

Subject	Year/ Semester	Number in class	Average score for questions 1 to 5

GMQ and GDM subject leader

Subject	Year/ Semester	% satisfied with subject	% agreeing that materials covered learning needs

Academic Review and Salary Supplementation
TEACHING

EY cohort leader or co-requisite leader

Subject	Year/ Cohort	Average score for questions 1 to 6

EY contribution

Subject	Year/Cohort	Mean score Content	Mean score Presentation	Mean score Relevance

Executive Education

Open programs

Subject	Year	Number of days	Number of participants	Content	Median score Presentation	Relevance

Custom/Consortium programs

Client	Year	Number of days	Number of participants	Summary of evaluations:

Supervision (Hons, MPhil, PhD)[#]

[#] Please note that a high degree of importance is placed on successful supervision of higher degree research students by staff eligible to supervise.

Student Name	Title of Thesis	Sole/ Co- Supervision	Completion Status	In time/out of time

Academic Review and Salary Supplementation
TEACHING

Other teaching

List other teaching carried out (eg. MBA projects supervised, PhD classes, etc)

Innovations and revisions in teaching material

List any teaching material (e.g. textbooks, cases) that has appeared in 2006-2008. Discuss innovations in teaching you have introduced over the period, and any substantial revisions of teaching material.

Comments

Add any comments on your teaching activities that may be relevant. For example you might comment on activities to improve your teaching, and any external recognition of teaching.

Academic Review and Salary Supplementation
TEACHING

Issues raised in last performance review

Please comment on any actions that you have taken following on from teaching issues raised in your last performance review.

The future

How do you anticipate your teaching profile changing over the next two years? What innovations and improvements do you intend to introduce? What “roadblocks” do you face?

Academic Review and Salary Supplementation

RESEARCH

Summary of research output in 2003-2008

Please attach a copy of your curriculum vitae to allow assessment of your research productivity over a 6 year period.

Publication summary (books, articles, reports, conference papers etc resulting from your research, your scholarship or your teaching). Distinction should be made between papers conditionally and unconditionally accepted for publication.									
<i>Category</i>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
<i>Total in the period 2003 -2008</i>									
Itemise according to the following categories (A-I)									
A Papers, notes, communication , reviews etc in refereed journals or other publications of eminence in the discipline									
B Refereed published conference or symposium papers									
C Books									
D Chapters in books									
E Any other published work									
F Patents									
G State, national and international government reports									
H Other (including university) reports									
I Unpublished conference papers or other public presentations such as workshops or seminars									

Academic Review and Salary Supplementation

RESEARCH

Refereed publications, books and book chapters 2006-2008

Please list and attach two copies of papers appearing or accepted during this period.

Please indicate the DEST categories and your contribution to jointly authored work. You may wish to comment on the relationship between published work (particularly if preliminary versions have appeared in other contexts), and also on the review history of papers.

Unrefereed publications and work in progress during 2006-2008

Please list below papers under review, working papers, conference papers and other unrefereed publications appearing during this period (indicating your contribution to jointly authored work).

You may wish to comment on the relationship between different papers. If you feel this would be helpful to the ARC, please attach two copies of working papers or papers currently under review.

Academic Review and Salary Supplementation

RESEARCH

Research grants 2006-2008

Full details of all grants received (amount, length of grants, co-authors, funding source, etc)

Research recognition 2006-2008

You may wish to comment on citations or reviews of your work appearing in this period, refereeing activity and editorial boards, and external recognition in the form of prizes, awards or fellowships.

Other comments on research activity 2006-2008

Under this heading you might mention seminars and conference presentations given during this period, conferences organised, and active participation in professional societies.

Issues raised in last performance review

Please comment on any actions that you have taken following on from research issues raised in your last biennial review.

The future

What is your research agenda over the next two to five years?
Are there any “roadblocks” to future research performance?

Academic Review and Salary Supplementation

INSTITUTION BUILDING AND ADMINISTRATION

Administration, management and institution building 2006-2008

Provide evidence of effective participation in School/Faculty/University governance (eg, participation at School/Faculty meetings, etc).

- Comment on your roles on internal (School, Faculty, University) committees served on during this period.
- Indicate any significant administrative or management projects that you have been involved in and comment on the outcomes.
- Describe any mentoring that you have been engaged in over this period.
- Indicate any visitors to the School/Faculty that you have organized and the outcomes of these visits.
- List the occasions in which you have represented the School/Faculty/University (e.g. out of Sydney graduations or information evenings)
- Indicate any marketing activities that you have been engaged in.

Contributions enhancing the reputation of School/Faculty/University 2006-2008

- Comment on your contributions to your profession/discipline (for example, positions/roles on professional associations, standard-setting bodies, regulatory bodies, writing of industry whitepapers, etc)
- List media or public appearances and newspaper articles
- Indicate any government policy input and company directorships connected to your University work

Other

- Indicate any other activities that you feel are worthy of note

Academic Review and Salary Supplementation

GUIDANCE FOR FACULTY ACADEMIC REVIEW CRITERIA

Rationale

The Faculty has developed the attached templates (an earlier version was originally used in the AGSM) to ensure as much consistency as possible in the ranking process. Essentially, the templates provide a framework for constructive discussion about performance criteria.

The templates can also be used to make it clearer to those being reviewed what is expected and how they can improve their ratings. The templates are intended to be constructive guides only, not exclusive and exhaustive lists of exact position specifications. The templates should be used flexibly, as indications, rather than rigidly. Inevitably, judgement is exercised in the evaluation of performance.

Description

The templates show both definitions of criteria used (in bold) as well as exemplars or 'pen pictures' of the type of behaviour that could be expected in each category of performance. It is not possible to develop definitive or prescriptive statements that will perfectly fit all types of performers. Instead, the template suggests the broad types of behaviour that a person could be expected to adopt within a category.

Use of 'and': An 'and' statement indicates that all sets of criteria need to be fulfilled. For example, to achieve an “Excellent” on research for Senior Faculty, the person being reviewed needs to have made a major contribution to the research field (i.e., in terms of publications) AND have received major external recognition, obtained external research funding AND successfully supervised research students so as to generate additional grants and publications.

Use of 'or': The 'or' indicates at least one of the sets of criteria should be fulfilled and that there are multiple routes to satisfy this criterion. For example, for senior faculty to achieve an “Adequate” on research, the person being reviewed needs to have achieved limited external recognition OR funding OR contribution to the profession. He or she does not need to have made achievements in all of these areas.

Definition of 'or equivalent': This indicates that there are alternative routes to achieve a particular level of performance, for example, three publications in lower tier journals over a two-year period might be judged to be equivalent to one high quality reputable publication in a Tier 1 journal.

Academic Review and Salary Supplementation

GUIDANCE FOR FACULTY ACADEMIC REVIEW CRITERIA

Exemplars

The exemplars provide **examples** of the types of behaviours/activities that define the criteria. Not all of the exemplars need to have been met to achieve the category of performance, and there may be additional exemplars not listed. For example, it is not expected that a person would carry out all of the exemplars listed under 'Major contribution to the School' in order to meet this category of performance. Other behaviours/activities not listed might also be used to demonstrate a major contribution to the School. The purpose of the exemplars is to give an idea of the types of activities/behaviours one would expect to see for a person meeting this category of performance.

The supervision of research students has been given as exemplars in both teaching and research to emphasise the importance placed on successful supervision of higher degree research students (by staff eligible to supervise) in order to obtain high rankings under both teaching and research.

The listed exemplars are cumulative: those listed for 'Adequate', for example, are expected to be included among those for 'Good' or 'Very Good' or 'Excellent' as well as the additional exemplars given under each category.

Academic Review and Salary Supplementation

GUIDANCE FOR FACULTY ACADEMIC REVIEW CRITERIA

Junior Faculty (Lecturer/Senior Lecturer)

Appropriateness of criteria

There are different templates, reflecting the different expectations, for lecturers/senior lecturers compared to associate professors/professors. The appropriate template should be used for the person being reviewed.

The templates are designed for reviewing those in a standard (research, teaching, service) role. Adjustments need to be made for those in non-standard roles. However, it is expected that almost all staff will be in standard roles. Adaptations will also need to be made by discipline (for example, what is considered 'several' publications in some disciplines may be higher than in others). Ratings should be realistic, for instance, the standard for a long serving Senior Lecturer should be higher than that for a newly appointed Senior Lecturer. In addition, HOS are expected to give guidance as to which journals belong to different 'tiers' or quality brands and the types of tradeoffs between the quantity and quality of research of output that are appropriate for the discipline.

Levels of performance for Lecturer and Senior Lecturer

For junior faculty we distinguish five levels of performance in each of the three activity areas of Research, Teaching and Institution Building.

- **Excellent:** overall performance at the top-most level of research, teaching or institution building within the School/Faculty
- **Very Good:** a very high and consistent level of performance that is significantly above the Faculty standards for the Lecturer and Senior Lecturer ranks.
- **Good:** performance that matches or exceeds the Faculty standards for the Lecturer and Senior Lecturer ranks.
- **Adequate:** performance that generally meets the Faculty standards for the Lecturer and Senior Lecturer ranks and occasionally does not.
- **Inadequate:** performance that consistently falls short of Faculty standards for the Lecturer and Senior Lecturer ranks. Simply defined, inadequate performance is when adequate levels of performance are not met

Categories of Performance				
Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Unsatisfactory teaching quality <i>Exemplars:</i> very poor student ratings tardy lecture attendance consistent student complaints AND no effort to improve courses or improve teaching ability <i>Exemplar:</i> course material and student results not completed on time	Satisfactory teaching quality <i>Exemplars:</i> reasonable student ratings across majority of courses taught AND efforts to improve courses or improve own teaching ability <i>Exemplars:</i> quality checking of course material obtained advice on teaching practice course material and student results are completed on time updated course materials and improving teaching AND successful supervision of Honours and / or higher degree students*	Satisfactory teaching quality in most courses <i>Exemplars:</i> demonstrated ability to teach across different formats (lectures, tutorials, undergraduate, postgraduate) reasonable ratings in all courses AND efforts to improve courses or improve own teaching ability <i>Exemplars:</i> attended courses to improve teaching active review to stay current in field	High teaching quality in most courses <i>Exemplars:</i> consistently high ratings in all courses AND considerable attention to improving courses or improving own/others' teaching ability & range <i>Exemplars:</i> restructured courses attended courses to improve teaching adopted strategies to increase range of teaching as needed by the School improved assessment methods improved teaching	High teaching quality in all courses <i>Exemplars:</i> excellent ratings from participants in all courses prizes for teaching or other external recognition AND extensive attention to improving courses or introducing innovation or improving own/others' teaching ability & range <i>Exemplars:</i> developed new materials major innovations in existing courses introduced new courses as needed by School/Faculty expanding range of courses taught/teaching time by individual as needed by the School/Faculty

This dimension needs to be assessed bearing in mind the opportunities for supervision and the eligibility of the member of staff to supervise a particular category of student

Performance Template for lecturer /Senior Lecturer - Teaching

Categories of Performance#				
Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
little or no contribution to research field <i>Exemplars:</i> no academic publications little evidence of work-in-progress leading to publications AND little or no external recognition or funding or contribution to profession <i>Exemplar:</i> no contact with professional bodies	Minor contribution to research field <i>Exemplars:</i> non-refereed publications refereed conference proceedings local practitioner publications refereed publications in tiers 2 and 3 journals AND limited external recognition or funding or contribution to profession <i>Exemplars:</i> gained internal funds conference attendance attendance at School research seminars in own field AND successful supervision of Honours and / or higher degree students*	Some contribution to research field <i>Exemplars:</i> some contribution in high quality journals research active AND some external recognition or funding or contribution to profession <i>Exemplars:</i> reviewed articles presented at refereed conference citations for published work gained external funds	Significant contribution to research field <i>Exemplars:</i> regular contribution in high quality journals; publication record to exceed that required to be research active in quality and quantity AND significant external recognition or funding or contribution to profession <i>Exemplars:</i> some citation of published work reviewed top tier articles present at quality refereed conferences invitations to speak at academic forum	Major contribution to research field <i>Exemplar:</i> multiple publications that include major academic book or top tier refereed publications AND major external recognition or funding or contribution to profession <i>Exemplars:</i> gained external funds from ARC or industry multiple and consistent citations over career prizes/ fellowships published review articles/ special issues member of editorial boards organized international conferences invitations to speak at high status academic forums

#In the case that the individual has performed markedly less well in the two-year period than over the longer six-year period, the review will be weighted in favour of the longer-term contribution.

*This dimension needs to be assessed bearing in mind the opportunities for supervision and the eligibility of the member of staff to supervise a particular category of student

Performance Template for Lecturer/Senior Lecturer –Research

Performance Template for Lecturer/Senior lecturer – Institution Building/Administration

Categories of Performance				
Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Nil or negative contribution to the institution <i>Exemplars:</i> • <i>damaged reputation by adverse, unjustified public comments</i> • <i>no contribution to School / Faculty meetings, etc</i> • <i>poor working relationships with colleagues</i> • <i>little initiative</i> • <i>behaviour that consistently fails to uphold UNSW values</i>	Minor contribution to the institution <i>Exemplars:</i> • <i>attendance at School / Faculty meetings etc.,</i> • <i>some membership of committees</i>	Some contribution to the institution <i>Exemplars:</i> • <i>participation in discussions with colleagues</i> • <i>attendance at School research seminars</i> • <i>constructive attendance at School meetings</i> • <i>helped with occasional administrative tasks</i> • <i>participation in professional body / external bodies</i>	Significant contribution to the institution <i>Exemplars:</i> • <i>willing and made substantive contributions to committees</i> • <i>organized research seminars / conferences</i> • <i>represented professional bodies</i> • <i>leadership / mentoring role to junior colleagues</i>	Major contribution to the institution <i>Exemplars:</i> • <i>helped with multiple administrative tasks</i> • <i>made substantive contributions to more than one committee</i> • <i>leadership role in professional bodies</i> • <i>leadership role in School / Faculty / University</i>

Academic Review and Salary Supplementation

GUIDANCE FOR FACULTY ACADEMIC REVIEW CRITERIA

Senior Faculty (Associate Professor/Professor)

Appropriateness of criteria

There are different templates, reflecting the different expectations, for lecturers/senior lecturers compared to associate professors/professors. The appropriate template should be used for the person being reviewed.

The templates are designed for reviewing those on a standard contract. Adjustments need to be made for those on non-standard contracts. Adaptations might also need to be made by cluster/discipline (for example, what is considered 'several' publications in some disciplines may be higher than in others). Ratings should be realistic, for instance, the standard for a long serving Associate Professor should be higher than that for a newly appointed Associate Professor. In addition, HOS are expected to give guidance as to which journals belong to different 'tiers' or quality brands and the types of tradeoffs between the quantity and quality of research of output that are appropriate for the discipline.

Levels of performance for Senior Faculty (Professor and Associate Professor)

For senior faculty we distinguish five levels of performance in each of the three activity areas of Research, Teaching and Institution Building.

- **Excellent:** overall performance at the top-most level of research, teaching or institution building within the School/Faculty.
- **Very Good:** a very high and consistent level of performance that is significantly above the Faculty standards for the Professor and Associate Professor ranks.
- **Good:** performance that matches or exceeds the Faculty standards for the Professor and Associate Professor ranks.
- **Adequate:** performance that generally meets the Faculty standards for the Professor and Associate Professor ranks and occasionally does not.
- **Inadequate:** performance that consistently falls short of Faculty standards for the Professor and Associate Professor ranks. Simply put, inadequate performance is when adequate levels of performance are not met.

Academic Review and Salary Supplementation

GUIDANCE FOR ACADEMIC REVIEW CRITERA

Performance Review Criteria Template for Associate Professor/Professor - Teaching

Categories of Performance				
Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Unsatisfactory teaching quality <i>Exemplars:</i> very poor ratings tardy lecture attendance AND no effort to improve courses or improve teaching ability <i>Exemplar:</i> course material and student results not completed on time no updating of material	Satisfactory teaching quality <i>Exemplars:</i> reasonable ratings AND efforts to improve courses or strategies in place to improve teaching <i>Exemplars:</i> obtained advice on teaching practice quality checking of course material AND successful supervision of Honours and / or higher degree students.	Satisfactory teaching quality in most courses <i>Exemplars:</i> reasonable ratings from participants in all courses AND efforts to improve courses or improve own teaching ability <i>Exemplars:</i> attended courses to improve teaching updated courses innovations in existing courses AND successful supervision of Honours and / or higher degree students	High teaching quality in most courses <i>Exemplars:</i> high ratings in all courses AND significant attention to improving courses or improving own/ others' teaching ability & range <i>Exemplars:</i> restructured courses strategies to increase range of teaching improved assessment methods wide range of courses taught taught on multiple programs AND successful supervision of all types research students leading to grants and publications	High teaching quality in all courses <i>Exemplars:</i> excellent ratings from participants in all courses prizes for teaching or other external recognition AND major attention to improving courses and improving own/ others' teaching ability & range <i>Exemplars:</i> developed new materials introduced new courses as needed by the School expanded range of courses as needed by School improved others' teaching AND successful supervision of all types research students leading to grants and publications

Academic Review and Salary Supplementation

GUIDANCE FOR ACADEMIC REVIEW CRITERIA

Performance Review Criteria Template for Associate Professor/Professor – Research

Categories of Performance#				
Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Little or no contribution to research field Exemplars: predominance of non-refereed publications and / or conference proceedings little evidence of work-in-progress leading to publications AND little or no external recognition or funding or contribution to profession Exemplars: little contact with academic / professional bodies; little interaction with regulatory / industry bodies	Minor contribution to research field Exemplars: research active regular contribution to Tier 2 Journals slight contribution to Tier 1 Journals evidence of research active status over last 6 years AND limited external recognition or funding or contribution to profession Exemplars: gained internal and external funds conference attendance regular attendance at School research seminars in own field AND successful supervision of Honours / higher degree research students	Some contribution to research field with publications Exemplars: regular contribution to high quality Tier 2 journals occasional publication in Tier 1 journals AND some external recognition or funding or contribution to profession Exemplars: gained external funds from ARC or industry reviewed articles presented at refereed conference participation in professional body citations for published work AND successful supervision of Honours / higher degree research students	Significant contribution to research field Exemplar: regular contribution to Tier 1 and 2 journals AND significant external recognition of leadership or contribution to profession Exemplars: some citation of published work reviewed top tier articles presented at refereed conference represented professional body invitations to speak at academic forums invitation to join the editorial boards of tier 1/ 2 journals AND demonstrated ability to generate external research funds over time Exemplar: gained external funds from ARC or industry AND successful supervision of all types research students leading to grants and publications	Major contribution to research field Exemplar: multiple publications that include one major academic book or top tier publications AND high quality research Exemplars: developed 'capstone'/definitive research interests / integrative research impact on theory and practice relevance to Australia & region AND major external recognition or leadership / impact or contribution to profession Exemplars: multiple and consistent citations over career prizes/ fellowships published review articles/ special issues member of editorial boards organising prestigious conferences leadership role in professional body invitations to speak at high status academic forum AND successful supervision of all types research students leading to grants and publications

#In the case that the individual has performed markedly less well in the two-year period than over the longer six-year period, the review will be weighted in favour of the longer-term contribution

Academic Review and Salary Supplementation

GUIDANCE FOR ACADEMIC REVIEW CRITERIA

Performance Review Criteria Template for Associate Professor/Professor – Institution Building/Administration

Categories of Performance				
Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
No or negative contribution to the Institution <i>Exemplars:</i> • damaged reputation by adverse, unjustified public comments • no contribution to School / Faculty discussions, etc • limited attendance at School / Faculty meetings etc • refusals to carry out administrative tasks • poor working relationships colleagues • behaviour that consistently fails to uphold UNSW values	Minor contribution to the Institution <i>Exemplars:</i> • participation in discussions with colleagues • attendance at seminars • attendance at most School / Faculty meetings • helped with administrative tasks	Some contribution to the Institution <i>Exemplars:</i> • identified opportunities for business development • some mentoring of junior colleagues • some promotion of School / Faculty / University	Significant contribution to the Institution BOTH internally and externally <i>Exemplars for internal:</i> • helped with multiple administrative tasks • organized & managed visitors • substantive contribution to School / Faculty / University committees • regular mentoring of other faculty in research and institution building <i>Exemplars for external:</i> • promoted positive awareness of School / Faculty / University • represented School / Faculty / University • media work or presentations • discussed opportunities for business development	Major contribution to the Institution BOTH internally and externally <i>Exemplars for internal:</i> • excellent performance in significant management role for School / Faculty • significant active mentoring of other faculty and research students <i>Exemplars for external:</i> • frequent public academic presentations / media work with business stakeholders • input into government policy, relevant • company directorships • significant positive marketing / awareness raising of School / Faculty • income generation / bringing in new sources of income • designed/developed business opportunities for School / Faculty

Academic Review and Salary Supplementation

INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW REPORT

Interviewee: _____

Head of School: _____ Date: / /

	Research	Teaching	Service
ARC Ranking			

Explanations are to be provided as the rankings given for each dimension of performance:

Areas of strength:

Areas for future development:

Future Goals (for discussion and agreement):

INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW REPORT

Impediments identified and support required:

Staff Member's comments:

Academic Supervisor's comments:

SIGNED: _____

Head of School

Print Name: _____

DATE / /

SIGNED: _____

Staff Member

Printed Name: _____

DATE / /