THE UNIVERSITY OF GHANA

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO PROPOSE GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION OF ACADEMIC STAFF.

FINAL REPORT

LEGON   NOVEMBER 23, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES AND APPENDICES

ADDENDUM

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<u>Introduction</u>

Anyone who has associated with the University of Ghana in the last 10 years would not only be familiar with significant boost in infrastructure but also changes in the internal processes to make it a world class university. The University has reviewed its governance structure, developed a sharper research focus in four areas (food security, climate change, malaria and poverty monitoring and evaluation) and currently implementing a 10-year Strategic Plan (2014-2024). In improving its internal processes, one area that has engaged the attention of management is the promotion of academic senior members. The University believes that acknowledging staff's efforts through a well-crafted promotion processes is key to creating a conducive environment for effective teaching, research and extension services and in so doing enhancing its national image and international appeal.

In the past, various efforts have been made to produce guidelines for the promotion of academic senior members that is just, fair, equitable, transparent and recognizing merit and achievement in all academic disciplines.

In an effort to bring some finality to the promotion guidelines for academic senior members, the Vice-Chancellor by a letter dated December 2, 2014 set up a Committee of Experts to propose appropriate guidelines as required by the Basic Laws of the University for the promotion of academic senior members for consideration by the University Appointments Board, the Academic Board and University Council.

The Vice-Chancellor in inaugurating this Committee, emphasized the need for the guidelines to be crafted in such a way as to address critical issues as the role of Assessors and use of Assessor's report in arriving at the final decision of Appointments Board; the discipline differences, especially between the Arts and the Sciences; perceptions that the current process is not transparent, just and fair; considerations of all the evidence given by an applicant; and the use of promotions to meet the strategic objectives of the University.

This report is a significant build-up of the previous efforts by the earlier Committees mentioned above and a product of broad consultations from the various disciplines across the University. Various memoranda were received from members of the University of Ghana community (individuals, departments, School/Institute/Centres and Colleges) and these informed most of the recommendations of the Committee.

<u>Assumptions for Promotion</u>

The Committee proposed the following assumptions for promotion at the University of Ghana.

1. Academic staff contribute to the total output of the University in diverse ways, principally through teaching and teaching-related activities, research and creative activities, publications, administration, service and leadership in the University, professional practice, service to the community, extension, etc.

2. The methods used to assess applicants by the University across board must be fair, transparent, flexible and equitable to allow the recognition and promotion of a diverse range of applicants.

3. The promotion is anchored in the full understanding that the applicant has met contractual obligations and demonstrated merit performance and contributed to the attainment of the University Mission in ways the University is proud and must be recognized and rewarded for this.

4. The primary responsibility in the promotion process centres on the applicant and the materials he/she prefers to support an application for promotion; such application being characterized by a detailed *Curriculum Vitae* (CV) and a comprehensive dossier describing in detail teaching methodologies, syllabi; forms of continuing assessment, examinations and philosophy of teaching in addition to records of service to the department, the University, the larger community and profession of activities and recognition

5. The University recognizes the diversities of scholars and disciplines and will not apply a one-size-fits-all approach in assessing promotions. The University will consider matters including discipline cultures, biases and preferences through a rigorous peer review system

Review of Schedule F

The Committee reviewed the Schedule F, "*Rules and procedures for appointment and promotion of senior members*" and noted

a.   the preparation of the document preceded the Collegiate system and therefore there should be no references to units and structures that no longer exist in the University.
b.   the lack of clarity on some sections and
c.   the absence of assessment instruments proposed to be developed to facilitate decision-making on applications for promotion.

The absence of these instruments have led to the current state in which publications are mainly used in considering applications for promotion even though, the Statutes require four key elements to be considered as criteria for promotion. Having understood this, the Committee reviewed these four elements and reduced them into three, namely, Teaching; Research and Scholarly Works; University and Public Services and has developed appropriate instruments to give more meaning to their applications. These instruments, which are mainly in tabular forms, are expected to assist internal and external assessors to review exhibits that have been submitted for promotion by academic staff. What the Committee recommends is a well-structured training to be led in part by the College of Education to sensitise staff and heads of Units about the use of the instruments.

General recommendations/proposals:

a. It is important to separate guidelines for application for a new appointment from application for promotion. This is to bring clarity on the process and the directions given in Schedule F.

b. The University should set dates for the receipt of Applications for Promotion. The Committee proposes that the application be submitted on or before September 1 and February 1 to coincide with the First and Second Semesters respectively. In addition, a tracking and reporting system has been proposed to ensure that the process is concluded within reasonable time for all applications.

c. The need to give proper recognition to Teaching which is the prime obligation of Lecturers and notably reduce the lack of congruence between the contract (75% teaching) and evaluation effort (55% teaching).

d. For promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer the Committee considers that with the inclusion of Teaching Evaluation as a critical component for the evaluation, the University should use internal assessors for this level of appointment.

e. The option for external assessment for promotion to Senior Lecturer should be maintained for Senior Members who prefer to be assessed through this mode. The Committee proposes that the Application Forms for promotion should be redesigned to include a section for the Applicant to select their preference for internal or external assessment.

f. In addition, the Committee recommends the establishment of a pre-submission internal assessment for scholarly works in determining that the dossier and accompanying exhibits conform to the University requirements and advise the applicant to amend, hold or proceed with the application.

g. Assessment for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor should still be externally-based but preliminary evaluation through an internal assessment system is recommended. The preliminary internal assessment is to assist the applicant, the school/unit and the College in determining that the dossier and accompanying exhibits conform to the University requirements and advise the applicant to amend, hold or proceed with the application.

h. Institutional peer assessment is important in World-class Universities. Rigorous peer review system is central to academic communication and merit recognition. It serves as a filter of academic quality control and the Committee recommends that the University of Ghana strengthen its peer review system.

i. The Committee proposes the setting up of an advisory Department-based pre-submission internal assessment system for scholarly works. This is to assist the applicant to determine whether the dossier and accompanying exhibits conform to the

University's requirements and advise the applicant to amend, hold or proceed with the application.

j. A variety of criteria should be set by the University to assess the research, teaching, professional and extension activities of an applicant for promotion. The process must be fair, transparent and objective. It must be accompanied by a high level of integrity and trust.

k. The Committee recommends the following peer assessment Committees:

  i. Department Teaching Assessment Committees, (DTAC, for normal teaching evaluation, membership to be rotational)
  ii. Internal Assessors for Promotion
  iii. External Assessors for Promotion

l. The report comments on authorship and academic promotions and recommends that University should develop a policy on authorship for guidance of applicants.

m. The minimum number of publications and exhibits proposed for promotion to the different ranks of Teaching Staff are:
   - Senior Lecturer, 6
   - Associate Professor, additional 12 after promotion to Senior Lecturer.
   - Professor, additional 12 after promotion to Associate Professor.

n. In order to address the concerns of Research Institutes currently involved with heavy teaching, the Committee proposed two tracks for this category, i.e. Research Fellow and Research Fellow with 50% or more Full Time Equivalent (FTE) teaching.

o. The minimum number of publications and exhibits proposed for promotion to the different ranks of Research Staff are:

Research Fellow (regular track)
   - Senior Research Fellow, 10
   - Associate Professor, additional 16 after promotion to Senior Research Fellow.
   - Professor, additional 16 after promotion to Associate Professor.

Research Fellow with 50% of more teaching

   - Senior Research Fellow, 8
   - Associate Professor, additional 14 after promotion to Senior Research Fellow.
   - Professor, additional 14 after promotion to Associate Professor.

p. The minimum number of publications and exhibits proposed for promotion to the different ranks of Academic Librarians are:
- Senior Librarian, 6
- Principal Librarian, additional 12 after promotion to Senior Librarian
- Chief Librarian, additional 12 after promotion to Principal Librarian

q. The Committee proposes that a database of Assessors for all disciplines be prepared and updated regularly. To ensure the availability of internal assessors, three clusters are proposed:
- Creative /Performing Arts
- Arts and Social Sciences (including Academic Librarians)
- Sciences (including Health Sciences)

r. Committee further recommends the setting up of a Tracking system to ensure that no application is unduly delayed.

s. The Committee recommends that Council review the current appeal system in the light of submissions from the Colleges.

t. Transitional arrangements should be made to take care of applications whose consideration commence before the effective date of the new promotion policy. The Committee recommends the transitional period to be two years to ensure that all such applications fully go through the consideration cycle.

u. Finally the Committee recognizes the need to train and sensitize stakeholders on any approved promotion system. In particular peer assessment in teaching and research and scholarly works.

INTRODUCTION

1. The University of Ghana's Strategic Plan (2014-2024) indicates that "*the last four years have witnessed an institution eager to reform in both structure and function with a view to becoming more effective and efficient in the delivery of its programmes and other activities*". One area which has engaged the attention of the University is the promotion of academic senior members. Various proposals have been presented for consideration, the objectives have been to have a promotion system that is just, fair, equitable, transparent, recognizing merit and achievement in all academic disciplines. The Committee will like to acknowledge the earlier proposals on promotion at the University of Ghana.[1][2][3][4]. These and others have been useful reference in the discussions, the proposals and recommendations.

2. The Basic Laws of the University of the Ghana require the Appointments Board to develop guidelines for the promotion of all categories of staff. The Basic Laws require appropriate consideration of an applicant's research, teaching and extension contributions using various standards.

3. In line with this requirement, the Vice-Chancellor by a letter dated December 2, 2014 set up a Committee of Experts to propose appropriate guidelines as required by the Basic Laws for the promotion of all categories of staff for consideration by the University Appointments Board, the Academic Board and University Council.

4. At the inauguration of the Committee, the Vice Chancellor emphasized some critical issues which should be part of the deliberations and recommendations of the Committee. These include the position of Assessors and use of Assessor's report in arriving at the final decision of Appointments Board; the discipline differences, especially between the Arts and the Sciences; perceptions that the current process is not transparent, just and fair; considerations of all the evidence given by an applicant; the use of promotions to meet the strategic objectives of the University.

---

[1] Draft Report of the Committee for Examining Guidelines for Promotion of Academic Staff in the University. (Prof. Dovlo Report)
[2] Guidelines for Promotion through Teaching Assessment of the Faculty of Arts dated February 4, 2008
[3] Report of the Committee on Guidelines for Promotions of Academic Staff (Prof. E. K. Osam Report) dated August 11, 2009
[4] University of Ghana, Draft Academic Promotion Policy 2010. (Prof. Ntiamoah-Baidu Report)

MEMBERSHIP

5. The membership of the Panel was as follows:

NAME	AFFILIATION	DESIGNATION IN COMMITTEE
Prof. S. Sefa-Dedeh	Department of Food Process Engineering	Chairman
Prof. P. L. French (From February 1, to March 2, 2015)	Consultant	Co-Chairman
Prof. K. Boafo-Arthur	Department of Political Science	Member
Prof. Isabella Quakyi	Department of Biological, Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences	Member
Prof. C. Omenyo	Provost, College of Education	Member
Prof. S. Agyei-Mensah	Provost, College of Humanities	Member
Prof. E. O. Owusu	Provost, College of Basic and Applied Sciences (CBAS)	Member
Prof. Yao Tettey	Provost, College of Health Sciences	Member
Dr. Langbong Bimi	Department of Animal Biology and Conservation Sciences, Representing UTAG	Member
Mr. B. Fosu Adjei	Assistant Registrar. Office of Pro Vice Chancellor (ASA)	Secretary
Mr. E. Baidoo	College Registrar, CBAS	Secretary

TERMS OF REFERENCE

6. Per the letter of the Vice-Chancellor of December 2, 2014, the Terms of Reference of the Committee were to:

    a. Review the procedures and regulations for the promotion of academic senior members as contained in schedule F of the University of Ghana Basic Laws;

    b. Review earlier guidelines proposed by the Prof. Kweku Osam Committee and by the Consultant Prof. Yaa Ntiamoa-Baidu for the purpose of organising promotions of academic senior members as per the Basic Laws;

    c. Consider international best practices and any other appropriate comparisons and considerations that University of Ghana needs to make in the promotion of senior members taking into account the University's vision and mission;

    d. Propose specific guidelines to be considered by the Academic Board, Appointments Board and the University Council in the promotion of academic senior members in the spirit of the University of Ghana Basic laws and Strategic Plan;

COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND APPROACH

Sittings

7. To address the Terms of Reference and consider other matters, the Committee held fourteen (14) meetings as follows:

January 26, 2015	-	New Council Chamber
February 2, 2015	-	Basement of the Great Hall
February 9, 2015	-	New Council Chamber
February 17, 2015	-	New Council Chamber
February 23, 2015	-	New Council Chamber
March 2, 2015	-	New Council Chamber
March 9, 2015	-	New Council Chamber
March 23, 2015	-	New Council Chamber
March 30, 2015	-	New Council Chamber
April, 10, 2015	-	Old Council Chamber
May, 18, 2015	-	Old Council Chamber
June, 29, 2015		Old Council Chamber
October 19, 2015		Old Council Chamber
November, 23, 2015		New Council Chamber

8. The meetings generally allowed members to discuss critical issues on promotion and provide solutions to unresolved matters in the Schedule F. The Committee referred to promotion practices and policies of other Universities[5][6][7][8].

9. Following the submission of the draft report to the Vice Chancellor and the Academic Board, the Committee interacted with the four Colleges to seek their responses to the draft report. The meetings were scheduled as follows:

- College of Basic and Applied Sciences   September 11, 2015
- College of Education   September 15, 2015
- College of Health Sciences   September 16, 2015
- College of Humanities   September 17, 2015

10. The responses from the Colleges are attached as Addendum to this Report

THE STRATEGY

11. To allow for broad consultations and inputs from the various disciplines, the Committee requested for memoranda from members of the University of Ghana community (individuals, departments, School/Institute/Centre or a College). No anonymous memorandum was to be accepted. In addition, Departments and Schools were requested to provide a list of journals in their respective disciplines to allow the future compilation of databases on journals recognized by the University of Ghana for purposes of assessment for promotion. The list of constituents that submitted responses are listed under section Appendix 1.

ASSUMPTIONS FOR PROMOTION

12. The Committee proposed the following assumptions for promotion at the University of Ghana.

a. Academic staff contribute to the total output of the University in diverse ways, principally through teaching and teaching-related activities, research and creative

---

[5] Makere University. Policy on appointment and promotion of academic staff as reviewed and approved by the University Council. http://governance.mak.ac.ug/wp-content/themes/default/policies/POLICY%20APPOINTMENT%20AND%20PROMOTION%20May%202010.pdf. Accessed February 20, 2015.
[6] University of Cape Town. Performance and Promotion. http://hr.act.ac.za/performance/promotion/academic. Accessed March 24, 2015.
[7] The University of Manchester. Guidance Notes: Criteria for academic promotions. http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/dispaly.aspx?DocID=473 . Accessed April, 2, 2015
[8] The Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Promotion Policy

activities, publications, administration, service and leadership in the University, professional practice, service to the community, extension, etc.

b. The methods used to assess applicants by the University across board must be fair, transparent, flexible and equitable to allow the recognition and promotion of a diverse range of applicants.

c. The promotion is anchored in the full understanding that the applicant has met contractual obligations and demonstrated merit performance and contributed to the attainment of the University Mission in ways the University is proud and must be recognized and rewarded for this.

d. The primary responsibility in the promotion process centres on the applicant and the materials he/she prefers to support an application for promotion; such application being characterized by a detailed *Curriculum Vitae* (CV) and a comprehensive dossier describing in detail the professional outputs of the applicant; e.g. for Lecturers, teaching methodologies, syllabi; forms of continuing assessment, examinations and philosophy of teaching in addition to records of service to the department, the University, the larger community and profession of activities and recognition.

e. The University should recognize the diversities of scholars and disciplines and not apply a one-size-fits-all approach in assessing promotions. The University should consider matters including discipline cultures, biases and preferences through a rigorous peer review system

SCHEDULE F-GENERAL

13. The Committee examined the Schedule F, "*Rules and procedures for appointment and promotion of senior members*" and discussed various aspects of this document. The Committee noted that a) the document was prepared before the Collegiate system and therefore referred to units and structures that no longer exist, b) the lack of clarity on some sections and c) the absence of assessment instruments proposed to be developed to facilitate decision-making on applications for promotion. The absence of these instruments have led to the use of publications mainly in considering the promotion even though the statutes require four key elements to be considered as criteria for promotion, i.e. Teaching; Research and Scholarly Works; University, Departmental and Public Service; Professional Activities. The Committee therefore noted that its work primarily hinged on the Schedule F and understood that eventually, its report should instigate its revision. The Committee proceeded to examine each of the four criteria and made proposals on how they could be assessed and considered in promotions at the University of Ghana.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS

14. Academic Librarians in Universities provide critical support for teaching, learning and research in the institution. In providing this professional support the Librarian partners the Teaching, Research, Administrative Staff and Students to create an environment for quality instruction/teaching, learning and research. The effective acquisition, organization, management and preservation of scholarly resources, including e-documents ensure the integration of information resources into the intellectual life of a University.

15. In the guidelines for the appointment, promotion and tenure of academic librarians, it is stated that, " appointment of librarians shall follow the same procedures that are established for appointing institutional faculty members and the appointment shall meet the criteria appropriate to that rank"[9].

16. The Business and Executive Committee of the University of Ghana, at its meeting held on February 16, 2015 decided that:
    a. *To ensure that the career path of Librarians is clearly distinct from the appointive positions, the following ranks should be provided for: Assistant Librarian, Librarian, Senior Librarian, Principal Librarian and Chief Librarian.*
    b. *On appointments and promotions there should be two tracks for librarians, academic and professional.*
    c. *The promotion of the academic Librarians will be considered by the College of Education whilst the promotion of professional librarians will be considered under the Registry Appointments and Review Committee.*

17. The Committee notes the decisions of the Business and Executive Committee and makes proposals for the promotion of academic librarians.

18. The criteria for promotion of academic librarians is similar to that set out for academic and research staff except that for librarians, the teaching aspect is equivalent to librarianship. It is evaluated as the most important component of an academic Librarian's performance." *Librarianship is defined as competence, creativity, and initiative in the performance of assigned professional duties. It is equivalent to Teaching Effectiveness as applied to the teaching faculty. A candidate's effectiveness in Librarianship is the most important consideration in tenure and promotion decisions"[10].*

19. *The Committee recommends that the criteria for promotion of academic librarians at the University of Ghana should be based on three critical indices:*

---

[9] A Guideline for the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Librarians. http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/promotiontenure. Accessed, July 8, 2015

[10] Academic Librarian Status. University of Mississippi Tenure and Promotion Guidelines. http://academic-librarian-status.wikispaces.com/University+of+Mississippi+Tenure+and+Promotion+Guidelines. Accessed July, 8, 2015

1. Evaluation of Librarianship (equivalent to Teaching)
2. Evaluation of Research and Scholarly Works
3. Evaluation of Service

20. **GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS/PROPOSALS**:

   a. Important to separate guidelines for application for a new appointment from application for promotion. This is to bring clarity on the process and the directions given in Schedule F.

   b. The University should set dates for the receipt of Applications for Promotion. The Committee proposes that applications be submitted on or before September 1, and February 1 to coincide with the First and Second Semesters respectively. In addition a tracking and reporting system must be set up to ensure that the process is concluded within reasonable time for all applications.

   c. The need to give proper recognition to Teaching which is the prime obligation of Lecturers and notably reduce the lack of congruence between the contract (75% teaching) and evaluation effort (55% teaching).

   d. For promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer the Committee considers that with the inclusion of Teaching Evaluation as a critical component for the evaluation, the University should use internal assessors for this level of appointment. In addition the Committee recommends the establishment of a Department-based pre-submission internal assessment system for scholarly works in determining that the dossier and accompanying exhibits conform to the University's requirements and advise the applicant to amend, hold or proceed with the application.

   e. Promotion to the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor should still be externally-based but preliminary evaluation through an internal assessment system is recommended. The preliminary internal assessment is to assist the applicant, the school/unit and the College in determining that the dossier and accompanying exhibits conform to the University's requirements and advise the applicant to amend, hold or proceed with the application.

   f. Institutional peer assessment is important in World-class Universities[11]. Rigorous peer review system is central to academic communication and merit recognition. It serves as a filter of academic quality control and the Committee recommends that the University of Ghana strengthen its peer review system.

   g. A variety of criteria should be set by the University to assess the research, teaching, professional and extension activities of an applicant for promotion. The process must

---

[11] Harley, D., Acord, S. K and Earl-Novell. 2010. Peer review in academic promotion and publishing: its meaning, locus, and future. Four draft working papers. Center for Studies in Higher Education. http://www.cshe.berkeley.edu/sites/defaultfiles/shared/publications/docs/PeerReviewWorkingPapers.04.22.10.pdf. Accessed April 2, 2015

be fair, transparent and objective. It must be accompanied by a high level of integrity and trust.

h. The Committee recommends the following peer assessment Committees at the Departmental, School and College levels.

- Department Teaching Assessment Committees, (DTAC, for normal teaching evaluation, membership to be rotational)
- Internal Assessors for Promotion
- External Assessors for Promotion

DEPARTMENT TEACHING ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (DTAC)

i. The Head of Department in consultation with academic staff will constitute the Departmental Teaching Assessment Committee (DTAC). They will serve for a period of two academic years on a rotational basis. The assessment programme or roster should be drawn up by the Head of Department and copies shared with the Dean and Provost. The Committee recommends the composition of the DTAC as follows:

- Professor/Associate Professor (1)
- Senior Lecturer (1)
- Lecturer (post-probation) (1)

Members of the DTAC should be selected from the Department and cognate Departments. The member from the cognate Department will be appointed by the Dean. The DTAC will be expected to lead the teaching evaluation as a continuous quality assurance process to improve teaching and also assess the proposed teaching portfolio of applicants applying for promotion. The reports of DTAC shall be shared with the Teacher being evaluated, the Head of Department, the Dean and the Academic Quality Assurance Unit.

j. For academic Librarians, the University Librarian in consultation with academic library staff and Head of Department of Information Studies will constitute the equivalent of the Departmental Teaching Assessment Committee (DTAC). They will serve for a period of two academic years on a rotational basis. The assessment programme or roster should be drawn up by the University Librarian and copies shared with the Dean, School of Information and Communication Studies and Provost of College of Education. The Committee recommends the composition of the DTAC as follows:

- Professor/Associate Professor/Principal Librarian/Chief Librarian (1)
- Senior Lecturer/ Senior Librarian(1)
- Lecturer/Librarian (post-probation) (1)

k. Members of the DTAC should be selected from the Department and cognate Departments. The member from the cognate Department will be appointed by the Dean. For Teaching Departments, DTAC will be expected to lead the teaching evaluation as a continuous quality assurance process to improve teaching and also assess the proposed teaching portfolio of applicants applying for promotion. The reports of DTAC shall be shared with the Lecturer/Librarian being evaluated, the Head of Department, the Dean and the Academic Quality Assurance

INTERNAL ASSESSORS OF EXHIBITS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER

l. The Provost, in consultation with the Dean and Head of Department, will constitute Internal Assessors for promotion at the School level.

m. The Internal Assessors for Promotion will be tasked to assess the scholarly works of the applicant using the instruments proposed. In addition, internal assessors will be required to consider the teaching evaluation report issued by the Department Teaching Assessment Committee (DTAC) and make recommendations to the Dean and School Management Committee. The internal assessors should be of professorial rank.

n. Where the Applicant prefers external assessment the assessors will be tasked to assess the scholarly works of the applicant using the instruments proposed. The teaching of such an applicant will be assessed internally using the approved processes.

ASSESSING FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND PROFESSOR

o. External Assessors will continue to feature prominently in the evaluation of the University promotion process, for applications to the Professoriate. The Committee makes proposals (see paragraph 67-70).

p. In addition to the external assessment of exhibits and scholarly works, the Committee recommends assessment for teaching as proposed for Senior Lecturer.

MODEL CURRICULUM VITAE

q. In order to ensure that applicants for promotion provide all the information needed for assessment, the Committee has developed a sample CV template (see Appendix 2) which can be used. The CV template is only advisory and the responsibility to provide accurate and up-to-date information rests on the applicant.

AMENDED CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION, SCHEDULE F

r. The Committee affirms the criteria for promotion as indicated in Schedule F, Section 20 (a) with a slight amendment. Senior Members applying for appointment or promotion will be evaluated on the basis of three instead of four indices

Teaching (T)
Research and Scholarly Works (RSW)
University, Departmental and Public Service and Professional Activities. (UPS)

s. For academic librarians these will be

Librarianship (equivalent to Teaching) (L)
Research and Scholarly Works (RSW)
University, Departmental and Public Service and Professional Activities. (UPS)

t. Other factors that may be considered include:
   - the recommendations of the School and, College Promotions Review Committee
   - applicant's formal qualifications
   - any other matters that the Appointing Authority considers strengthen the application

OVERALL EVALUATION METHOD (SCHEDULE F, SECTION 20; (14, 15)

u. Each of the indices, i.e. Teaching (T); Research and Scholarly Works (RSW) and University and Public Service (UPS) will be scored over 100% using the instruments proposed by the Committee. These scores will be combined in a proportion T:RSW:UPS according to an approved ratio depending on the rank under consideration. The Committee propose the adoption of the ratios from the draft promotion policy of 2012 (Ntiamoah-Baidu Report) for the different ranks (Table 1).

v. The College of Health Sciences proposed a category of Teaching Staff who offer Clinical and teaching services. This category referred to as Teaching plus Professional Practice are proposed to have a different weighting for Teaching, RSW, and UPS (See Table 1).The Committee could not elaborate on this category because the proposals did not come with measuring instruments. Further proposals are suggested for academic librarians. (Table 1)

w. To qualify for promotion at any level, an applicant must score at least 50% in each of the three categories (T, RSW, UPS). Using these criteria, a candidate may be promoted to the rank applied for if his/her total weighted average is not less than sixty (60) points (Schedule F, 20 (16). The final decision rests with the Appointing Authority.

Table 1.

Relative Weights for Teaching, Research and Scholarly Works and University/Public Service

PROMOTION		TEACHING STAFF	RESEARCH FELLOW		TEACHING PLUS PROFESSIONAL**	ACADEMIC LIBRARIAN**
			Regular 25%Teaching	Special 50% or more Teaching		
Lecturer/Research/ Fellow /Librarian to Senior Lecturer/Senior Research Fellow/Senior Librarian	Teaching (T)	60	30	40	50	60
	Research and Scholarly Works(RSW)	30	60	50	30	30
	University/Public Service(UPS)	10	10	10	20	10
Senior Lecturer/Senior Research Fellow/Senior Librarian to Associate Professor/Principal Librarian	Teaching (T)	30	20	25	20	50
	Research and Scholarly Works (RSW)	60	70	65	60	40
	University/Public Service (UPS)	10	10	10	20	10
Associate Professor/ Principal Librarian to Professor/Chief Librarian	Teaching (T)	20	10	15	10	40
	Research and Scholarly Works (RSW)	70	80	75	70	50
	University/Public Service	10	10	10	20	10

**For academic librarians, teaching is equivalent to librarianship as defined in the report (paragraph 16). Librarians who contribute to teaching should include in their librarian portfolio evidence for teaching for assessment. Teaching plus professional track proposed for Clinicians, instruments for assessment not provided by the College of Health Sciences. Committee did not deliberate further,

PROCEDURE FOR PROCESSING APPLICATIONS FOR PROMOTION-SENIOR LECTURER/SENIOR RESEARCH FELLOW

13. For promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer/Senior Research Fellow or its equivalent, the applicant shall submit the application package to the Head of Department. The Head of Department shall add a) the teaching assessment reports of the applicant (3 DTAC reports) b) the University and Public Service assessment reports to the application package and forward it with a recommendation letter to the School or Institute Management Committee for consideration.

14. Where a sitting Head of Department applies for promotion, the Dean should handle the application

   Assessment to Senior Lecturer by Internal Assessment

15. The School Management Committee shall review the application package and if the application is found to be suitable, the Dean in consultation with the Head of Department shall identify two Internal Assessors of Professorial rank to assess the application using the assessment tools provided.

16. The Internal Assessors for promotion will be tasked to assess the scholarly works, the teaching portfolio, which should include three DTAC reports, and collate the University and Public Service activities assessments of the applicant using the instruments proposed.

17. The completed Assessment Reports shall be submitted to the Dean/Director who will forward it to the College Appointments and Promotion Committee together with the recommendation of the School or Institute Management Committee.

   Assessment to Senior Lecturer by External Assessment

18. Where the Applicant has opted for the external assessment of the scholarly works, the School Management Committee shall review the application package and if the application is found to be suitable, the Dean in consultation with the Head of Department shall identify two External Assessors of Professorial Rank to assess the Scholarly Works using the approved instruments.

19. The Dean in consultation with the Head of Department will nominate two Internal Assessors for the Teaching Portfolio and the collation of the University and Public Service activities of the Applicant.

20. The completed Assessment Reports shall be submitted to the Dean/Director who will forward it to the College Appointments and Promotion Committee together with the recommendation of the School or Institute Management Committee.

PROCEDURE FOR PROCESSING APPLICATIONS FOR PROMOTION-ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR/PROFESSOR

21. For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, the applicant shall submit the application package to the Head of Department. The Head of Department shall add   a) the teaching assessment reports of the applicant (3 DTAC reports since last promotion), b) the University and Public Service activities assessments reports to the application package and forward them with a recommendation letter to the School or Institute Management Committee for consideration.

22. Where a sitting Dean or Director applies for promotion, the Provost should handle the application and appoint a Dean to chair the School Management Committee when the application is being considered. Where a sitting Head of Department applies for promotion, the Dean should handle the application.

23. The School or Institute Management Committee shall forward the application together with a recommendation to the College Appointments and Promotion Committee. The College Promotion and Appointments Committee shall forward the scholarly works of suitable applications to three External Assessors for assessment. The External Assessors will assess the scholarly works of the applicant using the instruments proposed. The Provost in consultation with the Dean/Director shall nominate the Assessors.

24. With respect to the Teaching and University and Public Service Assessment, The College Promotion and Appointments Committee shall forward the dossier to two Internal Assessors. The completed Assessment Reports (at least two external assessor's report and the two internal assessor's reports) shall be submitted to the Provost who will forward them to the University Appointments Board together with the recommendation of the College Appointments and Promotion Committee

TRACKING SYSTEM

25. The Committee recommends that an application tracking system be set up. All prospective applicants should know the two dates proposed for the receipt of completed applications, i.e. February 1 and September, 1. It is recommended that the applicant should allow at least 6 months to prepare the application dossier for submission.

26. At the School level the School Administrator should develop the tracking system and report through the Dean to the School Management Committee on applications received and their status. A similar system should be set up at the College Level.

27. The Committee proposes the following maximum time for handling applications at the difference levels (Table 2). This is for guidance and advisory and may change depending on the circumstances.

Table 2
Proposed Maximum Time for Handling Applications

Promotion to Senior Lecturer	
Stage	**Max.Time (Working days)**
Applicant and Head of Department (HOD) sign when complete dossier is finalized and submitted to HOD.	0
School Administrator, Dean and Provost are informed about application. Dean, countersigns to certify when completed dossier is received.	1
Head of Department (HOD)	10 after HOD receives dossier
Dean/School Management Committee	20 after receipt from HOD
Identification of Assessors	1 after the SMC

Assessors
    Internal Assessment
 	
    External Assessment
	40 after receipt from SMC
	
	60 after receipt from SMC

Dean/School Management Committee	5 after internal assessment reports
College AP Committee	Next meeting after receipt of complete dossier

Promotion to Associate Professor/Professor	
Stage	**Max. Time (Working days)**
Applicant and Head of Department (HOD) sign when complete dossier is finalized and submitted to HOD.	0
School administrator, Dean and Provost and College Secretary are informed about the application. Dean, countersigns to certify when completed dossier is received.	1
Head of Department	10 after HOD receives dossier
Dean/School Management Committee	20 after receipt from HOD
College Appointments and Promotion Committee (CAPC)	40 after receipt from SMC
Identification of Assessors	20 after the CAPC

Assessors
 	
    Internal Assessors (for teaching and service evaluation)
 	
    External Assessors (for scholarly works)
	
	20 after receipt from Provost
	
	60 after receipt from Provost

Provost/CAPC	20 after assessment reports
University Appointments Board	20 after receipt of full dossier or next available opportunity

TEACHING

28. To assist in the evaluation of Teaching, the Committee proposes the introduction of "Teaching Portfolio", a document prepared by all academic staff on their teaching. It must summarise the teaching profile of an applicant over a period of time and may include:
    a. Curriculum vitae
    b. Statements on Teaching Philosophy and Competency
    c. Teaching Goals
    d. Summary Information on each course taught since last promotion (Samples of course description; syllabus; assignments; examinations; student work including thesis supervision; student learning assessment methods; innovative teaching methods; introduction of new courses etc.).
    e. Reports from teaching evaluation (DTAC)
    f. Table showing the computation of teaching load per semester since last promotion.
    g. Conclusions on role and performance as a teacher

29. At least one live classroom assessment should be done for all confirmed teaching staff in a cycle of 2 years (DTAC). Academic Departments would therefore be expected to develop a programme to assess all staff within the 2 years. For Part-Time Lecturers and those in Post-Retirement Contract, this could be a 4-year cycle.

30. In exceptional circumstances, an applicant can call for in-class assessment to make up the number of such assessment needed to apply for promotion

31. The assessment should be done by at least three academic staff from the department and cognate department(s) and it is expected that at least one of the assessors should have some expertise in the field of the applicant. The combined reports of the live classroom assessment and that from the Teaching Portfolio should be the basis for scoring the applicant's teaching.

32. The Committee proposes a ratio of 1:4, In-class demonstration teaching score:Teaching Portfolio score to arrive at composite mark for Teaching.

33. Schedule F Section 20 (3-5) on Teaching were amended by the Committee for clarity and alignment with the proposals. It is proposed to read:

    (3) Where teaching is the primary and core duty of a senior member, the candidate for promotion shall be required to present a dossier demonstrating an ability to teach by submission of materials used in teaching including course syllabi, techniques and methods of continuous assessment, examinations prepared and a statement of how the materials presented reflect an integrated approach to teaching and a philosophy of learning.

(4) In judging the quality of a candidate's teaching, the appointing authority shall analyse the candidate's intellectual command of his subjects, his continuous scholarly growth in his field, evidence of ability to organize and present teaching materials with clarity; evidence of his ability to encourage intellectual curiosity and stimulate students to engage in original work; and indication of his willingness to be generally supportive of student's intellectual growth and development. The Committee recommends Form T.1 attached for implementing this provision

(5)The College and University Appointments and Promotions Committees are required to consider the following factors and criteria in the evaluation of teaching performance:
a. *demonstrated competence in the subject matter in the classroom via peer assessment and in public presentations, including seminars, colloquia, conferences and inter-faculty lectures.*
b. *effectiveness in the development **of course outlines and** use of innovative methods in teaching;*
c. *professional guidance, where assigned, to student co-curricular activities*
d. *initiation of and participation in curriculum development (e.g. introduction of new courses or programmes;*
e. *authoring of textbooks and other instructional materials*
f. *evidence of attentiveness and engagement in supervising research projects and graduate student academic progress toward completion of degree requirements,*
g. *teaching load*

34. The Committee recommends the attached Form T.1 for the approval of Academic Board, Council to be used for General Teaching Assessment.

35. The Committee recommends the attached Form T.2 for the approval of Academic Board, Council to be used for In-class Teaching Assessment.

36. The Committee recommends the attached Form T.3 for the approval of Academic Board, Council to be used for summarizing Teaching Load.

37. Instead of a Teaching Portfolio, the academic Librarian will put together a <u>Librarian Portfolio</u> to assist in the evaluation of librarianship. The portfolio may contain the following:
    a. *Full Curriculum vitae*
    b. Activity Reports showing the professional outputs.
    c. Performance appraisal reports.
    d. Other professional exhibits

38. The attached Form L.1 is proposed to be used to assess academic librarians. (Form to be further discussed and finalised)

TABLE 3

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA FORM T.1

General Teaching Evaluation Form (Schedule F, 20 (4 and 5)

Name of Lecturer……………………………………………………………………………………………….

Academic Year……………………………………………………. Semester …………………………………

	INDEX	SCORES (Tick)				
		Exceptional/Outstanding (4)	Significant (3)	Satisfactory/ Average (2)	Below Average (1)	SCORE
1	Course outlines fair and equitable assessment strategies					
2	Evidence through teaching materials of scholarly growth in the field					
3	Initiation and participation in curriculum development (e.g. new courses)					
4	Authoring textbooks and other instructional materials					
5	Attentiveness and engagement in supervising research projects and graduate students to graduation					
6	Teaching load by number of courses taught and total number of students					
					TOTAL SCORE	

Name of Assessor…………………………………………………………………………………… Date……………………………

Signature of Assessor…………………………………………………………………………………………

TABLE 4

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA FORM T.2

IN-CLASS OBSERVATION TOOL

Name of Lecturer……………………………………………………………………………

Course:…………………………………………………………………………………..

Academic Year………………………………………………………………….

		IN-CLASS OBSERVATION TOOL				
	INDEX	**Exceptional/ Outstanding (4)**	**Significant (3)**	**Satisfactory/ Average (2)**	**Below Average (1)**	**Total**
CONTENT						
1	Objectives and significance of content are stated with clarity					
2	Intellectual command of the subject					
3	Presented topics with a logical sequence					
4	Ability to organise and present teaching materials with clarity					
5	Sufficient variety in supporting information					
6	Ability to encourage intellectual curiosity and stimulate students' thinking					
7	Made distinctions between fact & opinion					
VERBAL/NON-VERBAL INTERACTION						
8	Treats students with respect					
9	Poses challenging and engaging questions					
10	Responds appropriately to student questions and comments					
11	Informative feedback given to students					
12	Speaks clearly, audibly and confidently					

13	Effective body movement and gestures					
14	Encouraged student questions					
TEACHING						
15	Uses instructional methods encouraging appropriate student participation					
16	Well-paced lesson					
17	Time spent on content					
18	Considers all learning types					
19	Attending to the needs of the marginalised (gender, disability, international students, etc)					
20	Summarized major points of lesson					
21	Used different participatory formats (e.g. group work, pair work)					
MEDIA						
22	Use of visual/teaching aids					
23	Content of media tools clear and well-organised					
ASSESSMENT						
24	Different assessment tools employed					
25	Encourages critical thinking and analysis					
					TOTAL SCORE	

Name of Assessor……………………………………………………………. **Date**…………………………………………….

TABLE 5.

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA FORM T.3

TEACHING LOAD RECORDS

Name of Lecturer:……………………………………………………………………………………………………

ACADEMIC YEAR	SEMESTER	COURSE CODE	COURSE TITLE	CREDITS	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	FTE

Compute the Teaching Load per Academic Year using the University Approved Formula.

Table 6

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA FORM L.1

Librarianship Evaluation Form

Name of Name of Librarian……

Academic Year……………………………………………………Semester……………………………………………………

INDEX	SCORES (TICK)				
	Exceptional/ Outstanding (4)	Significant (3)	Satisfactory/ Average (2)	Below Average (1)	SCORE
Understanding and knowledge of major issues and current trends in the field of academic librarianship and application of this knowledge to professional practice					
Demonstrating continued growth in professional development and leadership					
Developing instruction programs that foster students' critical thinking about information sources.					
Developing, adapting, implementing, and maintaining new methods and technologies to provide improved service to library users.					
Translating University policies into effective Library services and collections					
Knowledge in subject areas which support some aspect of the Library's contribution to the academic community					
Makes contributions which improve the internal operations of library department					
Involvement through activities such as research or other scholarly works including publication, editorial activity, presentation of papers or consulting.					
Collaborating with lecturers in designing, planning, implementing, and assessing meaningful learning activities that integrate the use of multiple library resources.					

PUBLICATIONS AND OTHER SCHOLARLY WORKS

39. Publications of academics may come out of research and data analysis and are generally valued by their quality and contribution to advancing knowledge in a discipline. Scholarship exhibited through refereed journals as well as peer reviewed published books, articles and other recognized forms of output are of greater significance in many Universities.

40. Discipline differences, such as the performing and creative arts, may present exhibits which may not fit the traditional definition of archival publication in lieu of publications. Generally in the humanities and social sciences there is a strong expectation to publish a book[12]. Table 5, summarised from the work of Harley *et al*.[13]show the wide discipline differences in the main source or preferred publication. For History, Musicology and Archaeology, books and monographs are important whilst for Astrophysics, Biology, Economics and Political Science, refereed journal articles are important.

41. The Committee recommends that the University of Ghana recognize and accept these disciplinary differences and apply them to the promotion process using a rigorous peer review system. For promotion to Associate Professor and Professor, at least 60% of the exhibits should be in refereed journals**.**

42. Other issues which came up during the deliberations and consideration of inputs was on the number of publications acceptable for promotion to the different ranks, multiple authorship and the classification of books.

43. The Committee recognized that the number of publications and the associated weights assigned to each have engaged the attention of several of the earlier proposals on promotion. The Committee suggests that discussion should be more on the quality of the publications and their contribution to the discipline. The Schedule F is very clear on this matter. Section 20 (9) states: "*In the evaluation of books, articles, technical reports, inventions and novelties and other scholarly works accepted under this Schedule as publication, the key ingredient should be significance not volume. The evaluator can judge the significance of a publication by examining the quality of the journals in which it appears, the use to which other researchers have made of it or by requesting testimony from distinguished scholars or authors in the candidate's field of research".*

44. The Committee recommends that in the evaluation of the exhibits submitted as scholarly works, the emphasis should be on the **quality** which encompasses **originality, significance, rigor and impact** in the discipline. These should be considered by Assessors when evaluating submissions.

---

[12]12 Estabrook, L. and Warner, B. 2003. "*The book as gold standard for tenure and promotion in the humanistic disciplines*'.https://www.cic.net/docs/default-source/reports/scholarlycommunicationssummitreport_dec03.pdf?sfvrsn=0. Accessed March 30, 2015.

[13] Harley, D. Acord, S. K., Earl-Novel, Lawrence, S. and King, C. T. 2010. "*Assessing the future landscape of scholarly communication: an exploration of faculty values and needs in seven disciplines*". http://scholarship.org/uc/intern/15x7385g. Accessed March, 30, 2015.

Table 7.

Publication Sources for Seven Disciplines.

Summarised from the work of Harley *et al*.(2010)

Discipline	Main Publication Source	Other Publication options
Astrophysics	**Refereed journal** article is the primary means of final publication in journals which are typically society-owned.	Pre-publication tradition
Archaeology	Final publication in the form of **books** or **monographs**; while more scientific work (e.g., in ethnobotany) or technical work (e.g., in papyrology) are published in **refereed journals.**	
Biology/Sciences including Engineering	**Refereed journals**	
Economics	**Refereed journals**	
History	**Book; Scholarly Monograph**	**Refereed journal** articles, chapters in books, documentary editions, and book reviews
Music	**Monographs, journal articles, book chapters, encyclopedia articles,** conference proceedings, critical editions of musical manuscripts for study or performance, reviews,	Liner and program notes, discographies, CDs, multimedia websites, scores, live performances, DVDs/videos of performances, recordings and software
Historical musicology and ethnomusicology.	**Monographs**	
Technical or theoretical work.	**Refereed journal articles**.	
Political Science	Trend toward publishing **refereed journal articles** and away from publishing books. The degree to which final publication is a book or article depends largely on the work's qualitative or quantitative orientation and the argument.	

EXHIBITS FOR PROMOTION

45. The Committee agreed to use the term exhibits to cover all types of materials submitted by Applicants for consideration in promotion. This is with the recognition that there could be different types of exhibits, some of which may not be the regular archival printed materials. With respect to the type of exhibit acceptable for consideration for promotion, the Committee is in agreement with earlier proposals (Osam/Ntiamoah-Baidu Reports) and confirm the following updated Table 8 as acceptable exhibits.

Table 8. Definitions of Acceptable Exhibits for Promotion.

EXHIBIT	DEFINITION
Book	A book resulting from primary research and published by a recognized academic publisher
Book Chapter	A chapter based on original research, contributed to an edited book
Book Review in Journals	A review of book(s) published in a peer reviewed journal
Conference Proceedings (Published)	A paper presented at a conference subsequently published in conference proceedings
Creative Work (Documented)	A public production of pieces such as drama, dance or music with accompanying background write-up and which have been preferably been independently reviewed. Include installations, productions of choreography and art exhibitions or the writing of plays and musical pieces
Creative Work (Published or Documented)	A novel, poetry, drama, and music composition published by a recognized publisher
Discussion Paper	A paper providing Specialist insights into current thinking in an area of enquiry and sets the stage for further work in the area
Edited Book	A collection of chapters written by different contributors around a common theme and edited by the applicant either as a sole editor or part of an editorial team and published by a recognized academic publisher
Encyclopaedia Entry	A section of an encyclopaedia written on a specific topic by the applicant
Engineering Innovation	Design, development of systems, processes and products with demonstrated commercial value that has not reached the patent stage.
Journal Article	A published peer reviewed article.
Monographs	An extended write-up on a common theme based on primary research excluding self-published works
Patent	any invention for which a patent has been obtained
Technical Report	A comprehensive report of a primary research project providing detailed summaries of project motivation and objectives, methodology, and findings, and which has been disseminated publicly in a published form
Working Paper	A research paper published in a non-peer reviewed publication. These are usually works in progress, from which researchers may pick issues raised, and explore them further

PROPOSED RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY WORKS ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

46. The Committee proposes **Tables 9, 10 and 11(University of Ghana RSW1, RSW2 and RSW3)** as instruments for assessment of research and scholarly works. This proposal is a two-tier assessment. First the Assessor (Internal or External) uses Form RSW1 (Table 8) to assess each submitted exhibit listed on Form RSW2 and scores each over 20. RSW1 provides an overall assessment taking into account the exhibit's *a) originality and contribution to knowledge in the academic discipline; b) relevance to applicant's own specialization in an academic discipline and c) the quality of the exhibit.* The first two columns of the Form RSW1 will be completed by the applicant detailing out their contribution to all published material and exhibits especially those with multiple authors (See further discussion below).

47. The Committee proposes that the number of exhibits acceptable for promotion to any rank should be as shown in Table 12. This follows the inputs from the four Colleges after reviewing the draft report. It is recommended that Research Fellows be classified into two, a normal track Research Fellow with 25% FTE teaching (according to Statutes) and Research Fellows with more than 50% FTE teaching.

48. The Committee affirms Section 20 (14) of the Statutes, which enjoins all Research Fellows to participate in at least 25% FTE of teaching. The Committee however recognizes that some Research Fellows carry teaching load far beyond the statutory 25% of FTE. It is proposed that this category of Research Fellows should be assessed using the proposed guidelines in Tables 1 and 12. The practice of assigning Research Fellows to teach beyond the 25% FTE should be phased out with Management enforcing the rule enjoining Research Fellows to teach but not more than 25% FTE.

49. If an applicant (Teaching Staff) for promotion to Senior Lecturer submits, for example, eight (8) exhibits, all 8 will be assessed and the scores for the best 6 used to compute the score for scholarly works. In the case of Associate Professor or Professor, if an applicant submits, for example, 18 exhibits, the scores for the best 12 will be used.

50. The Committee proposes that a well-researched book may be given a score ranging from 1-3 equivalents of refereed journal articles. Therefore where books are presented as exhibits, the Assessors (Internal/External) should make recommendations on how many journals articles the researched book (as defined in this document) will represent in the discipline. This will be factored into calculating the total score for the applicant.

51. The second Evaluation Form, RSW 3 (Table 11), is proposed for the Assessor to give an overall judgement on the applicant, taking into consideration the applicant's published and creative works as well as other professional/academic contributions as given in the applicant's *Curriculum Vitae* (e.g. attendance and contribution to conferences; keynote presentations, awards, professional and research leadership etc.).

52. If an applicant satisfies the **minimum** 50% expectation for Teaching, Research and Scholarly Works, University and Public Service, the Committee recommends that a score of 60% obtained on Form RSW3 should put the applicant in good stead for promotion to the rank applied.

53. The final decision rests with the Appointing Authority.

.

TABLE 9

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA FORM RSW1

SCORE SHEET FOR THE EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY WORKS

NAME OF APPLICANT……………………………………………………….. SUBJECT/DISCIPLINE…………………………………………… SPECIALIZATION…………………………………………………………

EXHIBIT No.	CONTRIBUTION	SCORE			TOTAL SCORE (20)
	Lead Author (L) Co-author (C.Au)** • Scholarship (Sc) • Drafting (Dr) • Approval (Ap) • Accountability (Ac)	Originality and Contribution to knowledge in the academic discipline (0-5)	Relevance to applicant's own specialization in an academic discipline (0-5)	Quality of Exhibit (0-10)	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
.					
N					

Comments……
………
………

** For Co-Authorship indicate all your contributions, i.e. Sc, Dr, Ap. or Ac.
*** Scores 0-5, 5 is the highest, 0-10, 10 is the highest
**** A well-researched book may be given a score ranging from 1-3 equivalents of refereed journal articles

TABLE 10

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA FORM RSW-2

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA

LIST AND DESCRIPTION OF EXHIBITS SUBMITTED FOR ASSESSMENT

NUMBER	NATURE	FULL TITLE/DESCRIPTION
1	*Book*	
2	*Book Chapter*	
3	*Refereed Journal*	
4	*Monograph*	
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
.		
.		
.		
.		
.		
N		

TOTAL NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = _____

SIGNED: _____

FULL NAME:_____

DATE:_____

TABLE 11

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA FORM RSW 3

GUIDELINES FOR OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY WORKS

RECOGNITION/SCORE	PROFESSOR	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	SENIOR LECTURER
EXCEPTIONAL/OUTSTANDING 80-100%	Recognized as one of the leading researchers/ creative artists in his or her field. Record shows that applicant makes regular, substantial contributions to scholarship of outstanding quality. Offers professional leadership and recognition through awards. Work attracts leading researchers to the University, demonstrate mentorship and collaboration. High participation in research and conferences in the field.	Recognized as a leading researcher/creative artist in his/her field. Record shows that applicant makes regular and major contributions to scholarship of high quality, demonstrate mentorship and collaboration. High participation in research and conferences in the field	Recognized as a leading researcher/creative artist in his/her field. Makes regular contributions to scholarship of high quality
SIGNIFICANT 60-79%	Recognized as a leading researcher/creative artist in his/her field. Is making regular and/or major contributions to scholarship of high quality, demonstrate mentorship and collaboration. Regular participation in research and conferences in the field	Recognized as a leading researcher/creative artist in his/her field. Is making major contributions to scholarship of high quality, demonstrate mentorship and collaboration. Regular participation in research and conferences in the field	Is beginning to be recognized as a contributor to research/creative areas in his/her field. Is making contributions to scholarship of high quality
ADEQUATE 40-59%	Has made a minimal contribution to knowledge production over the past 4 years. Attends few research conferences and seminars. Provides little leadership in research/creative work.	Has made a minimal contribution to knowledge production over the past 4 years. Attends few research conferences and seminars. Provides little leadership in research/creative work.	Has produced minimal research/creative work over past 4 years. Attends few research conferences and seminars. Minimal input to any research/creative work group.
INADEQUATE < 40%	Is not actively involved in research or the production of creative work. Attends few or no research conferences and seminars	Is not actively involved in research or the production of creative work. Attends few or no research conferences and seminars	Is not actively involved in research or the production of creative work. Attends few or no research conferences and seminars
OTHER COMMENTS			

………

………

………

Table 12. **MINIMUM NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS ACCEPTABLE FOR PROMOTION**

RANK	TEACHING/ACADEMIC LIBRARY STAFF	RESEARCH FELLOW. Normal Track	RESEARCH FELLOW. High Teaching Track
Senior Lecturer/Senior Research Fellow/Senior Librarian	6	10.	8
Associate Professor/Principal Librarian	**Additional 12**, after promotion to Senior Lecturer/Senior Librarian. Applicant is Lead or corresponding author in at least 50% of publications)	**Additional 16,** after promotion to Senior Research Fellow, Applicant is Lead or corresponding author in at least 50% of publications)	**Additional 14** after promotion to Senior Research Fellow, Applicant is Lead or corresponding author in at least 50% of publications)
Professor/Chief Librarian	**Additional 12**, after promotion to Associate Professor/Principal Librarian. Applicant is Lead or corresponding author in at least 50% of publications)	**Additional 16,** after promotion to Associate Professor. Applicant is Lead or corresponding author in at least 50% of publications)	**Additional 14** after promotion to Associate Professor. Applicant is Lead or corresponding author in at least 50% of publications)

MULTIPLE AUTHORSHIP AND ACADEMIC PROMOTIONS

54. In Academia, publications in peer-reviewed journals are critical for assessing applications for promotion[14],[15]. In this process the publication may be authored by one or more persons. There have been discussions on the ethical, transparent and fair approach to credit authors for their contributions to manuscripts[16]. Usually those listed as first or last authors are apportioned more credit for the work.[17]. The practice of giving authors equal credit is increasingly common in original research publications[18] The tendency for multiple authorship is therefore acceptable in some disciplines, especially in view of the effort to increase collaborative research, usually across countries.

55. The determination of how much credit to give to each author however can be a challenge. In the absence of explicit information on the significance of by-line position, promotion committees may have a misperception of deserved credit which may have tangible consequences. It is therefore important that institutions have clear policies on authorship for guidance. It is also important that a clear definition of what is acceptable and unacceptable under authorship are clearly defined, especially when this can influence the final outcome of promotion.

56. The International Committee of Medical Journal Editors(ICMJE)[19] recommends that authorship be based on four criteria

    1. Substantial contributions to conception or design of the work or acquisition, analysis or interpretation of data for the work. "**Scholarship**"
    2. Drafting the work or revising it for intellectual content. "**Drafting**"
    3. Approval of the version to be published, "**Approval**"
    4. Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work. "**Accountability**"

57. A person should meet all four criteria to be identified as an author. For a multi-author manuscript, all members of the group named as authors should meet the four criteria. All co-authors of publications are therefore responsible for scholarship, authorship or drafting, approval and accountable for the content of the publication. Where an individual made

---

[14] Beasley, B.W., Wright, S. M. (2003). Looking forward to promotion: characteristics of participants in the prospective study of promotion in academia. J. Gen. Intern. Med. 18: 705-710

[15] Thomas, P. A., Dienner-West, M. Canto, M. I. Martin, D. R., Post, W. S. and Streiff, M. B. 2004. Results of an academic promotion and career path suevey of faculty at Johns Hopkins University School of medicine. Acad. Med. 79: 258-264

[16]

[17] Wren, J.D., Kozak, K. Z., Johnson, K. R., Deakyne, S.J., Schilling, L.M. and Deliavalle, R. P. 2007. The write position. A survey of perceived contributions to papers based on byline position and number of authors. EMBO Rep. Nov, 8 (11): 988 -991. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2247376/ Accessed 4/4/15

[18] Akhabue, E. and lautenbach, E. 2010. "Equal" contributions and credit: an emerging trend in the characterization of authorship. Ann. Epidemiol. 20(11): 868-871. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20933195

[19] Defining the role of authors and contributors. http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html. Accessed 4/4/15

contributions but do not meet the criteria for authorship, they can be listed in an acknowledgement section.

58. The Committee proposes that the University of Ghana should adopt this definition and criteria. This should be applied when assessing the publications submitted by applicants for promotion. In determining authorship therefore the applicant must indicate the criteria that best fits their contribution to each multiple-authored publication. Specifically the Committee is referring to **Scholarship; Drafting; Approval** and **Accountability** as defined above.

59. It is important to define unacceptable authorship and the example from Washington University, St. Louis is useful and may be adopted by the University of Ghana. In the policy for authorship on scientific and scholarly publications, three types of unacceptable authorship are defined. These are guest, gift and ghost authorship[20] as defined below.

60. **Guest authorship**: when an individual is listed as an author out of appreciation, respect or belief that the expert standing of the individual will increase publication, credibility or status of the work

61. **Gift authorship**: when authorship is offered from a sense of obligation, tribute or dependence within the context of an anticipated benefit to an individual who has not contributed to the work.

62. **Ghost authorship**: when someone who made substantial contribution to the research or writing the manuscript is not recognized in the by-line position.

63. For any manuscript therefore there will be a Lead author, who takes responsibility for the manuscript and serve as the corresponding author and provide significant contribution to the research. In addition there may be Co-authors who have full responsibility for authorship (Scholarship, Drafting**,** Approval and Accountability). The Committee recommends that the University of Ghana recognize this in its promotion assessment process. It will be the responsibility of the applicant to provide information on their authorship status and responsibilities for all multi-authored publications listed on their application.

64. Applicants are advised not to include any publication where they do not satisfy the definition for authorship for that publication, as defined above. The Head of Department, in reviewing the application should advise the applicant on this matter before submitting the dossier to the Dean. It is also expected that the Pre-submission system, Internal Assessors and the College Promotion Review Committee will review the information given by the applicant and confirm.

---

[20] Policy for authorship on scientific and scholarly publications. Washington University in St. Louis. http://www.wustl.edu/policies/authorship.html Accessed April 3, 2015

ASSESSMENT OF UNIVERSITY AND PUBLIC SERVICE (UPS)

65. The Committee agrees with Schedule F, Section 20 (10, 11, 12 and 13) on University and Public Service. The following are however proposed for clarity and as a tool for evaluation:

a. The work of the academic should be accompanied by the provision of services outside the classroom. These enhance the total output of the Lecturer to the University and the wider community. This is the third leg of the promotion assessment tripod. The Committee proposes Form UPS.1 (Table 13) to be used for this assessment. The Table suggests two broad classes of services: service to the University and Service to National and International Community. The indicators for assessment are proposed under each service.

b. Service to the University refers to activities assigned to staff at the University, College, Departmental and community levels. This may include administrative positions such as Vice Chancellor, Pro Vice Chancellor, Provost, Dean, Head of Department, Member of Council, Master of Hall or Hostel, Senior Tutor, Tutor, Examinations Officer and other positions. Other recognized services include membership of Statutory and *Ad hoc* Committees at the Department, School, College and University level. It is important that all Academic Staff are given a fair opportunity to serve the University beyond the classroom. There should be a deliberate effort to attain equity in all units in this regard.

c. Service to National and International Communities refers to the applicant's contributions through knowledge sharing and field/practical application. Examples include membership of national and international committees or panels; serving on editorial boards, leadership in professional associations; serving as external examiner in other Universities; serving as external assessor for promotions in other Universities and extension work using applicant's knowledge and expertise and impacting the University publics.

d. The Committee recommends that the number of indicators to be used for assessment should be linked to the rank being applied for. For Senior Lecturer a maximum of three indicators are proposed, for Associate Professor, six indicators and Professor, nine indictors (Table 14).

e. It is proposed that the applicant will indicate the indices in each category which he/she prefers to be assessed in the application. (Need to modify the University of Ghana Promotion Application Form suggested).

66. The Assessment of University and Public Service will be done by the Applicant, the Head of Department, Dean and Provost. The applicant should ensure that his/her curriculum vitae include evidence on all the information needed for this assessment.

Table 13

University of Ghana Form UPS.1

TOOL FOR ASSESSMENT OF UNIVERSITY AND PUBLIC SERVICE

	INDEX	SCORE				
		Exceptional/ Outstanding 4	Significant 3	Satisfactory/ Average 2	Below Average 1	TOTAL
1	SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY					
	1. Administrative					
	2. Membership of Statutory Committees					
	3. Membership of Ad-hoc Committees					
	4. Other University Community Services					
	5. Financial and Material Resource Mobilization					
2	SERVICE TO NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL /COMMUNITY					
	1. Membership of National and Internal Committees					
	2. Membership of Editorial Boards					
	3. Leadership in Professional Associations					
	4. External Examiner					
	5. External Assessor for Promotion					
	6. Extension Work in Communities					

Table 14. Indicators for Assessing Service[21]

Rank	Number of indicators (Service to the University)	Number of indicators (Service to National or International Community)	Maximum Score for Rank
Senior Lecturer/Senior Research Fellow	2	1	12
Associate Professor	3	3	24
Professor	5	4	36

---

[21] This Table should be read alongside section 65(d) and Table 13 above.

ASSESSORS-IDENTIFICATION, SELECTION AND COMMUNICATIONS

67. The Committee discussed the matter of timely identification of external assessors for the review of dossiers. Apart from the difficulty in the identification and obtaining consent to assess, the Committee found out that there were issues of non-payment or late payment of assessors. In the circumstances this has negatively impacted the assessment of the dossier of some applicant leading to long delays. There were also variations in the form of letters sent to Assessors from different units of the University.

68. The Committee proposes the following:

    a. Internal assessors will be identified and appointed by the Provost, in consultations with Deans and Directors, as advisors to the College Appointments and Promotion Board. The assessors will evaluate dossiers for consideration of appointment to the rank of Senior Lecturer

    b. External assessors will be identified and appointed by the Provost in consultations with the Dean/Director. The external assessors will assist with the evaluation of dossiers for promotion to Senior Lecturer, Associate Professor or Professor.

    c. In this capacity, assessors will bring their professional and academic expertise to assist the University in assessing dossiers submitted using the tools and guidance given. The recommendations of assessors are not binding on the College/University Appointment and Promotion Board, their assessment reports will however be considered as one of the reports to guide the College/UAPB in arriving at the final decision.

    d. The responsibility for the appointment of assessors shall be that of the Provost acting on the recommendations of the Dean. A Head of Department may make proposals to the Dean on submission of applications.

69. The Committee prepared templates to serve as sample letters to be issued to assessors. These are summarized below, but subject to modification

    a. A letter requesting assessors to indicate readiness to serve

    b. A letter to introduce the candidate for the assessment and to elicit from the assessor if he/she has collaborated or co-authored manuscripts with the candidate.

    c. A cover letter forwarding the dossier of the candidate to the assessor.

70. The Committee proposes that a database of assessors should be developed and kept in the office of the Provost. This database should cover all disciplines in the College. The Head of Department in consultation with other academic staff should make proposals on potential external assessors indicating the specialization. When completed the database should be updated annually to take care of assessors who are no longer available due to retirement, transfer, death or illness.

ASSESSORS DATABASE

Dear Prof. ……………….

ASSESSORS/REVIEWERS FOR THE COLLEGE OF ……………………………….

The College of ……………………. is developing a database of assessors/reviewers for the purpose of appointment/promotion of academic senior members of the College. The head of …………………… department has submitted your name for consideration in …………………… (specialty).

This mail/letter is a request for you to confirm your willingness to serve the University in this capacity and to indicate your availability for the next **three (3) years.**

If you are willing to serve in this capacity, can you please make available to the College the following:

1. Curriculum Vitae (CV)
2. Area of specialisation and research interest
3. Office address
4. Postal address
5. Telephone numbers (landline and cell phone)
6. E-mail address(es)

Can you please indicate your preferred means of communicating with you.

On receipt of an application from the Department, you will be contacted for confirmation that you will be able to complete the assessment between six (6) and eight (8) weeks.

The dossier comprising the completed application form, curriculum vitae, the list of publications/exhibits of the candidate, a copy each of the selected publications/exhibits submitted in support of the application, the detail criteria for promotion to the particular grade in the University of Ghana and the instruments to be used in the assessment will be forwarded to you.

You will be paid an honorarium and any additional expenses incurred e.g. postage.

The honorarium is reviewed from time to time. The current rate is $200.00 for Lecturer to Senior Lecturer and $400.00 for Senior Lecturer to Associate Professor and for Associate Professor to Professor.

Thank you very much in anticipation of a favourable response.

Yours sincerely

Provost /Dean

BRIEF COMMUNICATION WITH ASSESSOR SELECTED TO REVIEW AN APPLICATION

Dear Prof. ………

I write on behalf of the Provost/Dean of …………………………... ,. Our records show that you are one of the external assessors for Academic Senior Members in the Department of ……………………. with specialization in……………………………

Dr. (name & grade) has applied for promotion to the grade of (name grade).

This mail/letter is to seek your confirmation that you have not **been associated with the applicant's formal studies at the graduate level or professional level, nor have been a collaborator with the applicant.**

I will also be grateful if you can confirm that you are available to complete the assessment within **six (6) to eight (8) weeks**. The following documents will be provided:

   i.   A copy of the candidate's completed application form and curriculum vitae with a list of all the scholarly works/exhibits of the candidate.
   ii. A list of scholarly works/exhibits submitted for assessment by applicant.
   iii. A copy each of selected scholarly/exhibits which the candidate has submitted in support of the application.
   iv. Criteria for promotion to the relevant grade.
   v.   Instruments to be used in the assessment (UG Form …….. and …….)

You will be required to score each publication/exhibit submitted for assessment in the following areas:
1. Originality and contribution to knowledge in the academic discipline (0-5).
2. Relevance to applicant's own specialization in an academic discipline.(0-5)
3. Quality of the exhibit (0-10).

In addition you will be required to give an overall assessment of the research and scholarly works of the applicant using the UG Form ………….., taking into account the contribution of the applicant to scholarship in the discipline.

You will be paid an honorarium of $200/400 should you agree to carry out the exercise for the University. **We shall include a self-addressed envelope to cover the cost of return postage.**

I shall be grateful if you could let me know whether you will be able to undertake this vital exercise for us within **six (6) to eight (8) weeks**. Please acknowledge receipt of this letter and send your decision by email to ………………….. within two (2) weeks.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully

School Administrator

COVER LETTER FOR SUBMISSION OF PROMOTION DOSSIER

Dear Prof/Dr…………………………………….

PROMOTION TO ……………………………….
DR. ……………………………………………..

I write on behalf of the (Provost/Dean of College/School/Institute) to thank you for agreeing to serve as External Assessor for the above-named candidate on the terms indicated in our invitation letter.

Enclosed are the following documents:

a) The candidate's completed application form and curriculum vitae
b) A list of scholarly works/exhibits of the applicant submitted for assessment.
c) A copy each of selected scholarly works/exhibits submitted in support of the application
d) Criteria for Promotion to the relevant grade
e) Instruments to be used for the assessment UG Form ……. and ……..

This letter is to seek your assessment of the research and scholarly works of the applicant using the attached instruments. Please note that the University of Ghana's promotion system is based on the trilogy of **i) teaching, ii) research and scholarly works and iii) service**. You are kindly requested to assist the University to assess the applicant's Scholarly works only.

I shall be grateful if you will let me have your scores on each of the scholarly works/exhibits **within six (6) weeks**.

1. Originality and contribution to knowledge in the academic discipline.
2. Relevance to applicant's own specialization in an academic discipline.
3. Quality of the exhibit.

Also provide an overall assessment of the research and scholarly works of the applicant using the UG Form …………., taking into account the contribution of the applicant to scholarship in the discipline.

Your honorarium of $200/$400 and cost of postage (to be indicated), will be paid to you upon receipt of your assessment report. **(NB: Please indicate your Bankers' Address, Account No, Swift Code and Sort Code) or any other reliable alternative means by which the College can conveniently and quickly pay for the service rendered).** Please return the publications in due course.

Once again, I would like on behalf of the Appointments Board, to thank you for this service.

Yours sincerely,

Provost/Dean/School Administrator

71. **CLUSTERING OF DISCIPLINES**

In other to ensure the availability of internal assessors for promotion to Senior Lecturer the Committee considered for clustering of disciplines. This is expected to minimize challenges that may be associated with finding qualified internal assessors by some Departments. In this respect the Committee proposes the formation of three clusters of disciplines for purposes of identification of internal assessors for promotion. These are

    a.   Creative /Performing Arts

    b.   Arts and Social Sciences (Including academic librarians)

    c.   Sciences (including the Health Sciences)

72. **LISTING OF JOURNALS FROM DEPARTMENTS**

The Committee proposes that the University should have a database of journals and outlets for publication of scholarly works for the guidance of Applicants and Appointments Board. In this regard all academic Department and Units are to suggest such a list. It is further proposed that this list should be updated on a regular basis to ensure that new outlets are included.

Addendum 5 shows the submission from the academic Departments and Units. This list is compiled as an Addendum to this report and it is recommended that the list be updated with information from the remaining academic Departments and Units. The Committee recommends that each College should discuss and approve the list.

73. **APPEAL**

The Committee recommends that Council review the current appeal system associated with the outcome of a promotion application. It has been argued that the appeal process should not require aggrieved applicants to bring their case to the same body that made the original decision. The Committee could not elaborate on this proposal and it should be a matter for further consideration.

74. **TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS**

    a.   Transitional arrangements should be made to take care of applications whose consideration commence before the effective date of the new promotion policy. The

Committee recommends the transitional period to be two years to ensure that all such applications fully go through the consideration cycle.

b. The Committee recognizes that there will be the need for training and reorientation of staff on the new guidelines at Colleges, Schools and Departments. This will include matters on teaching portfolio, teaching evaluation, peer assessment, dossier preparation for promotion, pre-submission assessment, etc.

c. The Committee, however, recommends that there would be several preparatory activities to sensitize the University community and this should not go beyond two years after Council has approved the document.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Committee will like to express their gratitude to the Vice Chancellor for the opportunity to serve in this capacity. The inputs of the various individuals, Colleges, Schools and Departments are acknowledged. The Committee further is grateful to Prof. R. Adanu who represented Prof. Yao Tettey when the latter was not available to attend the meetings. The support from the Secretariat, Mr. Baidoo and Mr. Fosu Adjei, in providing very useful documentation and recording of proceedings is much appreciated.

APPENDIX 1.

List of University of Ghana Units that submitted inputs and documents available to the Committee

The under listed submitted memoranda on the promotion policy for academic senior members:

1. School of Public Health
2. School of Medicine and Dentistry
3. Centre for Tropical Pharmacology and Therapeutics
4. Noguchi Memorial Institute for Medical Research
5. School of Biomedical and allied Health Sciences
6. School of Pharmacy
7. School Social Sciences
8. School of Languages
9. School of Arts
10. Language Centre
11. University of Ghana Business School.
12. University Teachers Association of Ghana (UTAG)
13. Department of Philosophy and Classics
14. Institute of African Studies
15. Dr. Saint Kuttu, Department of Finance, UGBS
16. School of Performing Arts
17. Dr. George Afrane, Department of Food Process Engineering
18. Dr. Tsatsu Adogla-Bessa, Livestock and Poultry Research Centre
19. School of Engineering Sciences

The following documents were available to the Panel:

- Extract of minutes of Academic Board meeting held on February24, 2012 on "Policy on Appointment and Promotion of Academic Senior Members".
- Extract of minutes of Executive Committee meeting held on August 17, 2009 on "Appointment and Promotion of Academic Senior Members".
- Extract of Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting held on October 19, 2009 on "Appointment and Promotion of Academic Senior Members".

- Extract of Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting held on April 12, 2010 on "Appointment and Promotion of Senior Members".
- Extract of Minutes of Academic Board Meeting held on June 18, 2010 on "Appointment and Promotions of Academic Senior Members".
- Report of the Committee on Guidelines for Promotions of Academic Staff chaired by Prof. E. K. Osam dated August 11, 2009.
- Schedule F of the statutes of the University of Ghana, Legon dated April, 2011.
- Academic Promotion Policy submitted to the Executive Committee dated April 11, 2010.
- Academic Promotion Policy submitted to the Executive Committee dated February 21, 2010.
- Academic Promotion Policy dated June 2010.
- Minutes of special Meeting of Council held on February 28, 2008 on the Report of the Visitation panel.
- Minutes of special Meeting of Council held on February 21, 2008 on the Report of the visitation Panel.
- Minutes of Registrar Meeting of Council held on July 15, 2010.
- Guidelines for Promotion through Teaching Assessment of the Faculty of Arts dated February 4, 2008.
- "Rules and Tools for effective Teaching" A Handbook for Faculty at the University of Ghana, prepared by Prof. Peter L. French, June 2013.
- Consolidated comments on Proposed Application and Promotion Policies by Prof. Peter L. French
- Amended Statutes of the College of Basic and Applied Sciences
- Procedures and Requirements for recruitment and Placement of Senior Members (Academic), January 2015, HRODD

Appendix 2

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA

MODEL CURRICULUM VITAE FOR APPLICATION FOR PROMOTION

1. NAME: *Provide Full Name*

2. ADDRESS (POSTAL)

3. EMAIL

4. CITIZENSHIP

5. DATE OF BIRTH

6. EDUCATION

DATE (Starting with most recent)	DEGREE/QUALIFICATION	INSTITUTION

7. POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP

8. ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS AND AFFILIATIONS (*Could use a table to show chronologically*)

DATE	POSITION	INSTITUTION
August 1, 1996-July 31, 1998	Assistant Lecturer	Department of Science, University of Ghana
August 1, 2004 – July 31 2009	Lecturer	Department of Science, University of Ghana
August 1, 2009-July 31, 2010	Lecturer (Visiting)	Department of Science, University of Benin
August 1, 2010 – Present	Senior Lecturer	Department of Science, University of Ghana

9. PREVIOUS ACADEMIC AND RESEARCH APPOINTMENTS (*If any)*

10. PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS

DATE	POSITION	INSTITUTION
August 1, 2004 – July 31 2009	Examinations Coordinator	Department of Science, University of Ghana
August 1, 2009- July 31, 2010	Examinations Coordinator	Department of Science, University of Ghana
August 1, 2010 – December 2010	Acting Head of Department	Department of Science, University of Ghana

11. LEICENSURES/BOARDS/OTHER PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS (*If any*)

12. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

13. CONSULTANTSHIPS

14. EDITORSHIP AND EDITORIAL BOARDS

   a. *List any Editorship/Guest Editor in a journal*
   b. *List Editorial Boards served or currently serving*
   c. *List Advisory Boards*
   d. *Others*

15. MANUSCRIPT REVIEWS

   a. *List all journals and peer reviewed publications you have served as a reviewer. For each include number of reviews per year*

16. HONORS AND AWARDS

17. PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY MEMBERSHIPS

18. CURRENT RESEARCH FOCUS

19. GRANT SUPPORT

20. TEACHING

   a. *Undergraduate*
   b. *Post-graduate*

21. GRADUATE STUDENT THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

22. GRADUATE STUDENT THESIS- SUPERVISOR

23. UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH SUPERVISOR

24. LECTURESHIP/SEMINAR AND VISITING PROFESSORSHIP

25. INVITATION TO NATIONAL AND INTERNATION CONFERENCES AND WORKSHOPS
    (List conference themes, title of presentation, any other role played)
26. PUBLICATIONS

    a. *Books*
    b. *Book Chapters*
    c. *Published Research Work in Refereed Journals*
    d. *Review Articles*
    e. *Published conference proceedings*
    f. *Published Symposium*
    g. *Editorial and Commentaries*

27. OTHER ACADEMIC WORK/EXHIBITS

28. PERSONAL INFORMATION

    a. *Date of Birth*
    b. *Any other information candidate may wish to provide*

SIGNATURE   *DATE*

APPENDIX 3

SAMPLE COMPUTATION USING THE PROPOSED TOOLS

Below the Committee shows what the likely computations and outcome will be like using three hypothetical cases.

CASE ONE

Teaching
- The applicant currently holds a position of Lecturer and has applied for promotion to Senior Lecturer after six years of service at the University of Ghana. The applicant has gone through two cycles of Teaching Evaluation as part of the quality assurance process by the Department Teaching Assessment Committee (DTAC). Using Form T.1 for assessment, the Applicant scored 20 and 18 respectively out of a total of 24, these translate to 83% and 75% respectively; average is 79%. One in-class assessment was done by DTAC and the applicant scored 72%.
- Final Teaching score is a combination a ratio of 1:4 for in-class assessment score:Teaching Portfolio.

- Combined Teaching Score = (72*0.2) + (79*0.8) = 14.4 + 63.2 = **77.6 %**

Research and Scholarly Works.
- The applicant submitted eight publications for assessment. The Assessors used Form RSW.1. All eight exhibits were assessed each over a total score of 20; the best 6 exhibits (for Senior Lecturer) will have a maximum score of 120.

Exhibit	Score/20
1	16*
2	12*
3	14*
4	17*
5	12*
6	8
7	12*
8	7
Total Score for Best 6 (marked with asterisk)	83

Percentage (Total Score/120* 100) = 69%

- The score for the applicant with respect to assessment of the exhibits using Form RSW.1 is **69%**.

- Using Form RSW.2, the Assessors overall assessment of the applicant, taking into account the exhibits and other information on scholarly activities was **72%**.

University and Public Service

- For promotion to Senior Lecturer, the applicant is expected to select three indicators for assessment (two from Service to University and one from Service to National or International Community) as indicated on From UPS.1
- For University Service, the applicant selected 'membership of Statutory Committees and 'Membership of Ad-hoc Committees'. For National/International Service applicant selected "Membership of National and International Committees.

- Applicant was assessed as follows:

Index	Applicant	HOD	Dean	Provost
Membership of Statutory Committees	3	2	3	3
Membership of Ad-hoc Committees'	3	3	2	2
Membership of National and International Committees	3	2	2	2
Total Assessed Score	9	7	7	7
Maximum Score	12	12	12	12

- The applicant has a combined total score of 30, i.e. (9+7+7+7), out of a total of 48; which is **62.5%**

Overall Evaluation of Applicant for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

- Applicant obtained the following scores

  Teaching (T) = 77.6%
  Research and Scholarly Works (RSW) = 69%
  University and Public Service (UPS) = 62.5%

- For Promotion to Senior Lecturer the relative weights are Teaching (T): Research and Scholarly Works (RSW): University and Public Service (UPS), i.e. 60:30:10

- Overall score for applicant

  $(T*0.6) + (RSW*0.3) + (UPS*0.1)$

  $= (77.6*0.6) + (69*0.3) + (62.5*0.1)$

  $=46.6 + 20.7 + 6.2 0$

  $= 73.5$

Conclusion

- The College Appointments and Promotion Board will have the full dossier of the applicant. Information summarized for the CAPB should include the profile of the applicant, the scores obtained for each assessment, including the additional information from Form RSW.2
- From the computations and the guidelines, the applicant obtained a combined score of 73.5%, He satisfies all the conditions for promotion. The final decision will be with the CAPB.

CASE TWO

Teaching

- The applicant currently holds a position of Associate Professor and has applied for promotion to Professor after fourteen years of service at the University of Ghana. The applicant has gone through two cycles of Teaching Evaluation since last promotion (three years ago) as part of the quality assurance process by the Department Teaching Assessment Committee (DTAC). Using Form T.1 for assessment, the Applicant scored 10 and 12 respectively out of a total of 24, these translate to 42% and 50 % respectively; average is 46%. One in-class assessment was done by DTAC and the applicant scored 62%.
- Final Teaching score is a combination a ratio of 1:4 for in-class assessment score:Teaching Portfolio.

- Combined Teaching Score = (62*0.2) + (46*0.8) = 12.4 + 36.8 = **49.2 %**

Research and Scholarly Works.

- The applicant submitted eighteen publications/exhibits for assessment. The Assessors used Form RSW.1. All eighteen exhibits were assessed each over a total score of 20; the best 14 exhibits (for Professor) will have a maximum score of 280.

Exhibit	Score/20	Exhibit	Score/20
1	15*	11	8
2	11*	12	11*
3	9*	13	9*
4	17*	14	12*
5	8	15	16*
6	11*	16	12*
7	12*	17	8
8	17*	18	9
9	10*		
10	14*		
Percentage (Total Score/280* 100) = 63%			

- Total score for best 14 exhibits = 176, which translates to (176/280) * 100 = **63%**

- The score for the applicant with respect to assessment of the exhibits using Form RSW.1 is **63%**.

- Using Form RSW.2, the Assessors overall assessment of the applicant, taking into account the exhibits and other information on scholarly activities was **60%**.

University and Public Service

- For promotion to Professor, the applicant is expected to select nine indicators for assessment (five from Service to University and four from Service to National or International Community) as indicated on From UPS.1
- For University Service, the applicant selected 'Administrative', 'Membership of Statutory Committees', 'Membership of Ad-hoc Committees' and Financial and Materials Resource Mobilization'. For National/International Service applicant selected 'Membership of National and International Committees', External Examiner', External Assessor for Promotion' and Extension Work in Communities'.
- Applicant was assessed as follows:

	Index	Applicant	HOD	Dean	Provost
1	Administrative	3	2	1	1
2	Membership of Statutory Committees	2	1	1	1
3	Membership of Ad-hoc Committees'	1	1	1	1
4	Financial and Materials Resource Mobilization	3	2	2	3
5	Membership of National and International Committees	3	1	1	1
6	External Examiner'	3	1	1	1
7	External Assessor for Promotion	3	2	2	1
8	Extension Work in Communities'	4	3	4	3
	Total Assessed Score	22	13	13	12
	Maximum Score Expected	32	32	32	32

- The applicant has a combined total score of (22+13+13+12) = 60 out of a total of 128; which is **46.9%**

Overall Evaluation of Applicant for Promotion to Professor

- Applicant obtained the following scores

  Teaching (T) = 49.2%
  Research and Scholarly Works (RSW) = 63%
  University and Public Service (UPS) = 46.9%

- Applicant does not satisfy the condition of having at least 50% for Teaching and University and Public Service.

Conclusion

- The University Appointments Board will have the full dossier of the applicant. Information summarized for the CAPB should include the profile of the applicant, the scores obtained for each assessment, including the additional information from Form RSW.2
- Applicant does not satisfy all the conditions for promotion. The final decision will be with Appointments Board.

CASE THREE

Teaching
- The applicant currently holds a position of Senior Research Fellow and has applied for promotion to Associate Professor after 10 years of service at the University of Ghana. The applicant has gone through two cycles of Teaching Evaluation since last promotion (four years ago) as part of the quality assurance process by the Department Teaching Assessment Committee (DTAC). Using Form T.1 for assessment, the Applicant scored 14 and 16 respectively out of a total of 24, these translate to 58% and 67 % respectively; average is 62.5%. One in-class assessment was done by DTAC and the applicant scored 75%.
- Final Teaching score is a combination a ratio of 1:4 for in-class assessment score:Teaching Portfolio.

- Combined Teaching Score = (75*0.2) + (62.5*0.8) = 15 + 50 = **65.0 %**

Research and Scholarly Works.
- The applicant submitted fifteen publications/exhibits for assessment. The Assessors used Form RSW.1. All fifteen exhibits were assessed each over a total score of 20; the best 14 exhibits (for Professor) will have a maximum score of 280.

Exhibit	Score/20	Exhibit	Score/20
1	11*	8	8
2	16*	9	9
3	10*	10	11*
4	17*	11	16*
5	8	12	16*
6	10*	13	12*
7	15*	14	8
		15	10*
Percentage Score = (Total Score/280* 100)			

- Total score for best 14 exhibits = (11+16+10+17+10+15+11+16+16+12+12+8+8+9) = 171, which translates to (171/280) * 100 = **61.0%**

- The score for the applicant with respect to assessment of the exhibits using Form RSW.1 is **61%**.

- Using Form RSW.2, the Assessors overall assessment of the applicant, taking into account the exhibits and other information on scholarly activities was **65%**.

University and Public Service

- For promotion to Associate Professor, the applicant is expected to select six indicators for assessment (three from Service to University and three from Service to National or International Community) as indicated on Form UPS.1
- For University Service, the applicant selected 'Administrative', 'Membership of Statutory Committees', and 'Membership of Ad-hoc. For National/International Service applicant selected 'Membership of National and International Committees', Leadership in Professional Associations and Extension Work in Communities'.

- Applicant was assessed as follows:

	Index	Applicant	HOD	Dean	Provost
1	Administrative	3	2	3	2
2	Membership of Statutory Committees	3	2	2	2
3	Membership of Ad-hoc Committees'	4	2	2	2
4	Membership of National and International Committees	3	3	2	2
5	Leadership in Professional Association	3	1	1	1
6	Extension work in Communities	3	2	2	2
	Total Assessed Score	19	12	12	11
	Maximum Score Expected	24	24	24	24

- The applicant has a combined total score of (19+12+12+11) = 54 out of a total of 96; which is **56.3%**

Overall Evaluation of Applicant, Senior Research Fellow for Promotion to Associate Professor

- Applicant obtained the following scores

  Teaching (T) = 65%
  Research and Scholarly Works (RSW) = 61%
  University and Public Service (UPS) = 56.3%

- Applicant does satisfy the condition of having at least 50% for Teaching, Research and Scholarly Works and University and Public Service

- For Promotion to Associate Professor for Research Staff the relative weights are Teaching (T): Research and Scholarly Works (RSW): University and Public Service (UPS), i.e. 20:70:10

- Overall score for applicant

  $$(T*0.2) + (RSW*0.7) + (UPS*0.1)$$

  $$= (65*0.2) + (61*0.7) + (56.3*0.1)$$

  $$= 13 + 42.7 + 5.63$$

  $$= 61.33$$

Conclusion

- The University Appointments Board will have the full dossier of the applicant. Information summarized for the CAPB should include the profile of the applicant, the scores obtained for each assessment, including the additional information from Form RSW.2
- Applicant does satisfy all the conditions for promotion. The final decision will be with Appointments Board.

NAME	AFFILIATION	DESIGNATION IN COMMITTEE/SIGNATURE/DATE
Prof. S. Sefa-Dedeh	Department of Food Process Engineering	Chairman
Prof. P. L. French (From February 1, to March 2, 2015)	Consultant	Co-Chairman
Prof. K. Boafo-Arthur	Department of Political Science	Member
Prof. Isabella Quakyi	Department of Biological, Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences	Member
Prof. C. Omenyo	Provost, College of Education	Member
Prof. S. Agyei-Mensah	Provost, College of Humanities	Member
Prof. E. O. Owusu	Provost, College of Basic and Applied Sciences (CBAS)	Member
Prof. Yao Tettey	Provost, College of Health Sciences	Member
Dr. Langbong Bimi	Department of Animal Biology and Conservation Sciences, Representing UTAG	Member
Mr. B. Fosu Adjei	Assistant Registrar, Office of Pro-Vice-Chancellor (ASA)	Secretary
Mr. E. Baidoo	College Secretary, CBAS	Secretary

ADDEDUM

RESPONSES FROM COLLEGES

ADDENDUM 1   **COLLEGE OF EDUCATION**

1. **Promotion to the Grade of Senior Lecturer:**
   Internal Assessment
   The College is of the view that internal assessment is a laudable idea, because it will hopefully speed up the process of promotion.

   However, reservations were expressed as to whether internal assessments would be fair. The college proposes therefore that:

   i.   There should be an appreciable level of trust created to ensure that staff have confidence they will be assessed fairly by their peers.
   ii. There should be one assessment done internally and the second externally, to provide balance and act as a check on the process.
   iii. It should be mandatory for comments received from assessors to be made available to the assessed. Among other things this would help faculty work towards international scholarship.

2. **Number of Publications Required for Promotion**
   Members of the College noted that in view of the amount of time and effort needed to publish in journals of high repute, demanding a minimum of 14 publications after promotion to Senior Lecturer and thereafter another 14 from Associate Professor to Professor, is too high. The College notes the high rejection rate of tier one journals and the number of revisions or resubmissions authors would have to endure to get published in any journal of high repute, for that matter. Realistically, in addition to other research publications, an article a year in a highly reputed journal is to be expected of a conscientious academic.

   In the case of Associate Professor to Professor the College notes that while authors would have more academic writing and publishing experience they are also likely to be encumbered with heavy administrative and mentoring responsibilities because of their seniority. The College considers that 14 publications after the last promotion may be a stretch for many because of time constraints. In the social sciences and humanities the average journal article is much longer than, for example, in the sciences; typically 6000-10000 words, depending on the journal. When one considers also that co-authorship is less practiced than in other disciplines, it means that more individual effort must be applied in order to get published.

The College therefore proposes that the number of publications for promotion from Senior Lecturer to Associate Professor as well as from Associate Professor to Professor be reduced to 12 at each stage.

3. **Multiple Authorship**
   There is considerable debate on author sequence in multi-authored publications and great variations in practice across disciplines. The College proposes that an assumption not be automatically made that the first listed author is the lead author as there are some cases in which authorship is listed alphabetically, in particular where there is equal contribution, etc. (See http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1769438/)

4. **Research Briefs and Editorship of Special Issue Journals**
   Research Briefs or Briefing Papers, like Working Papers, are derived from research projects and disseminated to the academic and policy communities (for definition and sense of their value please see http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/03098260305673). In some instances they are internally peer-reviewed before being published, often on institutional websites, and can be cited by others as authoritative research. In view of this the College proposes that Research Briefs be considered among the publications to be assessed as they qualify as genuine research efforts.

   Additionally the College proposes that just as editorship of books count towards promotion, editorship of special issues of academic journals be counted towards promotion also.

5. **Teaching Evaluation**
   The College takes cognizance of the fact that teaching loads would be considered in promotion and would like to emphasize that heavy teaching loads adversely affect publication output. In view of this the College proposes that:

i. Faculty who teach large classes and also those who are assigned many courses be adequately compensated in the assessment process.
ii. In the assessment of teaching, student evaluations should be considered as measures of teacher effectiveness and factored into the final assessment of this component.

6. **The Policy and Requirements for promotion in other Public Universities**
   The College would like to encourage the University of Ghana to lobby the NCTE to have similar promotion guidelines or allow different salary structures to obtain in relation to requirements for promotion and the standing of individual universities. This would reduce the University's risk of employee de-motivation and attrition.

ADDENDUM 2   COLLEGE OF BASIC AND APPLIED SCIENCES

1.0   INTRODUCTION

Following the Special meeting of the CBAS Academic Board (at which all Senior members in the College were invited) held on Friday September 11, 2015 to consider the proposed policy for the promotion of Academic Senior members, the Provost of the College by a letter dated September 11, 2015, constituted a Committee to put together a concise statement from the College on the new promotion policy. The committee was mandated to consider the key issues arising out of deliberations at the meeting and put together the College's position on the proposed policy.

1.1   Membership

The membership of the Committee was as follows;

Prof. J. Ofosu-Anim	- Dean, School of Agriculture/Chairman
Prof. Esther Sakyi-Dawson	- Department of Nutrition and Food Science/Member
Prof. M. Yangyuoru	- SIREC/Member
Dr. J. S. Ayivor	- IESS/Member
Mr. M. K. Glozah	- CBAS/SES/Secretary

1.2   Meetings

The Committee met on Friday September 25, 2015.

1.3   Documents Considered

The following documents were considered by the Committee;

- ➢ Report of the Committee to propose guidelines for promotion of Academic Staff (Draft for discussion and consultation).
- ➢ Write–up of the comments of the Special CBAS Academic Board meeting with the Committee on guidelines for promotion of UG Academic Senior Members held on September 11, 2015 (submitted by the Recorder of the CBAS Academic Board).
- ➢ Position papers on the new promotion policy submitted by the following constituent units of the CBAS;
  - School of Agriculture (including the Agricultural Research Centers)
  - School of Biological Sciences
  - School of Engineering Sciences
  - School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences
  - School of Veterinary Medicine, and
  - The Institute for Environment and Sanitation Studies.

2.0   GENERAL COMMENTS ON DRAFT POLICY

Promotions in the public universities in general, are tied to remunerations which are determined by the Fair Wages and Salaries Commission, and paid from the public purse through the Controller and Accountant General's Department. The College therefore suggests that, the proposed guidelines for promotion of academic staff be submitted to the Government of Ghana, through the National Council for Tertiary Education (NCTE) to be harmonized with the national policy on the promotion of all academic staff of Ghana.

Should the University of Ghana decide to go by its own policy as part of actions to achieve its vision of a world class research University, then the implementation of the policy should include aspects on staff remuneration that rewards the staff appropriately, or at least, should also provide a package that will not put the UG academic staff at a disadvantaged position. The College recommends that a special fund be set aside using the University's internally generated funds (IGF) to top-up salaries of staff on the ranks of Senior Lecturer and above as a way of motivating them appropriately pending the adoption of a harmonized national policy for the promotion of all academic staff of Ghana.

3.0   COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC SUBJECT MATTERS

3.1 Number of Publications Acceptable for Promotion

The College at its Special Academic Board meeting suggested a review of the recommendations by the Committee to Propose Guidelines for Promotion of Academic Staff on the minimum number of publications required for promotion to each level. The College's suggestion came after examining what pertains in other universities, such as Makerere University, Uganda (Table 1) which happens to be one of the high ranking Universities in Africa and is quite similar to UG.

**Table 1. Publication Requirements, Makerere University Fast Track Promotion, 2014

RANK	Publication
Lecturer to Senior Lecturer	5
Senior Lecturer to Associate Professor	+ 6
Associate Professor to Professor	+ 10
Total	**21**

**Table 2. Publication Requirements, Makerere University Ordinary track promotion, 2014

RANK	Publication
Lecturer to Senior Lecturer	3
Senior Lecturer to Associate Professor	+ 4
Associate Professor to Professor	+ 5
Total	**12**

> ***these are only publication requirements of Makerere University. Other requirements such as teaching, student supervision and number of years served at current rank, etc., are also considered in the promotion process.*

Based on Makerere's example and other local conditions, the Committee recommends numbers of publications for promotion as presented in Table 2, for consideration by the Committee to Propose Guidelines for Promotion of Academic Staff.

Table 3: Required number of Publications for Promotion suggested by CBAS

Rank	Lecturers	Research Fellows
Lecturer/Research Fellow to Senior Lecturer/Research Fellow	6	10
Senior Lecturer/Research Fellow to Associate Professor	10	12
Associate Professor to Professor	10	12
Total	**26**	**34**

In addition to the numbers shown in the Table, CBAS wishes to stress that apart from the number of publications the quality of each publication should be carefully considered as well.

3.2   Relative weights for Teaching, Research and Scholarly Work and University/Public Service

3.2.1   Amended criteria for promotion –Schedule F
As per University of Ghana Statutes, all Research Fellows are to be engaged in some teaching. However the report makes a distinction between RFs with no teaching assignment, and RF with teaching assignment, which appears to contravene the UG Statutes.

Teaching load by Research Fellows vary from one research unit to another. There should therefore be a clear distinction between units with more teaching and supervision loads and those

which only engage in minimal teaching or none at all. In other words, research units should be categorized based on their teaching and research engagement and those with disproportionate high teaching and supervision burdens should be categorized differently. For instance, in terms of teaching load, Institute of African Studies (IAS) may not be comparable to Noguchi Memorial Institute for Medical Research (NMIMR) even though they are all categorized as research units.

The College refers to page 9 of the draft report, and to the following statement: "Research Institutions with more teaching load". This statement, in our view, looks rather ambiguous and should be properly defined in line with our suggestion as in the preceding paragraph.

3.2.2 *University/Public Service*
The College recognizes that administrative load has a huge impact on the number of publications Academic Senior Members can turn out. In view of this, the College recommends that administrative load of Academic Senior Members should count as service to the University and should be awarded maximum points.

3.3 Proposed Research and Scholarly works assessment instrument
3.3.1 *Requirements for Progression*

The report did not capture research and scholarly works assessment for Research Fellows.

The College suggests that, publications to be considered for promotion from the position of Lecturer/Research Fellow to Senior Lecturer/Research Fellow should follow the same guidelines as proposed for Professorial positions.

It is noted that to attain the rank of Senior Lecturer, it is required of a Lecturer to be a sole author, lead or be a corresponding author in **6 publications** with additional **14 publications**, in the case of promotion to Associate Professor. In this case one is expected to lead in at least 50% which makes at least **7 publications as lead, sole author and corresponding author.** It is assumed that this upward movement from one level to the other is based on experience over years of service. It will therefore not be fair to the Lecturer with lower level of experience to lead in 6 publications whereas Associate Professors and Professors with longer years of experience lead in 7 publications. It is therefore suggested that the lecturer should be the **lead/ sole author/ corresponding author** in at least 3 of the 6 publications required. This suggests that for all positions, the applicant should be the lead-author in at least 50% of the publications.

At the professorial level however, it is expected that one mentors younger faculty and therefore may not necessarily contribute to publications as lead or corresponding author. Evidence of ability to show mentorship through research activities and collaboration with younger faculty and supervision of MPhil and PhD theses should be taken into consideration. For example where the applicant shows evidence that a publication of which he/she is not a lead or corresponding author

came out of research he/she originated, that should be counted the same as the applicant being the lead author.

This notwithstanding, CBAS is of the view that, the number of publications should not be over-emphasized above quality. Exceptionally good publications should be rewarded, if impact is considered. The weights given to all categories of publications should be clearly stated to minimize subjectivity.

Books and book chapters published by high profile publishing houses such as *Springer, Ashgate* and the likes, should be rated equally as the peer-review papers since they also go through rigorous editorial review before publication.

3.4 Publications submitted for promotion
3.4.1 Authorship
Emphasis on lead authorship as in the draft report does not promote collaborative work. The report seems to suggest that co-authorship carries no weight particularly in the case of the Lecturers.

In the opinion of the College, the order of co-authorship should not matter since the process of producing a paper from conception of ideas, through fieldwork and drafting of the report is done as a team. At the end of the process, it is only one person whose name could appear as a lead author. Each author is bound by ethics to contribute and the College thinks that any unethical issue should be a sole responsibility of the team.

In instances where there is international collaboration, for instance, each country coordinator may play equally the same role but when it comes to authorship, one of the country coordinators will have to be a lead author. This should not down-grade the contribution of the co-authors. The College suggests that, since positioning of the authors in the list may mean different things for different disciplines as pointed out in the report, equal weighting should be given each co-author. The contribution of each author should be given due consideration instead of just looking at their position in the publication.

3.4.2 Journals and their Impact Factors
The issue of publication in an appropriate or recognized Journal should be reconsidered. The College is of the view that, in the matter of New/Emerging/Online Journals, emphasis should be placed on the content of the Journal, its relevance, the composition of its Editorial Board, and how rigorous their peer review processes are, instead of focusing on its volume or reputation/recognized name. A distinction should however be made between purely predatory journals and emerging ones.

3.4.3 Honour and ethical issues

In Section 55 on page 31, the Committee proposes that when assessing the publications submitted by candidates seeking promotion, authorship should be based on Scholarship, Drafting, Approval and Accountability. "In determining authorship (emphasis ours) therefore the applicant must indicate the criteria that best fits their contribution to each multiple-authored publication. Specifically, the Committee is referring to **Scholarship; Drafting; Approval** and **Accountability…"** The proposal seem to suggest that if a senior member submits an exhibit in which he is clearly stated as one of the authors, he still has to prove that he is an author based on the four criteria of scholarship, drafting approval and accountability, which the College considers unnecessarily bureaucratic. There has to be an implicit assumption that all senior members are guided by honour and ethics. Once the exhibit identifies them as an author/co-author, there should be no need in proving authorship again.

Additionally with regard to "the defined types of unacceptable authorship (guest, gift and ghost authorship)" as referred to in page 31 of the draft report, it was not made clear how the 'unacceptable authorship' will be determined. As stated above, this is an ethical issue that should remain the sole responsibility of the research team.

3.5 Processing of Promotion

3.5.1 Feedback from College Appointments and Promotions Committee

In cases where an application for promotion is rejected, the College suggests that a full detail of the external assessors report and the College Appointments and Promotions report be made available to the candidate to guide in the re-submission of the application. Additionally, the College suggests that throughout the process of application and assessment, the applicant must be given feedback as to which stage the application is at.

3.5.2 Weight of External Reviewer

The draft report (as in page 10, item v) states that the final decision on the assessment process of promotion rests with the Appointing Authority. Since there is a process to be followed, why should the final decision be determined by the Appointment Committee? In instances where reviewers might have assessed and approved of exhibits for promotion, for example, why should the Appointing Authority review the same exhibits again? Do we continue to engage the services of external reviewers at a fee if we cannot accept their recommendations on exhibits as final?

3.5.3 Internal assessment of Exhibits for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

The College agrees with the proposal for internal assessment of applications for the position of Senior Lecturer (page 9, item L), however, where an applicant wants to be assessed externally, this should be allowed.

3.5.4 Additional Exhibits for Promotion

The College proposes the inclusion of an additional Promotion Exhibit (page 24, item 42) to reflect the work of Engineers. The Exhibit is to be called **Engineering Innovation**. It is defined as Design, Development of Systems, Processes and Products with a demonstrated commercial value that has not reached the patent stage.

3.6 Assessment of Teaching

The College is of the view that the concept of Department Teaching Assessment Committee (DTAC); though laudable, may have implementation challenges. In the College's view, peer assessment would increase subjectivity and personalization as peers may score their friends highly as compared with others colleagues. The College observed that the in-class evaluation format appears similar to that done by the Ghana Education Service for trainee teachers. In the College's opinion, this assessment procedure is unsuitable for Lecturers and should therefore not form part of the teaching portfolio. The College would rather prefer teaching evaluation that is based on the following criterion:

a) Teaching Load.

b) Student Evaluation of Lecturers if done effectively, with a higher percentage of students participating.

c) Head of Department Annual Report on Lecturers.

d) Head of Department record of course syllabi prepared by Lecturers.

e) Supervision of Graduate Students and Mentoring.

f) Minimum number of Teaching/Service years at the University required for promotion should be **at least 3 years** for each level.

4.0 GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the responses advanced in the foregoing, the following recommendations are made to make the policy guidelines for promotion of academic staff in the University of Ghana more relevant:

a. The **membership of the panel** that drafted the policy appeared to exclude representation from Research Units. The College believes that the inclusion of Research Fellows (RF) on the panel would have helped streamline pertinent issues that affect RF, for example issues pertaining to the number of publications required for promoting Research Fellows at all levels were not adequately addressed. Thus, the College recommends that future panels, should include all constituent units of the University.

b. Clearly stated **transitionary measures** and timelines should be put in place before the new policy takes full effect. This must be properly communicated to all academic staff.

c. The College did not see the link between the current proposal and new appointments to positions above the rank of Lecturer/Research Fellow. This should be clarified.

d. The policy guideline is silent on specific research regulations for Research Fellows. This would be useful to have.

e. Issues on the number of publications required for promoting a Research Fellow should be clearly stated (please paragraph 42 of the policy guideline).

f. Relative weights for Teaching, Research and scholarly work should include the supporting element of teaching.

g. Research units should be categorized based on their teaching and research engagement and those with disproportionately high teaching and supervision burdens should be categorized and assessed differently.

h. Papers put in for promotion from the position of Lecturer/Research Fellow to Senior Lecturer /Senior Research Fellow should follow the same guidelines as proposed for professorial positions. This suggests that for all positions, the applicant should be the lead-author in at least 50% of the publications.

i. In cases where an application for promotion is rejected, the College suggests that a full detail of the external assessors report and the College Appointments and Promotions report be made available to the candidate to guide in the re-submission of the application.

j. There is the need for more clarification on the report under section "S" (Page 8) which states that…."a candidate may be promoted to the rank applied for if his/her total weighted average is not less than **sixty (70)** points…" Is it 60 or 70?

k. Further, Page 18 of the document states that Teaching Load per Academic Year should be based on the **University Approved Formula**. Whatever constitutes the University approved formula must be clarified and also made known.

l. Course assessment by students at the end of the semester should be complemented with a Departmental Teaching Assessment and Evaluation (DTAE) procedure to make it more complete.

5.0 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the College of Basic and Applied Sciences wishes to state that since University of Ghana remains a public university under government subvention, any policies and guidelines for promotion should be guided by the principle of equal pay for equal work. The employer (the state) assumes that lecturers of similar ranks irrespective of where they are employed have the same work load and are therefore paid equally.

If the University of Ghana is more stringent in the assessment for promotion of its faculty than other public universities, UG will end up having lecturers who are perceived as "lower rated" compared to other public universities. Additionally, it may turn out that a Professor with fewer publications from other public universities would have a better standing in evaluating UG staff for promotion, and in the supervision of our graduate students. This, coupled with high

remuneration that comes with promotion, puts the UG faculty at a disadvantage and could risk some legal challenges.

ADDENDUM 3   COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES

Introduction
Academic Staff of the College of Health Sciences after a careful look at the draft report of the Committee to Propose Guidelines for Promotion of Academic Staff of the University is of the opinion that the draft guidelines attempt to make the promotion process fair, equitable and clearer for a diverse range of applicants.

The College of Health Sciences feels that the following if adopted could make the report very complete.

i.   **Dates for Receipt of Applications**
       Proposal from the Committee of Experts
       The Committee proposes August, 15 and January, 15 for the receipt of   applications for promotion to coincide with the first and second semesters respectively

       College of Health Sciences Proposal
       The College proposes the insertion of the words "on or before" the set dates.

       Justification:
       That will take care of the likelihood of the dates falling   within weekends   and public holidays

ii.   **Minimum Number of Publications Acceptable for Promotion**
       Proposal from the Committee of Experts
       The Committee proposes 10 publications for promotion of Research Fellow to Senior Research Fellow.

       College of Health Sciences Proposal
       The College proposes the reduction of the number of publications required for promotion of Research Fellow to Senior Research Fellow from 10 to 9.

       Justification:
       The reduction will make the number of required publications proportional for   all   staff. The ratio will then be 2:3 in all cases, i.e. 6:9 and 14:21 respectively.

iii.   University and Public Service
       The College proposes the inclusion of professional practice into the tool for assessment of University and Public Service (UPS); (Table 13, pg.33 of draft report).

       Under the professional practice, clinical service, teaching of interns and   residents   and innovations in clinical practice should be assessed for promotion.

<u>Justification</u>
Clinicians spend a lot of time on clinical services more than the extension services other faculty who are non-clinicians have to do. It is therefore suggested that a separate category be created in table 1, pg. 11 and weighted as indicated in the Table below.

Also Clinicians are obliged to teach house officers and residents in addition to undergraduates.

PROMOTION		Teaching Staff	RESEARCH FELLOW		Teaching plus Professional	Academic Librarian
			Teaching	Non-Teaching	Practice	
Lecturer to Senior Lecturer	Teaching				50	
	RSW				30	
	UPS				20	
	TOTAL				100	
Sen. Lecturer to Assoc. Prof.	Teaching				20	
	RSW				60	
	UPS				20	
	TOTAL				100	
Assoc. Prof. to Prof.	Teaching				10	
	RSW				70	
	UPS				20	
	TOTAL				100	

The College proposes that higher weighting should be given to administrative responsibilities since the administrative responsibilities take a lot of time. Faculty in high administrative offices like HoDs, Deans and Directors etc. should have a higher weighting for their administrative responsibilities/loads compared to other faculty members.

\

iv.   Implementation Date
        The College suggests that the implementation of this promotion document should not
        start immediately after approval. Rather, the implementation should start three years
        after the approval.

        Justification
        This is to ensure that all promotion applications that have been started are dealt with
        before the new policy is introduced.

v.   Procedures for Redress/Appeal
        The College again also suggests that there should be procedures for redress/appeal when
        applications are rejected.

Conclusion
It is the belief of the academic staff of the College of Health Sciences that these suggestions will
be included in the final report of the Committee to Propose Guidelines for the Promotion of
Academic Senior Members of the University of Ghana in order to make the document able to
serve the interest of the academic staff of the College of Health Sciences.

Signed   Signed
Augustine Amissare   Rev. Prof. Patrick F. Ayeh-Kumi
Secretary   Chairman

ADDENDUM 4   COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES

Faculty of the College of Humanities appreciate the initiatives being taken to put together promotions policy for academic staff. The comments are collated from written responses from units in the College to the draft report of the committee to develop guidelines for promotion (see appendices), and from discussions at a special meeting of the College Board held on Wednesday, 9 September 2015. We hope that the comments below go to strengthening the draft policy in terms of fairness and comprehensiveness.

<center>**Requirements for promotion**</center>

Recommended numbers of exhibits

1. The additional numbers of exhibits required for promotion to the professorial ranks for faculty in both teaching and research units (14 and 21 respectively) are unrealistic, bearing in mind that these are <u>minimum</u> requirements, applicants will feel the need to submit more exhibits, in order to increase their chances of promotion.
2. Overall the teaching units came to the decision of a minimum of 10 additional exhibits while research units recommended 16 additional exhibits. Fellows in research units that are mandated to teach UGRC courses (i.e., IAS and the Language Centre) and who can demonstrate significant undergraduate teaching load should fall in a mid-range between teaching and research fellows and should therefore be required to submit a minimum of 13 exhibits.
3. The College is of the view that the focus should be on cumulative numbers rather than additional exhibits.

Differences in numbers required for research and teaching units

4. In general, the difference in numbers required for teaching and research staff is large and should be reconsidered, given that faculty in research units have considerable post-graduate teaching and supervision.
5. Moreover, the distinction between research and teaching units is not absolute. Even among research institutes, the teaching load for faculty members differs; for instance, there are faculty in research institutes and centres like RIPS who are on the teaching track, and IAS research fellows generally have a heavy undergraduate teaching load. These differences should be taken into account in promotion.
6. Given the above-mentioned reality, rather than provide fixed numbers of publications required, a range should be given so that those whose work tilts more towards teaching can apply with the minimum and those with a heavy research load can work towards the maximum.

7. The policy does not specify how joint appointments between teaching and research units, in particular should be handled, even though this was approved during the revision of the College statutes.

Quantity versus quality

8. The report places a great deal of emphasis on quantity of exhibits, to the relative neglect of quality. The question of the quality of the journal outlet does not seem to be considered even though, in other academic spaces, it is possible to get a promotion on the basis of three well-placed articles or one critically-acclaimed book. The recommendation is that promotion be based more on quality of research work and the quality and weighting of the journals into which this work is submitted, rather than on the quantity of papers published.

9. Promotion to the professorial rank should reflect one's overall contribution to an area of scholarship. The mechanical assessment of individual exhibits does not get to this question of scholarly reputation and contribution.

Value/weights given to different types of exhibits

10. On p. 22, the parameters given should not be imposed too rigorously. Although Harley et al. (2010) may be a useful guide, its recommendations do not have to be taken completely, especially given that it speaks to a different academic and publishing context than pertains in Ghana.

11. The College is concerned about scholarly work that seem to have been neglected or not given sufficient value:
    - *edited books***:** these require a great deal of time and a wide grasp of a research area or discipline, and should count as one contribution to one's area of scholarship and as mentorship of other scholars.

    - *journal editing* as part of the editorial board of a journal. (see above)

    - *creative works,* including installations, productions of choreography and art exhibitions or the writing of plays and musical pieces which can entail considerable amounts of research and a mastery of technique. *(The statement by the School of Performing Arts in the appendices provides more detail about how creative works should be assessed).* The tendency in the report to privilege analytical works over researched creative works has been largely overcome by several highly regarded tertiary institutions around the world, and UG must strive to be abreast of these developments.

    - *policy briefs*

    - *textbooks*: considering that there is a dearth of undergraduate textbooks written by Ghanaian scholars in economics, political science and other subjects, it is

important that faculty members are encouraged to produce texts that are situated in the Ghanaian context and that utilize Ghanaian data.

- *distant education modules*

- *peer-reviewed discussion papers* should be considered, especially if (non-reviewed) working papers are included as acceptable publications. (The definition of discussion papers is given on p. 24, item 43).

- *training:* in LECIAD and other units, faculty are to undertake training, in addition to teaching and research.

- *international assignments* such as those undertaken by LECIAD staff

- *supervision of students'* thesis and field placements/attachments

- *service in other universities* in other universities one may have worked in before joining UG

- *grants/fund-raising activities* should be captured because most cutting edge research are conducted from grants and fundraising is a lifeline for departments, centres, etc.

Assessment of exhibits

12. Table 9 (also, p. 25, item 44) should include some guidance on what is meant by originality, contribution to knowledge, and relevance, etc. The range given (0-5) should also be explained--what does a 5 mean, versus 3, and so on?

13. Table 9 -- The meaning of 'quality' should be made clear, since the other columns provide for 'innovation' and 'originality'. How can quality be defined separately from innovation, originality, etc.?

Co-authorship

14. For the humanities and social sciences, co-authors do not exceed three persons conventionally and considerations other than the weight of one's contribution can determine who the lead or corresponding author is. Therefore, for publications with up to three authors, each author should be given full and equal credit for the exhibit.

15. For the above reasons, the clause in table 12, p. 9 that requires applicants for senior lecturer/research fellow to submit only sole or lead-authored publications should be removed.

Teaching assessment

16. Rather than the emphasis on the DTAC, the existing student assessment process should streamlined and broadened out, so it can be used as a teaching assessment component.

17. Does an applicant have an input into who sits on his/her DTAC? There is need for caution given ideological and pedagogical differences that can sometimes lead to rifts and victimization.
18. On p. 17, table 3---some items on the table need clarification, such as 'continuous scholarly growth'? Also, the items listed on the table are very qualitative but the responses require quantitative assessment.
19. On p. 18, table 4--25 questions are too many to be answered in a single classroom session.

Administrative work

20. There were mixed opinions about the weight of administrative work. While some felt the 10% weight would discourage faculty from taking up administrative positions, others thought the weight was too much because not everyone is given equal opportunity to take up administrative positions. However, since the demand for such duties tends to increase as one goes up the academic ladder, and there should be progressive increase in the weight of administrative service the higher up the ladder one goes.

Processes for promotion

Timing of submission of applications

21. The two submission dates for promotion are limiting. COH recommends submission of applications quarterly (that is, four submission dates in a year).

Processes at School and College levels

22. The majority opinion in the COH opposes the internal assessment of scholarly works for promotion to senior lecturer/research fellow because of questions of trust, unfairness and possible victimization. The recommendation is that an external assessment of these applications be done, just as for promotion to the professorial ranks.
23. The role of the Head of Department (HOD), which is a problem given the history of HODs sometimes stifling 'high flyers'.
24. For the creative arts, there is a need for a peer review mechanism comprising of both external and internal members of the school of Performing Arts to serve as quality control before papers are sent out for assessment.
25. The SMCs should be left out in the processing of professorial appointments as this creates another layer in the promotion process. Even though their inclusion may serve as control mechanism (in case of differing recommendations at the School and College levels about an application), the consensus is that the composition of the College Appointments and Promotions Board provides sufficient balance.

26. Page 12, item 18 should read 'Where a sitting Dean or Director applies for promotion, the Provost should handle the application.'
27. The process for applying for promotion by Deans and Directors should also apply to HODs who are of professorial status.

Exhibits Assessed

28. Even if only additional publications since the last promotion go out for assessment, previous assessor's reports should be added to the package so that an applicant is being assessed based on their entire body of scholarship.

Role of applicant, assessors and Appointments Board

29. The document should make clear the relative weights given to the recommendations/decisions of the university's Appointments Board and the external assessors. Our recommendation is that the assessors' recommendation should be privileged since they are the only persons to evaluate an applicant's entire portfolio of exhibits.
30. It is not clear whether an applicant is bound to the recommendations of the HOD, SMC or College Board to hold on, amend or proceed with the application process.

Tracking

31. On p. 13--the COH recommends that a university-wide <u>online</u> tracking system be adopted that would follow an application through the various levels (much as is done for leave applications), rather than leaving each college or school to come up with its own separate tracking system (p. 13).

Appeal or redress

32. The policy should outline avenues for redress if an applicant is not satisfied with the decision of the appointments boards (at the college and university levels). This process should not require applicants to bring their case to the same Appointments Board that made the original decision. In other words, appeals over promotions decisions should go directly to an appeals board and not to the full appointments board.
33. The policy should make clear what information an applicant is entitled to in the appeal process. This should include a written statement of the decision by the SMC or Appointments Board, and the assessors' report (with assessors' names redacted).

Transitioning from old promotion system to new one

34. The report should clarify the process of transition to the new promotion policy.

35. Of particular concern is the emphasis on additional publication, which may disadvantage those who have earlier applied to positions with more than the minimum required number. Thus, rather than additional publications, we should consider using cumulative numbers