Appendix C: Staff Profile

1) Supervisory Capacity in 2018: Number of Staff Members with Doctoral degrees

Number of staff members with doctoral degrees per population group (African, Coloured, Indian, White, unknown/not disclosed), gender (male, female, unknown/not disclosed), nationality (South African, SADC excluding SA, other African, other foreign) and field of study (as indicated in the table below) for the year 2018. The demographic data are to be provided for the total as well as per field of studies.

Field of Study	CESM Categories
Science Engineering and Technology (SET)	01, 02, 06, 08, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16
Health Sciences	09
Business and Commerce	04
Education	07
Humanities and Social Sciences	03, 05, 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 20

1.1. Number of staff members with doctoral degrees by CESM, population group and gender

CESM	African	Coloured	Indian	White	Grand Total
SET	**23**	**31**	**4**	**289**	**347**
Female	10	11		89	110
Male	13	20	4	200	237
Humanities and Social Sciences	**13**	**18**	**3**	**130**	**164**
Female	5	9		63	77
Male	8	9	3	67	87
Business and Commerce	**7**	**2**	**1**	**55**	**65**
Female	2	2	1	19	24
Male	5			36	41
Education		**16**	**1**	**12**	**29**
Female		8		10	18
Male		8	1	2	11
Health	**1**	**5**	**5**	**27**	**38**
Female		2	2	16	20
Male	1	3	3	11	18
Grand Total	**44**	**72**	**14**	**513**	**643**

1.2. Number of staff members with doctoral degrees by CESM and Nationality SADC and Other African

CESM	SET	Humanities & Social Sciences	Business & Commerce	Grand Total
BWA		1		**1**
MDG	1			**1**
MWI	1			**1**
SWZ	1			**1**
ZWE	8			**8**
GHA			1	**1**
GMB	1			**1**
KEN		2		**2**
NGA	1	1	2	**4**
UGA			1	**1**
Grand Total	**13**	**4**	**4**	**21**

1.3. Number of staff members with doctoral degrees by South African Nationality

CESM	SET	Humanities & Social Sciences	Business & Commerce	Education	Health	Grand Total
ZAF	**291**	**151**	**57**	**29**	**38**	**566**

1.4 Number of staff members with doctoral degrees by CESM and Nationality Other Foreign

CESM	SET	Humanities & Social Sciences	Business & Commerce	Grand Total
AUS	3			**3**
AUT	2			**2**
BEL	3		1	**4**
CAN	1			**1**
CHE	2			**2**
CHL	1			**1**
CHN	2		1	**3**
CZE	1			**1**
DEU	9	2	1	**12**
DNK	1			**1**
ESP	1			**1**
FIN			1	**1**
FRA	2	2		**4**
GBR	3			**3**
IND	1			**1**

ITA	2			**2**
NLD	3			**3**
NZL	1			**1**
POL		1		**1**
PRT	2	2		**4**
ROU	1			**1**
RUS	1			**1**
SWE		1		**1**
USA	1	1		**2**
Grand Total	**43**	**9**	**4**	**56**

2) Head Count of Supervisors in 2018

Number of staff members supervising doctoral candidates enrolled in 2018, per population group (African, Coloured, Indian, White, unknown/not disclosed), gender (male, female, unknown/not disclosed), nature of appointment (full-time, part-time, occasional), nationality (South African, SADC excluding SA, other African, other foreign) and field of study (as indicated in the table below), and highest qualification (PhD/other). The demographic data are to be provided for the total as well as per field of studies.

Field of Study	**CESM Categories**
Science Engineering and Technology (SET)	01, 02, 06, 08, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16
Health Sciences	09
Business and Commerce	04
Education	07
Humanities and Social Sciences	03, 05, 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 20

CESMs	Doctoral Degree	General Bachelors Degree	Honours Degree	Masters Degree	MTEch Degree	No Information	Other Qualification	Postgraduate Dip or Certificate	Prof First Bachelors Degree	Grand Total
Business and Commerce	**94**			**5**		**11**	**18**			**128**
Female	17						3			20
Male	76			5			15			96
No Information	1					11				12
Education	**91**	**2**		**8**		**2**	**5**			**108**
Female	42			8		1				51
Male	49	2					5			56
No Information						1				1
Health Sciences	**56**	**3**		**11**		**70**	**31**		**2**	**173**
Female	32			10			15			57
Male	24	3		1		1	16		2	47
No Information						69				69
Humanities and Social Sciences	**262**		**4**	**19**	**2**	**38**	**32**			**357**
Female	86		2	10			20			118
Male	174			9	2		12			197
No Information	2		2			38				42
No Information	**15**					**1**	**17**			**33**
Female	11						7			18
Male	4					1	10			15
SET	**908**	**7**	**9**	**63**		**132**	**117**	**17**		**1253**
Female	256	1		25			43	16		341
Male	652	6	9	38			74	1		780
No Information						132				132
Grand Total	**1426**	**12**	**13**	**106**	**2**	**254**	**220**	**17**	**2**	**2052**

3) Supervisory Load

If not already discussed under Section 5.1 above, provide details of how your Doctoral supervisory workload is managed. This should include details of provision for the maintenance of appropriate Doctoral supervisor-student ratios, in relation to other academic staff commitments and responsibilities.

Supervisor load and the management of supervisory workload has been discussed under Section 5.1. Doctoral supervision workload is not as easily managed as, for example the allocation of an undergraduate teaching load. It was concluded that there are no universally accepted 'appropriate Doctoral supervisor-student ratios' at Stellenbosch University but that the management of supervisory workload largely occurs at an individual level and tends to be a spontaneous balancing of all the commitments and responsibilities associated with academic work.

The institutional mechanism which is used to monitor all staff's work is the annual performance appraisal process which, in turn is driven by each individual's annual work agreement. Student supervision (especially at PhD level) and graduation of students (especially PhDs) is encouraged and these activities count favourably towards the overall performance assessment of academic staff, especially for promotion.

It is also worth mentioning that the management (Head of Department/Departmental Chairperson) of academic departments at an institution like Stellenbosch University is a rotating responsibility. This results in frequent change of Departmental management and consequently, some inconsistency in terms of the level of knowledge and experience that Heads of Department possess in matters of academic staff management. To address this, an annual HoD Indaba was introduced in 2018. This forum is helping to professionalise the role and support the needs of Heads of Departments. It also provides a peer-environment where views, challenges and good practices can be discussed and shared. The topic of performance management of academic staff has been on the agenda along with other issues relating to financial management of departments, improvement of productivity, mentorship, staff well-being and so forth.

During the self-evaluation discussions, the Review Coordinator did come across one particular department who had an interesting story to relate regarding its concerted efforts to increase

PhD outputs. The sentiments expressed in the environment resonate with the findings of a study done by De Jager, Frick and van der Spuy (2016) regarding the factors which contributed toward enhancing research productivity in academic departments. This particular department was at risk of closure when a new HoD with a PhD from abroad was appointed. He immediately began his tenure by putting an end to private consulting activities by the academic staff and prioritising and incentivising research and research outputs instead. Just as De Jager et al (2016) found in their study, this particular department has developed a strong research culture through actively providing its academic staff and PhD students with international exposure and encouraging a culture of publication amongst staff members and students. The result has been that the department is financially viable with a thriving postgraduate student body supported by research active academic staff. Most notable is the growth in this department's PhD graduates, including amongst its staff. The management of supervisory workload in this department is entirely self-regulatory. Those who supervise and successfully graduate PhD students are rewarded with a portion of research income and it also play a role in the academic's promotional possibilities. Conversely, any staff in the environment who are less research active are compelled to accept a higher teaching load and in this manner, multiple priorities are achieved.

There are numerous other examples at the institution where the establishment of a *"mature research culture"* (De Jager et al, 2016), for example around SARChIs or other high profile researchers have led to increased PhD outputs. However, the pace at which this sort of reorientation can take place is naturally dependent of the availability of posts that departments can fill with candidates who have the correct profile to cultivate a mature research culture.

References:

De Jager, P. Frick, L. & van der Spuy, P. 2016. Developments in the production of economics PhDs at four research-intensive universities in South Africa. *South African Journal of Science.* 13 (3/4): 9.