

Workshopped Faculty Points for the Improvement Plan September 2021

Prof LJ Rafapa 06 September 2021

Discussion Point	Faculty Input	Terms of Reference	Session Output	Points for Faculty Improvement Plan
<p>1. Streamline administrative and bureaucratic processes</p>	<p>FH to implement turnaround times contained in the University–approved faculty policy as well as submit to Central PG office by means of packaged documents rather than individual cases in isolation</p> <p>Amend the “Outline” faculty policy document to have dissertations and theses submitted along with other documents to FEC for approval of external assessors (paragraph 8)</p> <p>Inculcate the culture of supervisors submitting research reports and directing related enquiries to the Faculty Research and PG Office and NOT to the Central PG Office</p>	<p>Turnover: Note points for common understanding of the time corrections must take HODs after FEC meeting to appoint external assessors; how long Directors should take to resubmit to FEC; (paragraph 9)how long supervisors must take after receiving summary reports to submit summarised reports; etc.</p> <p>Identify and beef up the pertinent University rule to address HEQC concern</p>	<p>Proposals The student should make a presentation before registration in the Programme. Once registered the proposal is sent to the Departmental Research Committee.</p> <p>Until when should first entering PG students be allowed to register in an academic year?</p> <p>Once approved at the School or Departmental committee, the corrected proposal should be sent within <u>two weeks</u> to the FHDC.</p> <p>Can the student and supervisor refuse to effect corrections required by DREC, SREC and FHDC?</p>	<p>All students should make proposal presentations in the department before registration. Once the student is registered the proposal should be submitted to the Departmental Research and Ethics Committee (DREC).</p> <p>The institution should reconcile the opening of PG registration throughout the year with the June audit cut-off date.</p> <p>Once approved at the DREC, the proposal should be processed further to the School Director (SD) and Faculty Higher Degrees Committee (FHDC) within 14 calendar days.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On the Table of Corrections students should be free to indicate where they are not comfortable with an input from the REC, and motivate.



FH outline of postgraduate policy for



Clarification of operational implications



Postgraduate progress tracking template



Outstanding Summarised Reports



Research Professor memo of 17 August 2017



TREC letter from School Matshanisani N


What is required during proposal submission, since we differ from one school to the other?

Summarised reports should depend on what changes are expected. If both assessors have passed the student, the student should submit the



- REC can insist on all corrections made including where motivation is given for differing. If the supervisor then agrees the matter would have been resolved.
- Should the supervisor and student not be happy with such an insistence, then only revisions agreed upon should be done.
- Should the REC continue to insist, democratic deadlock breaking mechanisms should be invoked.
- If that does not work, the discretion of the Chairperson should be invoked to resolve the looming impasse.
- If this still does not help, the matter should be escalated.




Students should not just walk in for registration but should develop and present concept papers to the Head of Department (HOD) prior to registration.


In cases where both assessors have passed the student, the supervisor should submit the summarised report accompanied by a Table of Corrections

		<p>corrected version with table of corrections within two week.</p> <p>There is also a question regarding the need for summarised report from the supervisor</p> <p>Policy on Appointment of assessors Agreed that we should maintain the status of supervisors recommending external assessors because they are the ones who know the experts in their fields.</p> <p>Suggestion that the Central postgraduate office be decentralised. Faculty have its P/G office staff</p>	<p>within 14 calendar days to the Faculty Research and Postgraduate Office.</p> <p>Only a memo should suffice mentioning only key points that sum up the gist of what is now required in the long summarised report</p> <p>A distinction should be made between departments recommending and Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) appointing. Only FEC appoints assessors and these may not eventually be the ones recommended by supervisors.</p> <p>The Central Postgraduate Office should be decentralised and housed in the Faculty Research and Postgraduate Office.</p>	
<p>2. Actively strengthen a research culture</p>	<p>Introduce research colloquiums, seminars, as well as proposal and thesis defences prior to School Research Committee approvals and submission for assessment respectively</p>	<p>Identify and beef up pertinent University rules</p> <p> FH outline of postgraduate policy fc</p>	<p>Faculty need to strongly consider expediting the processing of student proposals & dissertations/theses</p> <p>Presently, the administration and processing of the proposals and theses is poor.</p>	<p>Communication between supervisors and faculty should entail supervisors being copied at all exit points up to FHDC, later by means of an automated system.</p> <p>An oral proposal defence should be compulsory before a proposal is approved by the Departmental Research and Ethics Committee (DREC) and this should be implemented during pre-registration induction.</p>

			<p>There's a need for the faculty to offer sufficient academic support to supervisors</p> <p>Policies governing research activities in the faculty need to talk to each other in order to enhance the research culture</p> <p>Need for balance between research and teaching. As of present, the latter is taking centre stage at the expense of research activities (e.g., mentoring & support programs for junior staff, defences, collaborations, colloquium). For instance, faculty to consider freeing academic staff once a week to focus on research activities</p> <p>What about differentiating level competencies for the various research activities, e.g. departments to organise or school or faculty?</p> <p>Research related activities and publications should not be optional. There's a need for auditing and monitoring of research outputs in order to help academics in need of support in the faculty.</p> <p>For accessibility and support to supervisors and students, the faculty should consider having its own statistician.</p>	<p>An oral defence should be compulsory before a thesis may be sent out for assessment.</p> <p>SRECs should assume ethical clearance duties</p> <p>The weighting of research and teaching responsibilities for all academics should be equal at a 50-50 proportion.</p> <p>Research activities like colloquiums, seminars and symposiums should be organised regularly by departments independently of FHDC.</p> <p>The monitoring approach should be developmental towards inexperienced researchers and it should not be optional for any academic to perform in research.</p> <p>The faculty should have its own statistician to support supervisors and students.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

<p>3. Probe impact of shortened proposal approval route</p>	<p>Devise an audit instrument comparing turnaround between now and the period prior to 2020</p>	<p>Consolidate common understanding of the approved faculty policy document</p> <p>Give inputs towards the instrument design</p> <p> Faculty Research Proposal Approval Ro</p> <p> Research Professor memo of 17 August 2</p>	<p>Faculty should consider developing a research tool or document that will guide in the screening of research students' eligibility for enrolment in postgraduate studies. This would be an add on to the basic entry requirements.</p> <p>Guidelines towards/blueprint for the audit instrument, e.g. expertise needed, possible involvement of a statistician, possible research topic for an MEd student, the possibility of outsourcing, etc. ??</p> <p>Faculty to consider introducing proposal writing aspects at an undergraduate level to ready or prepare students for the undertaking of postgraduate studies</p>	<p>The faculty should develop a research tool or document that will guide in the screening of research students' eligibility for enrolment in postgraduate studies after the basic entry requirements are met.</p> <p>The University statistician (Dr Mutanga's Office) should provide us with indicators (e.g. throughput rates, graduation rates) to help us determine the impact of the shortened approval route comparatively.</p> <p>The faculty should incorporate proposal writing aspects in undergraduate programmes to prepare students for postgraduate studies.</p>

		 <p>TREC letter from School Matshanisi N</p>  <p>Clarification of operational implicatio</p>	<p>Faculty to consider interrogating the issue of African languages vs foreign languages in postgraduate research studies. Use of foreign languages impact on the progress of students. The practice needs to be relooked in favour of African languages in the undertaking of post-graduate studies.</p>	<p>The University's language policy should be in favour of African languages in the undertaking of postgraduate studies.</p>
<p>4. Uniformly adhere to use of Turnitin</p>	<p>Turnitin reports to accompany the submission of all proposals as well as dissertation/thesis chapters and final complete documents</p>	<p>Identify and beef up the pertinent University rule to address HEQC concern</p>  <p>FH outline of postgraduate policy fc</p>	<p>Use of turnitin should be a standard practice in the faculty</p> <p>To facilitate the above, the faculty need to avail an IT-personnel to supervisors and students or find a way to collaborate with ICT.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All proposals submitted for approval must be accompanied with a Turn-it report, right up to TREC. • A Turnit-in report should accompany the thesis/dissertation and submitted along with other documents to external assessors • It must be compulsory for students and supervisors to attend Turnit-in training. • Supervisors and students should be trained to identify and avoid more subtle forms of plagiarism like self-plagiarism and exceeding of the similarity phrase length (not to be longer than five words).

<p>5. Uniformly adhere to publication in accredited journals</p>	<p>Compulsory mentioning of an accredited publication harvested from the thesis or proof of approved submission to an accredited journal/essay collection together with submission of thesis for assessment</p>	<p>Identify and beef up the pertinent University rule to address HEQC concern</p>  <p>FH outline of postgraduate policy fr</p>	<p>For quality of publications, the faculty to consider reviewing the quality of journals accredited and published by DHET and recommend to the faculty. Some of the listed journals are of low quality.</p> <p>There's a need for the identification of discipline specific quality journals by the faculty and shared with member staff.</p> <p>Is this not duplication of Mr Lekalakala's office in DRDA??</p>	<p>Students should be encouraged to publish before they are assessed and should attach at least proof of acceptance of a manuscript when they submit documents for external assessment, without making this compulsory. Already-registered students should not be affected by whatever implementation date.</p>
<p>6. More interrogation of compliance with and value of workplans</p>	<p>Insist on all supervisors filing signed MOUs and Contracts with students as well as submission of satisfaction surveys filled by supervisees</p>	<p>Identify and beef up the pertinent University rule to address HEQC concern</p> <p>Make inputs towards the monitoring instrument</p>  <p>FH outline of postgraduate policy fr</p>	<p>Consider using google docs which can be shares within a short space of time</p>	<p>Research Management software should be secured for a digitised submission of compulsory documents (e.g. use of Google docs), in liaison with DRDA and/or ICT. DRDA should be asked to incorporate this in the digitisation of progress tracking.</p>
<p>7. Guidelines needed to formalise the appointment of External Supervisors/ Co-Supervisors</p>	<p>Compile guidelines on need, eligibility, contracts and channels of communication for External Supervisors/Co-Supervisors</p>	<p>Identify and beef up the pertinent University rule to address HEQC concern</p>	<p>No mention of external supervisors and co-supervisors appointment in the policy. (not an employee of UL)</p>	<p>A policy should be developed for the appointment of external supervisors and co-supervisors:</p>



FH outline of postgraduate policy for

Appointee should have relevant CESM expertise.

Letter of appointment and incentives for external supervisors. Remuneration tables.

Benchmarking necessary on incentives for external supervisors

External supervisors to be appointed with internal co-supervisor for administrative duties. Internal supervisor to be the main supervisor.(Relevant CESM expertise)

No maximum years or cool off period for supervisors.

Appointment of supervisors will still be made by FEC after submission by the Department.

Feedback from and to supervisors to be improved.(Automated system to be implemented?)

The finer distinctions among CESM categories should be considered when departments recommend external supervisors/co-supervisors

There should be standard templates for appointment letters.



Benchmarking must be done in order to have competitive incentives for external supervisors/co-supervisors.


External supervisors should be appointed with internal co-supervisors for administrative purposes, with the internal supervisor possessing a relevant CESM expertise and assuming the role of main supervisor.





No cool-off period should be needed to appoint external supervisors/co-supervisors who have previously been employed by the institution.

The appointment of external supervisors shall be made by FEC after recommendations by departments.

Communication to and feedback from the external supervisors should be integrated in the envisaged automated system.

			<p>Consider appointing external supervisors who are diligent and fulfil obligations. Decisive action should be taken where there is laxity.</p> <p>Students could have link with supervisor and be able to track the progress of their submission. (Project type management) Supervisors dismissed when not performing? External supervisors' appointment be tied to G10.</p>	<p>In cases where there is laxity and dishonouring of contracts decisive action should be taken against the external supervisor/co-supervisor.</p> <p>Students should have a link with external supervisors enabling them to track the progress of their submission</p> <p>Contracts for the appointment of external supervisors should be tied to preventing students' exclusion by Rule G10.</p>
<p>8. Involvement of all staff with PhD in supervision of doctoral students</p>	<p>Introduce a faculty policy of appointing a Mentor for each doctoral student as well as involving inexperienced staff members with doctoral qualifications in co-supervision</p>	<p>Identify and beef up the pertinent University rule to address HEQC concern</p> <p> FH outline of postgraduate policy for</p> <p> Faculty Research Committee Members</p>	<p>Experienced supervisors should become mentors for inexperienced ones via co-supervision</p> <p>Encourage staff to attend supervision workshops for supervisors.</p>	<p>All colleagues with a PhD must be paired with experienced researchers and supervise students.</p> <p>Only after co-supervising to completion one PhD graduate should a colleague be allowed to supervise alone.</p>
<p>9. Ways to reduce the reporting administrative load for both students and supervisors</p>	<p>Make use of Mentors rather than supervisors in compilation of summarised reports as well as determine whether the current practice of summarised reports should be continued or replaced</p>	<p>Identify and beef up the pertinent University rule to address HEQC concern</p>	<p>Shortened route of approval.</p> <p>Do not agree to include mentors in compilation of summarised reports, only supervisors as the case is now.</p>	<p>The shortened proposal approval route should continue with DREC approving, SREC endorsing and FHDC ratifying.</p> <p>Supervisors should continue to compile and submit summarised reports.</p>

	with the further processing of full assessment reports only	 FH outline of postgraduate policy fr	<p>No need to add another layer to the process.</p> <p>Summarised reports could be shortened. Keep both assessment reports, important to student.</p> <p>Keep to 1:5 allocation.</p>	<p>The covering letter described elsewhere in this document accompanied by both assessment reports should suffice, removing the need for a summarised report.</p> <p>The supervisor-student ratio of 1:5 per academic year should be implemented.</p>
10. Threshold of proven supervision record to supervise a PhD student independently	Have a record of Experienced versus Inexperienced researchers as well as enrich it with required minimum completed supervision for eligibility to supervise doctoral students independently	<p>Discuss and fill in required content for the “Experienced Researchers” faculty document</p> <p>Agree on required minimum completed supervision for eligibility to supervise doctoral students independently</p> <p>Identify and beef up the pertinent University rule to address HEQC concern</p>	<p>Co-supervision for PhD candidates is suggested before one can do that independently</p> <p>There is a need for criteria that makes one eligible to supervise PhD candidates independently</p>	

		 <p>FH outline of postgraduate policy fc</p>  <p>Experienced Researchers.docx</p>  <p>Faculty Research Committee Membersl</p>		
<p>11. Rule G10 strict compliance and distinction of full-time and part-time studies</p>	<p>Make inputs into enforcing strict adherence to Rule G10 as well as differentiate applications to part-time and full-time students</p>	<p>Tabulate distinctions between full-time and part-time students</p> <p>Identify and beef up the pertinent University rule to address HEQC concern</p>  <p>FH outline of postgraduate policy fc</p>	<p>G10 to be strictly adhered to.</p> <p>G10 applies to maximum time of attendance.</p> <p>UL approved as full time contact institution.</p>	<p>The institution should in future consider revising maximum stays in a programme to 4+2 for part-time PhD, and 3+2 for part-time MA.</p> <p>The institution should in future apply for the approval of some programmes as part-time, as this is likely to benefit longitudinal studies.</p>
<p>12. Guidelines for appointing a new supervisor as soon as possible after departure or resignation</p>	<p>Introduce a system to re-confirm sustained supervision for all students on a monthly basis through feedback provided by students</p>	<p>Identify and beef up the pertinent University rule to address HEQC concern</p>	<p>Co-supervision for PhD candidates is suggested before one can do that independently</p> <p>There is a need for criteria that makes one eligible to supervise PhD candidates independently</p>	




		 FH outline of postgraduate policy fc	<p>If someone resigns from the university we can appoint them as external supervisors provided they agree to continue, and we should also appoint someone internally to liaise with the student</p> <p>Ways to solicit feedback from students??</p>	<p>A system should be introduced to monitor and assert sustained supervision for all students on a monthly basis through feedback provided by students.</p>
<p>13. Ensure the objective evaluation of proposals at any level</p>	<p>Devise a policy for the faculty to deal with students' and supervisors' appeals</p> <p>Amplify advantages for having appeal process in place in relation to operations in instances like proposal revisions, ethical clearance, assessment, etc.</p>	<p>Lay down the two different procedures for appeal by:</p> <p>Identifying and beefing up the pertinent University rules to address HEQC concern</p> <p>Outline how and why differences of opinion may not harm operational productivity</p>  FH outline of postgraduate policy fc	<p>Appeal policy to be designed.</p> <p>Clear template for Depts, Schools and Faculty</p> <p>Benchmarking could be done.</p> <p>Go legal route when appeal is launched.</p> <p>Request Prof Rafapa to draft a Policy for the Faculty.</p> <p>Appeal or arbitration?</p> <p>Guidelines/blueprint for the appeal policy??</p>	<p>Two separate dispute resolution policies for students and supervisors must be developed and implemented.</p> <p>A small committee should be constituted to benchmark and then work on the details.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where there is a supervisor and co-supervisor and the student is not satisfied with supervision by either, the student should first indicate his/her detailed dissatisfaction to one of the two. If that does not help, the student should involve the mentor. If not resolved the dissatisfaction should be escalated to the HOD. The HOD can enlist the help of the REC if

				<p>difficult to finalise. If still not adequately handled, the SD should be involved through the HOD, and in the discretion of the SD if not resolved still be escalated to SREC. Should the situation persist, the matter can be taken by the SD to the Faculty Research and Postgraduate Office. The next level should be DVC RIP if necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the case of the supervisor the first point for expressing dissatisfaction with the supervisee will be with the co-supervisor; if dissatisfaction is with a DREC decision it will be the HOD in consultation with the co-supervisor. Thereafter the same route of escalation will apply upwards as above if need be.
<p>14. Entrench a thorough sensitivity to and knowledge of substantive ethical considerations</p>	<p>Conduct biannual training on ethics for students, supervisors and members of the REC at the three levels of the faculty</p>	<p>Make inputs towards organisation of the three-tier biannual training on substantive ethical considerations</p>	<p>Need for faculty to develop ethic oriented workshops aligned to TREC for the induction of students and supervisors</p> <p>The faculty needs to entrench a culture of ethical research supervision whereby amongst other issues regarding the</p>	<p>The faculty should liaise with DRDA and CAE and identify relevant online modules on ethics and impel supervisors and students to enrol.</p> <p>The faculty should look around for external accredited workshops to which supervisors and students can be invited.</p>

			balance of power-relations in supervision are observed.	PhD students should be enrolled for an online ethics module at the start of their research.
<p>15. Organise supervision induction courses/workshops that include issues like social justice, power relations, a range of supervision models, and Doctoral pedagogies</p>	<p>The Faculty's University-approved "Outline" policy document subjected to a workshop covering all supervisors, to clarify regulated power relations including whether and under which circumstances communication between external assessors on the one hand as well as between supervisors and external assessors on the other hand may take place as well as other policy aspects meant for social justice without paralysing operations</p>	<p>Make inputs on communication policy between external assessors of a single research report</p> <p>Make inputs towards a communication policy between supervisors and external assessors of the work they are supervising (paragraphs 10 & 11)</p> <p>Identify and beef up the pertinent University rules to address HEQC concern</p>	<p>Need for faculty to develop a research workshop program to address the suggested topical research issues (e.g., issues like social justice, power relations, a range of supervision models, and Doctoral pedagogies)</p> <p>Faculty to consider Collaborating and/or getting support from the CAE</p> <p>Communication policy guidelines/blueprint??</p>	<p>The faculty should develop an annual research workshop program to address topical research issues (e.g. social justice, power relations, a range of supervision models, and doctoral pedagogies).</p> <p>Experts should be involved in research workshops in consultation with CAE, DRDA, Library Services, QA, etc. to address the key and profound research elements (e.g social justice, power relations, a range of supervision models, and Doctoral pedagogies).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> External assessors should not be allowed to communicate on the work they are assessing. An electronic feedback system to be installed by the University. The supervisor should be copied at each exit level of a proposal/thesis even with the present system. Students, supervisors and/or academic managers they report to

				<p>should not communicate with external assessor during assessment of work they are supervising.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University rules should be complied with guiding how permission can be obtained. • It is only at the summary report level when supervisors and students may know from the research reports who the external assessors are, during which no communication with the external assessor may not take place before prior written permission as laid down by University rules.
<p>16. Supervisor preparation programmes to include training on relevant level descriptors and detection of the plagiarism of ideas for students and supervisors</p>	<p>Develop training content and organise training to cater for level descriptor definition, the detection of plagiarised ideas as opposed to text similarity for avoiding sanction, and discussing punitive action tied to the issue</p>	<p>Give guidelines regarding where to draw experts from to lead discussions on for level descriptor definition/content</p> <p>Give guidelines regarding where to draw experts from to lead discussions on the detection of plagiarised ideas as opposed to text</p>	<p>There's a need from the faculty to provide ongoing supervisor-student research support in this regard</p> <p>Need for collaboration with the library to offer support to the departments</p> <p>Beefing up of Staff, and career pathing: There's a need to consider putting in place a program intended to capacitate and enhance the quality of junior staff through collaboration with established researchers</p> <p>The guidelines/blueprint??</p>	<p>Should a student be caught plagiarising he/she should not be allowed to continue with his/her studies.</p> <p>In the PG Compliance Audit Form there should information required about when last the supervisor/co-supervisor attended a supervision workshop.</p>

		<p>similarity for avoiding sanction</p> <p>Give inputs into penalty policy for plagiarism</p>		<p>Library Services, CAE, QA and DRDA (Research Office) should be consulted to help with experts to train supervisors on the description and content of Masters and PhD level descriptors.</p>
17. Provide consequence management for failure to submit progress reports and keep records	Develop an instrument to record compliance soon after reporting nodes, in order for intervention not to be hindered where research progress is inadequate	Make inputs towards the design and implementation of an effective monitoring instrument	<p>Recommendations that we need to consider the advantages of google docs.</p> <p>An electronic research management system should also be sourced</p> <p>Guidelines/blueprint for the instrument??</p>	The faculty should devise/piggyback on an electronic research management system to assist HODs monitor supervision progress in order for intervention to take place on time
18. Different needs for full-time and part-time students for deeper analysis of dropout rates and differentiated support	Compile a document for the function with recommendation included	Determine the nature of support for full-time and part-time students taking into account their different circumstances and needs in order to alleviate dropout rates	<p>No part time students for now.</p> <p>Cohort Model could be introduced.(Workshops, invite experts)</p> <p>Support was explained in the PhD report submitted.</p>	A Cohort Model could be introduced for part-time students in future where there could be workshops led by experts.
19. Arbitration and improvement in dealing with conflicting assessment reports	Revisit departmental volumes of external assessor databases to accommodate a shift to appointing three external assessors plus an alternate assessor	<p>Assess the feasibility of this faculty inputs</p> <p>Identify and beef up the pertinent</p>	For PhD we can appoint two local and one international and one alternative.	The faculty should add an adjudicator to current-practice two external assessors and one alternate assessor, in case the two assessors disagree. For this reason, two alternate assessors should now be included instead of just one, to cater for

		<p>University rule to address HEQC concern</p>  <p>FH outline of postgraduate policy fc</p>  <p>Postgraduate progress tracking tem</p>	<p>What about tiny departmental databases of external assessors?? With what quantity should the databases be increased</p> <p>Must the addition of international assessors be compulsory??</p>	<p>possible adjudication as well as curb delays in case one or both external assessors do not accept or honour the appointment contract.</p> <p>Departmental databases of external assessors should be increased by 5% with immediate effect.</p> <p>Out of the two external assessors, where possible at least one must be international.</p>
<p>20. Improve marketing of doctoral programmes to attract students from diverse backgrounds</p>	<p>Introduce a programme to constitute research project team members to attract external funding as well as have departments develop and operate within a matrix of themes derived from departmental niche areas</p>	<p>Discuss and consolidate key practical requirements for research project teams to be constituted effectively and function optimally</p>  <p>Experienced Researchers.docx</p>	<p>Faculty to consider uploading member staff's academic and research profiles on the university website. This will make it easy for potential post-graduate students to approach potential supervisors on a need or similar interest basis</p> <p>Niche areas.</p> <p>Research Projects.</p>	<p>The faculty should upload staff members' academic and research profiles on the university website.</p> <p>HODs should facilitate completion of the Faculty Research and Postgraduate Office's "Experienced Researchers" table requiring indication of CESM categories and niche areas within which each academic is performing teaching and research.</p>

What about the project teams & SARChI Chairs attracting external funding to help with marketing of our programmes and attraction of students from outside the institution??

Acknowledge we do not have strong marketing strategy for attracting PhD students.

Design a draft.
More Faculty wide plan needed for marketing.

Recruitment strategy?? What is the fine line between it & marketing strategy??

HODs and experienced researchers should lead in the constitution of research and developmental project teams that will attract huge external funding preferably running into millions of rands. SARChI Chairs should also be appointed in the faculty to enhance this project. Part of attracted funding should cover study fees for supervised students recruited through the advertisement of themes informed by identified CESM categories and niche areas in each department.

With the CESM categories and niche areas per academic per department specified, themes for Masters and PhD studies should be derived and used to advertise nationally and internationally to attract postgraduate students who will derive study titles from the themes under the guidance of their supervisors.

A more comprehensive recruitment and marketing strategy should be designed to build on the initiative above and include vehicles for recruiting and marketing (e.g. advertising MA and PhD themes and names of available supervisors on the University website and in electronic and print media).