

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

FACULTY OF PHARMACY AND PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES

As an academic staff member at Monash University, you are required to perform in accordance with the University's academic performance standards for your relevant classification level. These academic performance standards include qualitative performance standards for the three areas of academic activity – research, education and engagement – and quantitative performance standards for education and research. Minimum standards refer to the minimum acceptable standard of performance, below which a staff member can expect to be actively performance managed. Aspirational standards are stretch standards that will assist the faculty reach its strategic objectives, as informed by relevant benchmarks and data.

The standards are reviewed on an annual basis and it is your responsibility to ensure that you are aware of, and adhere to, the academic performance standards, if adjusted.

All staff are expected to describe their contribution to the responsible conduct of research illustrating how they conform with the university's policy relating to the conduct of research. This should include brief responses to the following and in the context of widening responsibility as described on page 8:

- How do you ensure data quality, integrity, reliability in your research activities?
- What is your approach to record keeping/raw data archiving/primary material storage?
- What is your contribution to supervision and mentoring on scientific rigour and research integrity?

Achievement relative to opportunity

Monash will apply an achievement relative to opportunity approach when assessing results under the Academic Performance Standards for staff who disclose 'achievement relative to opportunity' circumstances.

To enable a more nuanced and contextual assessment of achievements, we will consider both the personal and professional circumstances of staff relative to what is expected at their level in the context of:

- the quality of academic work in the time available rather than the quantity of work produced;
- the opportunity to participate in certain types of activities; and
- the consistency of the activities or output over the period under consideration.

Qualitative academic performance standards for research, education and engagement

The qualitative performance standards for research, education and engagement are accessible at <http://www.monash.edu/academic-promotion/standards>.

Quantitative academic performance standards for education

The University's Student Evaluation of Teaching and Units (SETU) provides the quantitative indicators of performance in the area of education. An overall satisfaction median score of 3.8 or greater for the overall satisfaction question in the unit component of SETU is the endorsed minimum quantitative standard for education for all Monash teaching staff and the aspirational quantitative performance standard is the overall satisfaction median score of 4.7 or greater.

Quantitative academic performance standards for research

The quantitative research performance standards are faculty or discipline-specific measures of research performance at each academic level and discipline. The quantitative research performance standards are developed within your faculty and are revised annually. Applicants should consider their research relative to the various standards in the context of their discipline.

The current research performance standards relevant to your faculty are as follows.

RESEARCH PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Teaching & Research staff

(Research-only staff see note below table 1b, Education-focussed staff see table 1c)

		B Lecturer (T&R)		C Senior Lecturer (T&R)		D Associate Professor (T&R)		E Professor (T&R)	
		Minimum	Aspirational	Minimum	Aspirational	Minimum	Aspirational	Minimum	Aspirational
1a	RESEARCH OUTPUTS Total publications	2.5	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	6.5	7.0	12.0
	RESEARCH OUTPUTS Total publications as first, last and/or corresponding author (or co-first or co-corresponding)	No formal standards are set: the proportion of outputs where the academic is the lead author (either as first, last or corresponding author) will be assessed in relation to the other research output measures. This proportion of outputs with corresponding authorship will be increasingly relevant as an indicator of leadership as levels change from Level B to Level E.							
	RESEARCH OUTPUTS Field Weighted Citation Impact	FWCI standards have been set at the same minimum and aspirational targets for all Levels, with the only variation being for staff in organisational units, in recognition of the variation of citation distribution, and therefore FWCI, between fields of research. See separate table following.							
	RESEARCH OUTPUTS Cumulative Impact Factor	5	15	10	20	15	30	20	50
	RESEARCH OUTPUTS Proportion of Q1 journals	70%	80%	70%	85%	75%	85%	75%	85%
2	RESEARCH INCOME	\$20,000	\$55,000	\$100,000	\$150,000	\$165,000	\$225,000	\$300,000	\$500,000
	Principal Chief Investigator / Chief Investigator A INCOME	No formal standards are set: the value of research income generated where the academic is the lead CI will be assessed in conjunction with the other research income measures. This value will be increasingly relevant as an indicator of leadership as levels change from Level B to Level E.							
3	SUPERVISION HDR Supervisor Load (headcount – annual average)	1	3	3	5	5	7	7	10
	SUPERVISION HDR Completions	-	1	2	4	4	7	7	10

		All Themes	
		Minimum	Aspirational
1b	RESEARCH OUTPUTS Field Weighted Citation Impact	1.3	2.0

The standards above apply to all academic (T&R) staff at levels B to E. These research standards need to be viewed within the broader research performance expectations within the [Academic Performance Framework](#), as well as performance expectations for Education and Engagement. For Research Only staff at levels B to E the aspirational standards for T&R academics (above) are typically considered the minimum expected and performance is assessed relative to the research profile of the researcher.

Education focused staff

The following standards apply to T&R staff on Education Focused work contracts. They reflect both the different academic profile of these staff and the nature of the research.

		B Lecturer (T&R)		C Senior Lecturer (T&R)		D Associate Professor (T&R)		E Professor (T&R)	
		Minimum	Aspirational	Minimum	Aspirational	Minimum	Aspirational	Minimum	Aspirational
1c	RESEARCH OUTPUTS Total publications	1.00	1.5	1.5	2.00	2.00	2.67	2.5	5
	RESEARCH OUTPUTS Total publications as first, last and/or corresponding author (or co-first or co-corresponding)	No formal standards are set: the proportion of outputs where the academic is the lead author (either as first, last or corresponding author) will be assessed in relation to the other research output measures. This proportion of outputs with corresponding authorship will be increasingly relevant as an indicator of leadership as levels change from Level B to Level E.							
	RESEARCH OUTPUTS Field Weighted Citation Impact	Minimum				Aspirational			
		1.3				2.0			
	RESEARCH OUTPUTS Cumulative Impact Factor	2	5	3	8	6	12	7	20
	RESEARCH OUTPUTS Proportion of Q1 journals	70%	80%	70%	85%	75%	85%	75%	85%
2	RESEARCH INCOME	\$2,500	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000
	Principal Chief Investigator / Chief Investigator A INCOME	No formal standards are set: the value of research income generated where the academic is the lead CI will be assessed in conjunction with the other research income measures. This value will be increasingly relevant as an indicator of leadership as levels change from Level B to Level E.							

3	SUPERVISION HDR Supervisor Load (headcount – annual average)	0	1	1	2	1	3	2	3
	SUPERVISION HDR Completions	0	1	1	2	2	3	2	3
4	LEADERSHIP Project Leader Roles	1	2	1	2	2	3	2	4
5	IMPACT On practice of others or policy	0	1	1	2	2	3	2	4

Definitions of Measures

Triennial Performance

It is clear that activity in any performance indicator can vary per year as grants end or begin, students enrol or graduate. As such the expectation will be that performance of an individual should reflect a rolling triennial period for staff. The exception to this is the measure of HDR completions which will be measured as the total number of completions over a 5-year time frame and Field Weighted Citation Impact which will also be measured over the 5 previous years.

Where staff are new to Monash their track record over the previous few years should be taken into consideration as this performance will not be captured in the Monash systems providing performance reports.

Research Output Standards

Research Output Quantity

Total Publications are raw numbers without pro-rating per author or weighting the publication. The targets are for the average annual number of publications. Publications included in counts: Book, Authored - Research (Formerly HERDC Category A1), Chapter in a Book, Authored - Research, (Formerly HERDC Category B1), Contribution to Journal, Refereed Article in a scholarly Journal, (Formerly HERDC Category C1)

*Source – Monash Pure/Business Intelligence Research Performance reports

Research Output Quality

There are no perfect single measures of research quality. As a result, research standards for research quality have been expanded to provide three separate metrics that can be used to make the case for the quality of research metrics. Research quality performance will be assessed by taking account of performance across all of the nominated metrics (FWCI, CIF and PQ1, definitions below). Whilst there are no constraints for interpreting data holistically across the three measures, researchers presenting a good case for research quality might commonly outperform targets in at least 2/3 measures.

Field-Weighted Citation Impact (FWCI)

Field-Weighted Citation Impact takes into account the differences in research citation behaviour across disciplines when the values are at or near 1.0. As the values move away from 1.0 citation distribution varies between disciplines.

Sourced from SciVal, this metric shows how the number of citations received by a researcher's publications compares with the average number of citations received by all other similar publications indexed in the Scopus database. This data will be sourced for the prior 5 calendar years of complete data: e.g., in 2026 the FWCI will be calculated for all publications in 2021-2025.

A Field-Weighted Citation Impact of 1.00 indicates that the publications have been cited at world average for similar publications in that field.

A Field-Weighted Citation Impact of greater than 1.00 indicates that the publications have been cited more than would be expected based on the world average for similar publications, for example a score of 1.44 means that the outputs have been cited 44% more times than expected.

*Source – Elsevier, SciVal

Cumulative Impact Factor (CIF)

Cumulative Impact Factor (CIF) is the sum of the individual impact factors of every journal in which a publication appeared. (e.g., four publications in a single year in journals with impact factors of 6.5, 1.5, 4.0 and 3.3 = CIF of 15.3). The CIF standard for the Faculty is the average CIF for the three years of the performance period.

We recognise the DORA declaration on the use of journal impact factors in research assessment. Journal impact factor is one of multiple metrics and, as with all quantitative standards in this document, is considered along with the qualitative standards to assess an individual's research performance

Proportion of Q1 Journals (PQ1)

This is the percentage (%) of total publications that appear in the first quartile ranked journals (Q1 = top 25%) in the year of publication, expressed as a percentage. The Faculty uses the Elsevier-linked CiteScore metric for journal ranking.

Research Income

Research Income is assigned to each chief investigator on a pro-rata basis. The income is pro-rated by the number of investigators for each income source. See example below. The targets are for the average annual pro-rated income.

- Category 1 Australian Competitive Grant Funding
- Category 2 Other Public Sector funding
- Category 3 Industry and Other income
- Category 4 Co-operative Research Centre funding

For level D & E there is an expectation that research income should be diversified across several categories and not be overly focused on any one category.

Income example:

Year	Income	Total annual income
1	Fellowship (single CI) = \$100,000 Research grant (3 CIs) = \$270,000	$\$100,000 + (\$270,000/3) = \$190,000$
2	Fellowship (single CI) = \$100,000	\$100,000
3	Fellowship (single CI) = \$100,000 Contract research (2 CIs) = \$60,000	$\$100,000 + (\$60,000/2) = \$130,000$
Average annual pro-rated income		$(\\$190,000 + \\$100,000 + \\$130,000)/3 = \\$140,000$

*Source – Monash Pure/Business Intelligence Research Performance report

HDR Supervisor Load based on a supervisor’s average annual HDR load the number of students under supervision, either as Main Supervisor or Associate Supervisor.

*Source – Business Intelligence/Callista

HDR Completions is the total number of completions in the previous 5 complete calendar year period.

*Source – Monash Callista/CHIP reports.

Project Leadership refers to the number of discrete education projects that the staff member leads – these can include implementation and evaluation of teaching innovations (e.g., simulations), educational research (e.g., engagement index) and educational leadership projects (e.g., entrustable professional activity system) at Faculty or University level. These would typically be activities which include some form of peer evaluation other than publication.

Impact on the practice of others refers to any one or more of the following: adoption of educational innovation or research approaches at faculty, university, national or international level; acknowledgement by stakeholders/governing bodies, changes to accepted practice, guidelines, framework

ENGAGEMENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

		B Lecturer (T&R)	C Senior Lecturer (T&R)	D Associate Professor (T&R)	E Professor (T&R)
4	ENGAGEMENT and MENTORING	Individual change active engagement at the individual level e.g. Ally training, DEI week engagement, HDR panel membership etc.	Organisational change active engagement at Theme/Faculty level e.g. committee membership (e.g. HDR, EMCR, OHS etc), Chairing HDR panels, active mentoring	Advocating change identifiable benefit to the Faculty/University resulting from engagement e.g. leading committees, initiatives, external partnerships	Leading change demonstrated impact at National/International level resulting from leading effective change e.g. leading initiatives that were adopted externally, mentees who are themselves creating change

- 'Change' encompasses a broad range of mentoring and engagement activities that enhance research culture – e.g. mentoring the next generation, enabling diverse and inclusive communities, creating opportunities for industry engagement, sustainability initiatives, entrepreneurial mindset, social impact

RESPONSIBLE RESEARCH STANDARDS

		B Lecturer	C Senior Lecturer	D Associate Professor	E Professor
5	RESEARCH PRACTICES	Individual practice Demonstrate and articulate ethical & responsible research practices at the individual level	Group practice Lead ethical & responsible research practices at the group level	Organisational unit practice Lead ethical & responsible research practices at the level of the organisational unit (e.g. Theme)	Faculty level practice Lead ethical & responsible research practices at the organisational unit level and contribute to practices at the Faculty level.

- All staff are expected to conform with the University's policy relating to the conduct of research. In the Faculty staff are expected to demonstrate research practices of the highest integrity. As academic levels increase from B to E, the expectations of a staff member as an advocate as well as a practitioner of research integrity increases.
- Examples include: discussion of research challenges and unsuccessful outcomes at group meetings; discussing and declaring conflicts of interest; developing and providing training in data management practices to team members; demonstrating fair research authorship attribution; development of initiatives to foster research integrity at the Faculty level.

GUIDELINES FOR THE USE OF RESEARCH PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Background

The research performance standards are one component of the academic performance framework, and constitute a benchmarking tool that allows individual academic staff and their supervisors to assess the quality and impact of an individual's research performance.

The Academic Performance Framework for Research consists of five research criteria, which can be evidenced by quantitative metrics as well as more descriptive qualitative data. (See the University website <https://www.monash.edu/academicpromotion/academic-performance-framework>).

The **quantitative research indicators** are based on the historical research performance of a cohort or peers at the same T&R level within the faculty. Minimum indicators are set close to the 25th percentile of the cohort performance and aspirational indicators close to the 75th percentile.

As outlined in the Academic Performance Framework, both **quantitative data** and **qualitative performance data** enables individuals to draw on evidence to highlight, in their own words, their research impact across six criteria:

- RC1: Advancing the discipline
- RC2: Building reputation and recognition of research excellence
- RC3: Quality research supervision and mentoring
- RC4: Establishing, leading or participating in successful research teams, research units or centres, and fostering interdisciplinary research
- RC5: Translation, commercialisation or adoption of discoveries and policy-to- practice by external entities

Achievement against these criteria will be used for performance review and promotion.

The use of both **quantitative research indicators** and **qualitative research data** can provide a broad picture of an individual's research performance across the six research criteria.

Use of the Research Performance Standards

The Research Performance Standards provide an important signal of the performance expectations for specific levels of academic appointment for differing disciplines. However, as outlined above, they should not be used in isolation from the broader Academic Performance Framework

Minimum Performance Standards are relevant for new staff appointments, probation conditions and for setting ongoing minimum performance expectations. For new staff, the letter of offer has probation conditions, which includes the requirement to meet the minimum academic performance at or above minimum standards.

Aspirational Performance Standards are where staff should be aiming. Staff who apply for promotion are expected to perform at least to the minimum performance indicators at the level to which promotion is sought and their current performance should be commensurate with the aspirational performance indicators at their current level.

Performance targets for individual staff performance planning and review should be guided by the minimum/aspirational quantitative performance indicators.

Qualitative Performance Descriptors aid in assessing the impact of an individual's research performance and are used in the overall academic performance development at all career stages. Whereas for early career levels the local and regional impact is important, at advanced career levels an international impact profile is paramount.

The University-wide research criteria specify impactful evidence-based performance across six criteria:

- RC1: Advancing the discipline
- RC2: Building reputation and recognition of research excellence
- RC3: Quality research supervision and mentoring
- RC4: Establishing, leading or participating in successful research teams, research units or centres, and fostering interdisciplinary research
- RC5: Translation, commercialisation or adoption of discoveries and policy-to- practice by external entities

A list of indicative examples of evidence is outlined on the [Academic Performance Framework website](#).

Assessment of Performance In assessing an individual's performance against research standards, for any purpose, careful academic judgement should be exercised. Performance will be assessed holistically, and within the context of their discipline:

- Performance against the standards will not be used in isolation as it provides only one element of an individual's performance - there are other aspects of performance not captured in the standards and it is normal for staff fall along the continuum of performance. The expectation is for acceptable performance to be between the minimum and aspirational values. However acceptable performance is ultimately a matter of judgement for supervisors;
- Performance summary data for individuals will be used only as a starting point to drill further and look at performance in more detail;
- Recognition should be given to individuals' unique strengths and opportunities. This may lead to an individual not achieving some quantitative performance indicators, but exceeding others;
- Consideration should be given to relevant circumstances that might affect an individual's ability to meet the standards: achievement relative to opportunity.
- When using the standards workload must be considered. The Research Performance Standards are conceived with the notional workload model of a full-time Teaching & Research staff member spending 40% of their time on research activities, 40% on teaching activities and 20% time on leadership and engagement activities. Where staff have an agreed different workload model with their supervisor this will be taken into consideration. Likewise, appropriate consideration must be given to expected standards for staff on fractional appointments.
- Similar activity across all facets of research activity is anticipated. However, in some situations superior performance in one category may be used to mitigate against activity in other categories. For the purpose of promotion, activity at the minimum standard of the level to which promotion is sought would be expected (along with other broader indicators of performance).
- The proposed metrics are necessarily simplified and do not reflect all areas of endeavour. In particular, evidence of leadership in research would be expected at Levels D and E (such as senior authorship etc). In particular, at Levels D and E approximately 50% of publications would be expected to be 'led' by individual investigators and they would be expected to be CIA in approximately 50% of successful grants.

Governance

Noted	Monash Research Committee	Date:	19 May 2026
Noted	Academic Board	Date:	9 June 2026
Effective Date	1 January 2027		