

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR RESEARCH, 2024

GUIDELINES FOR STAFF AND SUPERVISORS

1. Background

This document provides additional guidelines for the [Faculty of Business and Economics Research Performance Standards](#).

Section 2 provides a summary of the main elements of the Research Performance Standards and the supporting resources available on the Faculty intranet (<https://www.intranet.monash/business/research/research-standards>).

Sections 3 and 4 clarifies the treatment of two authorship matters that emerged in 2024.

2. Supporting resources

2.1 The quantitative academic performance standards provide **minimum research expectations** which can be satisfied by **one** of publications, research income or impact over the preceding complete **five-year calendar period**.

2.2 For the purposes of **promotion**, academics should refer to the **Career Development Guidelines** on the [Faculty intranet](#) which provide advice on presenting the research case as a portfolio of achievement across all dimensions of research activity.

2.3 Detailed information on research impact is available on the Faculty intranet:

- The **Research Impact Framework** provides comprehensive guidance about how research impact is defined and evaluated.
- The Faculty Research Impact Sub-Committee has responsibility for the **process for evaluating Research Impact cases**.
- Formal evaluation of impact cases is required to determine the validated assignment of **research impact quantitative metrics**. These metrics then appear on institutional reports for the purposes of demonstrating research performance (including the Research Activity Report and the Research Performance Report).

2.4 Detailed information about **quality research outputs** is available on the [Faculty intranet](#), including:

- the **Quality Journals List**, the **Quality Publishers List** and the **Non-ABDC Quality Journals List**.
- Formal evaluation of Non-ABDC journals is undertaken by an expert panel following the **process for evaluation of non-ABDC journals**. If a journal is determined to be a quality output through this process, it will be added to the Non-ABDC Quality Journals List for a period of five years.
- An expert panel is convened to review submissions seeking research output points for software following the **Process for evaluation of software as a research output**.

3. Authorship of editorials and introductions to special issues of journals

Organising and editing a special issue is recognised as research leadership. Organising special issues contributes to building one's research reputation and is valued by the Business School.

However, normally an editorial or introduction to a journal special issue will not be classified as 'research'. This is because the purpose of such introductions is typically to provide an overview of articles in the special issue, rather than contribute new knowledge. Even when the introduction seeks to contribute new knowledge – for example through providing an organising framework for the literature – the introduction usually will not meet all of the criteria expected for research, given that this is not the primary purpose of the introduction.

The explanation below is based on information provided by the Research Outputs Classification Service at Monash.

For a research output to receive a 'research' classification, it must meet the criteria as set out by the HERDC. A research output must be characterised by:

- substantial scholarly activity, as evidenced by discussion of the relevant literature, an awareness of the history and antecedents of work described, and provided in a format which allows a reader to trace sources of the work, including through citations and footnotes;
- originality (i.e. not a compilation of existing works);
- veracity/validity through a peer review process or by satisfying the quality control processes of a commercial publisher
- increasing the stock of knowledge; and
- being in a form that enables dissemination of knowledge.

For determining whether editorials and introductions for special issues may be classified as research, additional information that may be considered includes:

- How is the article presented by the journal? For example, has the journal labelled the item as an editorial or as an original article?
- What is the structure of the article? For example, what proportion of the item is focused on describing the articles contained in the journal issue?

There may be exceptional cases in which introductions to special issues meet the requirements to be counted as research, but the onus will be on the author(s) to demonstrate that the HERDC requirements to be classified as research are satisfied and that there was an independent blind-reviewed peer assessment of the article.

A subcommittee of Faculty Research Committee, consisting of the Deputy Dean (Research) and two other members will consider such applications. Positive decisions will be recorded in Pure and counted as an output for the author.

4. Articles with large numbers of authors

Examples are emerging in some business school disciplines of articles involving large numbers of co-authors. Instances are encyclopaedic reviews in which each co-author writes one subsection of the article; replications of famous/seminal studies involving collaboration of large numbers of co-authors; and teams of collaborators testing the same hypotheses on the same data to give the results added robustness.

Where there are an unusually large number of co-authors, a statement of contribution by the author can be submitted. A subcommittee of Faculty Research Committee, consisting of the Deputy Dean (Research) and two other members will review the case and determine the points to be allocated based on intellectual contribution to the publication.

As a guide, for publications on the ABDC journal list, six or more co-authors will be considered to be an unusually large number of co-authors.

There will be instances of publications with six or more co-authors that are not of this sort (i.e. encyclopaedic reviews, replication studies, team testing of the same hypothesis and the like). In such instances, the subcommittee can award full points.

In the case of encyclopaedic reviews, replication papers and papers with teams of collaborators testing the same hypotheses on the same data, the default will be that no quality research publication points will be automatically allocated. In such cases, however, the subcommittee can as a matter of discretion award some points or partial points for cases of very strong intellectual contribution to the publication as a whole.

This provision does not apply to publications in the health, medicine and STEM disciplines, in which large teams of co-authors represent the discipline norm. The research norms in health, medicine and STEM will apply to publications in these disciplines.

5. Questions

Please direct any queries regarding the Academic Performance Standards to the Faculty Research Office at buseco-research@monash.edu.