Criteria and Evidence Guide for Academic Promotions – Research and Enterprise (inc Leadership in R&E)

Table of Contents

Note:

This document should be read alongside:
1. Notes for Staff Consultation Nov 2022
2. Criteria and Evidence Guide for Staff Consultation - Education (inc Leadership in Education) Nov 2022
3. Criteria and Evidence Guide for Staff Consultation - Service (inc Leadership in Service) Nov 2022

Key Terms in the Assessment Process

Activities: The work academic staff undertake in Education, Research & Enterprise, and Service aligned with ACU's Mission and supporting its strategic priorities. Leadership activities are embedded within the criteria associated with each of these three areas of academic activity.

Domains: The criteria for promotion are specified under three areas of academic activity, each of which includes four domains of achievement (i.e., 12 domains in total):

- Education (including Leadership in Education)
    1. Designing Learning Activities and/or Programs
    2. Teaching and/or Supporting Learning
    3. Developing Effective Learning Environments
    4. Educational Scholarship
- Research and Enterprise (including Leadership in Research and Enterprise)
    5. Knowledge Creation
    6. Research Income
    7. Research Engagement and Impact
    8. Research Training and Development
- Service (including Leadership in Service)
    9. Internal Service to the University
    10. Institutional Advancement
    11. External Service to the Discipline, Sector or Profession
    12. Community Engagement Community Engagement

Achievements: Outcomes that are the result of academic staff activities.
Achievements are demonstrated by the quality and/or the impact of the staff member's activities. In some instances, quantity is an indicator of achievement (e.g., research grant income). In some domains, early career academics' achievements may include developing skills and knowledge.
Time spent doing an activity does not inherently indicate achievement. However, it is expected that staff will typically achieve more in domains where they have been allocated more workload (i.e., spent more time). Applicants are <u>not</u> expected to achieve in all 12 domains.

Evidence: Information that verifies the applicants' achievements.
When evaluating a staff member's achievements against the criteria, the committee will consider the quality and the impact of the work, along with the strength of the evidence that has been supplied. Thus, a case for promotion with more robust evidence will be considered stronger than a case with evidence that is less clear.
Where is feasible, staff should ensure that evidence is recorded within ACU systems. If two pieces of evidence are similar, one that is drawn from an ACU database will be considered stronger than one that is not from a university system.

Achievement Standards: At each academic level (B-E), the Criteria and Evidence Guide describes three achievement standards in each domain. These standards are organised in a rubric that committee members will use to rate applicant's achievement in each domain. Committee members will select the standard that best represents the applicant's achievements in that domain. It is acknowledged that in many cases none of the standards will exactly match the applicant's achievements. Committee members will need to use their judgement to determine which standard is the best match.

Achievement Points: After choosing which standard is the best match, committee members will assign a point value from the following options:

Achievement Standard 1 = 1 point
Achievement Standard 2 = 2 points (low end of the standard) or 4 points (high end)
Achievement Standard 3 = 7 points (low end of the standard) or 10 points (high end)

Threshold for Promotion: Using a modified version of the current decision making process (here), the committee will determine if the applicant has reached the threshold for promotion: **XX** points (**TBC**) with no more than 50% of included points from the four Service domains.

Note: A full glossary of terms can be viewed here.

Mission and Values and Code of Conduct Criterion

Applicants for promotion must demonstrate professional behaviour that is consistent with the university's Mission and Values and the Code of Conduct for all Staff. Human Resources will confirm at the time of application if the staff member has been of subject of prior disciplinary or administrative action or is currently the subject of an investigation. An applicant will be ineligible if they have been the subject of discipline or unsatisfactory performance review, where the results were upheld against the applicant, within the past 24 months. In this instance, the promotions committee will not assess the application.

If an applicant was the subject of a review where the allegations were dismissed against that individual, they are eligible to apply for promotion. If there is an investigation underway at the time of application for promotion, the staff member may submit their application and it will progress through the process, but a final decision will not be made until the result of the investigation is known. If the finding of the review is made against the staff member the application will be deemed ineligible.

Research & Enterprise (including Leadership in Research & Enterprise)

Knowledge Creation

Citation Disciplines

	Achievement Standard 1	Achievement Standard 2		Achievement Standard 3	
Points	*1*	*2*	*4*	*7*	*10*
Academic Level B	*Output quality* Field Weighted Citation Impact (FWCI) score of at least 1.2 or a mean journal Source Normalize Impact per Paper (SNIP) score of at least 1.4. *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. *Role* N/A	*Output quality* FWCI of at least 1.6 or a mean journal SNIP score of at least 1.6. *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. *Role* Sole, lead or senior role on at least 1 output.		*Output quality* FWCI of at least 1.8 or a mean journal SNIP score of at least 1.7. *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. To score at the top of this standard, an applicant would be expected to have more than 10 publication points, with output quality meeting the threshold described above. No level of quantity can overcome low quality outputs. *Role* Sole, lead or senior role on at least 2 publication points. To score at the top of this standard, an applicant would be expected to have more than 4 publication points as the sole, lead or senior author.	

	Achievement Standard 1	Achievement Standard 2		Achievement Standard 3	
Points	*1*	*2*	*4*	*7*	*10*
Academic Level C	*Output quality* FWCI of at least 1.2 or a mean journal SNIP score of at least 1.4. *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. *Role* Sole, lead or senior role on at least one output.	*Output quality* FWCI of at least 1.8 or a mean journal SNIP score of at least 1.7. *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. *Role* Sole, lead or senior role on at least 2 outputs.		*Output quality* FWCI of at least 2.1 or a mean journal SNIP score of at least 1.8. *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. To score at the top of this standard, an applicant would be expected to have more than 12 publication points, with output quality meeting the threshold described above. No level of quantity can overcome low quality outputs. *Role* Sole, lead or senior role on at least 2 publication points. To score at the top of this standard, an applicant would be expected to have more than 4 publication points as the sole, lead or senior author.	

Draft Only – 1

	Achievement Standard 1	Achievement Standard 2		Achievement Standard 3	
Points	*1*	*2*	*4*	*7*	*10*
Academic Level D	*Output quality* FWCI of at least 1.2 or a mean journal SNIP score of at least 1.4. *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. *Role* Sole, lead or senior role on at least two outputs.	*Output quality* FWCI of at least 2.1 or a mean journal SNIP score of at least 1.8. *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. *Role* Sole, lead or senior role on at least 2 outputs.		*Output quality* FWCI of at least 2.4 or a mean journal SNIP score of at least 1.9. *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. To score at the top of this standard, an applicant would be expected to have more than 20 publication points, with output quality meeting the threshold described above. No level of quantity can overcome low quality outputs. *Role* Sole, lead or senior role on at least 3 publication points. To score at the top of this standard, an applicant would be expected to have more than 5 publication points as the sole, lead or senior author.	

Draft Only – 1

	Achievement Standard 1	Achievement Standard 2		Achievement Standard 3	
Points	*1*	*2*	*4*	*7*	*10*
Academic Level E	*Output quality* FWCI of at least 1.2 or a mean journal SNIP score of at least 1.4. *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. *Role* Sole, lead or senior role on at least two outputs.	*Output quality* FWCI of at least 2.4 or a mean journal SNIP score of at least 1.9. *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. *Role* Sole, lead or senior role on at least 3 outputs.		*Output quality* FWCI of at least 2.7 or a mean journal SNIP score of at least 2.0. *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. To score at the top of this standard, an applicant would be expected to have more than 45 publication points, with output quality meeting the threshold described above. No level of quantity can overcome low quality outputs. *Role* Sole, lead or senior role on at least 4 publication points. To score at the top of this standard, an applicant would be expected to have more than 12 publication points as the sole, lead or senior author.	

Notes:

1. Output refers to ERA eligible publications and/or non-traditional research outputs.
2. "Citation disciplines" refers the most recent ERA designations.
3. Each output's discipline will be based on the most recently assigned Field of Research code(s) in Orion.
4. Publication points = 5 points for a research book (A1), 1 point for a research chapter (B1), and 1 point for a research article (C1).
5. Knowledge creation standards have been established based on analysis in 2022 (see below) of research performance at ACU, within Australia, and internationally. Benchmarks may be adjusted in future revisions of this schedule.

Peer Review Disciplines

	Achievement Standard 1	Achievement Standard 2		Achievement Standard 3	
Points	*1*	*2*	*4*	*7*	*10*
Academic Level B	*Output quality* At least 50% of publication points placed in outlets ranked as RQR 4 (or equivalent) or above on the relevant quality list(s). *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. *Role* N/A	*Output quality* At least 60% of publication points placed in outlets ranked as RQR 4 (or equivalent) or above on the relevant quality list(s). *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. *Role* Sole, lead, or senior role for at least one publication points.		*Output quality* At least 70% of publication points placed in outlets ranked at RQR 4 (or equivalent) or above on the relevant quality list(s). *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. To score at the top of this standard, an applicant would be expected to have more than 10 publication points, with output quality meeting the threshold described above. No level of quantity can overcome low quality outputs. *Role* Sole, lead, or senior role on at least two publication points. To score at the top of this standard, an applicant would be expected to have more than four publication points as the sole, led or senior author.	
Academic Level C	*Output quality* At least 50% of publication points placed in outlets ranked as RQR 4 (or equivalent) or above on the relevant quality list(s). *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. *Role*	*Output quality* At least 70% of publication points placed in outlets ranked at RQR 4 (or equivalent) or above on the relevant quality list(s). *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. *Role*		*Output quality* At least 80% of publication points placed in outlets ranked at RQR 4 (or equivalent) or above on the relevant quality list(s), with at least 30% of publication points placed in outlets ranked at RQR5 (or equivalent) or above. *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. To score at the top of this standard, an applicant would be expected to have more than 12 publication points, with output quality meeting	

	Sole, lead, or senior role for at least two publication points.	Sole, lead, or senior role on at least two publication points.	the threshold described above. No level of quantity can overcome low quality outputs. *Role* Sole, lead, or senior role on at least three publication points. To score at the top of this standard, an applicant would be expected to have more than four publication points as the sole, led or senior author.
Academic Level D	*Output quality* At least 50% of publication points placed in outlets ranked as RQR 4 (or equivalent) or above on the relevant quality list(s). *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. *Role* Sole, lead, or senior role for at least two publication points.	*Output quality* At least 80% of publication points placed in outlets ranked at RQR 4 (or equivalent) or above on the relevant quality list(s), with at least 30% of publication points placed in outlets ranked at RQR5 (or equivalent) or above. *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. *Role* Sole, lead, or senior role on at least three publication points.	*Output quality* At least 80% of publication points placed in outlets ranked at RQR 4 (or equivalent) or above on the relevant quality list(s), with at least 40% of publication points placed in outlets ranked at RQR5 (or equivalent) or above. *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. To score at the top of this standard, an applicant would be expected to have more than 20 publication points, with output quality meeting the threshold described above. No level of quantity can overcome low quality outputs. *Role* Sole, lead, or senior role on at least three publication points. To score at the top of this standard, an applicant would be expected to have more than five publication points as the sole, led or senior author.
Academic Level E	*Output quality* At least 50% of publication points placed in outlets ranked as RQR 4 (or equivalent) or	*Output quality* At least 80% of publication points placed in outlets ranked at RQR 4 (or equivalent) or above on the relevant	*Output quality* At least 80% of publication points placed in outlets ranked at RQR 4 (or equivalent) or above on the relevant quality list(s), with at least 50% of publication points

above on the relevant quality list(s). *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. *Role* Sole, lead, or senior role for at least two publication points.	quality list(s), with at least 40% of publication points placed in outlets ranked at RQR5 (or equivalent) or above. *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. *Role* Sole, lead, or senior role on at least three publication points.	placed in outlets ranked at RQR5 (or equivalent) or above. *Body of work* At least 5 publication points. To score at the top of this standard, an applicant would be expected to have more than 30 publication points, with output quality meeting the threshold described above. No level of quantity can overcome low quality outputs. *Role* Sole, lead, or senior role on at least three publication points. To score at the top of this standard, an applicant would be expected to have more than six publication points as the sole, led or senior author.

Notes:

1. Output refers to ERA eligible publications and/or non-traditional research outputs.
2. "Peer review disciplines" refers the most recent ERA designations.
3. Each output's discipline will be based on the most recently assigned Field of Research code(s) in Orion.
4. Publication points = 5 points for a research book (A1), 1 point for a research chapter (B1), and 1 point for a research article (C1).
5. RQR4, RQR5, and RQR5* are ratings used in most quality lists at ACU. Conversions for other rating systems are being discussed. For example: a draft conversion for Business (ACBD list) includes B = RQR4, A = RQR5, A* = RQR5*
6. Knowledge creation standards have been established based on analysis in 2022 (see below) of performance at ACU, within Australia, and internationally. Standards may be adjusted in future revisions of this schedule.

Data Used to Inform Knowledge Creation Benchmarks

ACU Research Outputs (2017-2021) in Orion

Primary 2-digit FoR	Primary Field of Research	Outputs	Publication Points
30	AGRICULTURAL, VETERINARY AND FOOD SCIENCES	19	19
31	BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES	38	38
32	BIOMEDICAL AND CLINICAL SCIENCES	911	911
33	BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND DESIGN	112	112
34	CHEMICAL SCIENCES	10	10
35	COMMERCE, MANAGEMENT, TOURISM AND SERVICES	76	76
36	CREATIVE ARTS AND WRITING	20	20
37	EARTH SCIENCES	1	1
38	ECONOMICS	18	22
39	EDUCATION	797	861
40	ENGINEERING	8	8
41	ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES	8	8
42	HEALTH SCIENCES	1616	1620
43	HISTORY, HERITAGE AND ARCHAEOLOGY	278	342
44	HUMAN SOCIETY	259	315
45	INDIGENOUS STUDIES	34	42
46	INFORMATION AND COMPUTING SCIENCES	74	74
47	LANGUAGE, COMMUNICATION AND CULTURE	75	123
48	LAW AND LEGAL STUDIES	77	97
49	MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES	13	13
50	PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES	543	655
51	PHYSICAL SCIENCES	1	1
52	PSYCHOLOGY	818	822
Total		**5806**	**6190**

Notes: All values should be considered preliminary as ODVC-RE is still verifying the analyses. Includes research outputs by current ACU academic staff, excluding executive staff (e.g., Institute Directors and Executive Deans) and overseas professorial fellows. Research books (A1) = 5 points, Book chapters (B1) = 1 point, research articles (C1) = 1 point. Other research outputs (E1 and non-traditional research outputs) and scholarly outputs (non-research; e.g., A2, B2, and C2) not included in this summary.

Research books (A1) (2017-2021)

2 citation discipline outputs, 97 peer review discipline outputs
Note: Publisher ratings for A1 outputs not currently recorded in Orion.

Research book chapters (B1) (2017-2021)

41 citation discipline outputs, 3 citation and peer review discipline outputs, 613 peer review discipline outputs.
Peer review B1 outputs with a publisher rating of RQR5 or RQR5* (or equivalent) = 40%.
Note: Ratings below 5 not currently included in Orion.

Research Articles (C1) by Academic Level (2017-2021)

Academic Level	Number of Staff	Average Number of Articles	Average Number of Citation Discipline Articles	Average of Number of Peer Review Discipline Articles
Staff who publish articles only in peer review disciplines				
A	3	2		2
B	58	4		4
C	81	6		6
D	46	8		8
E	42	13		13
Subtotal	*230*	*7.2*		*7.2*
Staff who publish articles only in citation review disciplines				
A	6	4	4	
B	86	6	6	
C	61	8	8	
D	24	14	14	
E	11	37	37	
Subtotal	*188*	*9.2*	*9.2*	
Staff who publish articles in citation and peer review disciplines				
A	3	4	4	1
B	27	9	6	4
C	24	11	7	6
D	14	14	12	4
E	17	32	27	9
Subtotal	*85*	*15.0*	*11.4*	*5.4*

Notes: All values should be considered preliminary as ODVC-RE analyses is still verifying the analyses. Includes C1 research outputs by current ACU academic staff, excluding executive staff (e.g., Institute Directors and Executive Deans) and overseas professorial fellows. Peer review + citation discipline articles may not equal total number of articles because some articles are coded in both broad disciplines.

Research Article (C1) Output Quality Summary

	Articles	Average FWCI	Average of SNIP	Rank 4 and above (n)	Rank 5 and above (n)	Rank 4 and above (%)	Rank 5 and above (%)
Citation disciplines	3331	2.1	1.6				
Peer review disciplines	1503			664	320	44%	21%
Peer review and citation discipline articles	221	2.5	1.6	34	20	15%	9%

Notes: All values should be considered preliminary as ODVC-RE analyses is still verifying the analyses. Includes C1 research outputs by current ACU academic staff, excluding executive staff (e.g., Institute Directors and Executive Deans) and overseas professorial fellows. Outputs with more than 100 authors not included. "Citation disciplines" and "peer review disciplines" refer to the most recent ERA designations. Each output's discipline is based on the most recently assigned Field of Research code(s) in Orion. RQR4, RQR5, and RQR5* are ratings used in most quality lists at ACU. Conversions for other rating systems (e.g., Business and Law) are preliminary. Non-research outputs (e.g., C2 publications) have not been included. FWCI = Field-Weighted Citation Impact. SNIP = Source Normalized Impact per Paper.

Articles and Reviews in SciVal (2017-2021)

Entity	Output	FWCI
Australian Catholic University	4,490	2.43
Australia	449,952	1.62
World	12, 695,605	1.00

Note: Includes outputs that Scopus has designated as an 'article" or a "review". Outputs are assigned to organisations and countries according to author byline (i.e., not current employment status). Last updated Nov 12, 2022 via SciVal. FWCI = Field-Weighted Citation Impact.

Research Income

	Achievement Standard 1	Achievement Standard 2		Achievement Standard 3	
Points	*1*	*2*	*4*	*7*	*10*
Academic Level B	*Income* A track record of research related income is not expected at this Achievement Standard. *Role* Chief or Associate/Partner Investigator on a research grant application submitted through ACU (whether or not successful). *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 1 in Knowledge Creation domain.	*Income* Income approaching 50% of the 5-year sector average. *Role* Chief or Associate/Partner Investigator on a successful research grant application submitted through ACU. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 1 in Knowledge Creation domain.		*Income* Income approaching 100% of the 5-year sector average. *Role* Chief Investigator on a successful research grant application submitted through ACU. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 1 in Knowledge Creation domain.	
Academic Level C	*Income* Income approaching 50% of the 5-year sector average. *Role* Chief or Associate/Partner Investigator on a successful research grant application submitted through ACU. Chief Investigator on a research grant application submitted through ACU (whether or not successful). *Knowledge Creation Threshold*	*Income* Income approaching 100% of the 5-year sector average. *Role* Chief Investigator on a successful research grant application with income to ACU. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 1 in Knowledge Creation domain.		*Income* Income approaching 150% of the 5-year sector average. *Role* Lead Chief Investigator on a successful research grant application with income to ACU. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 1 in Knowledge Creation domain.	

	Achievement Standard 1	Achievement Standard 2		Achievement Standard 3	
Points	*1*	*2*	*4*	*7*	*10*
	Meets at least Achievement Standard 1 in Knowledge Creation domain.				
Academic Level D	*Income* Income approaching 50% of the 5-year sector average. *Role* Chief Investigator on a successful research grant application with income to ACU. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 2 in Knowledge Creation domain.	*Income* Income approaching 150% of the 5-year sector average. *Role* Lead Chief Investigator on income approaching 60% of the 5-year sector average. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 2 in Knowledge Creation domain.		*Income* Income approaching 300% of the 5-year sector average. *Role* Lead Chief Investigator on income approaching 100% of the 5-year sector average. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 2 in Knowledge Creation domain.	
Academic Level E	*Income* Income approaching 50% of the 5-year sector average. *Role* Lead Chief Investigator on income approaching 30% of the 5-year sector average. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 2 in Knowledge Creation domain.	*Income* Income approaching 300% of the 5-year sector average. *Role* Lead Chief Investigator on income approaching 100% of the 5-year sector average. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 2 in Knowledge Creation domain.		*Income* Income approaching 500% of the 5-year sector average. *Role* Lead Chief Investigator on income approaching 250% of the 5--year sector average. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 2 in Knowledge Creation domain.	

Notes:
1. For the purposes of promotion, research income refers to:

Draft Only – for staff consultation

    a. Funding awarded during the period of assessment. Income awarded prior to the period of assessment will not be considered, even if the funding is received during the period of assessment.

    b. The portion of the awarded grant that will be administered by ACU. Grant income administered by other institutions will not be considered.

2. Research income must be reportable to HERDC and includes Category 1-4 grants (defined by the Department of Education here):

    a. Category 1 grant income: Australian competitive grant Research & Development income

    b. Category 2 grant income: Other public sector Research & Development income

    c. Category 3 grant income: Industry and other Research & Development income (including domestic and international)

    d. Category 4 grant income: Cooperative Research Centre Research & Development income

3. Staff performance will be assessed within their designated discipline area(s) according to the relevant 4-digit Field of Research grant income data published by the ARC (2018 data here). Annual sector averages will be calculated and then multiplied by 5 to obtain a 5-year sector average. Where staff are working across multiple fields of research (4-digit field of research codes) a weighted sector benchmark will be calculated.

4. Within the criteria, the term 'approaching' is used to indicate an income total that meets or nearly meets the stated percentage of the 5-year sector average. The *exact* percentage awarded will be calculated and then rounded *up* to the next highest 5%. This rounded percentage will be compared with the benchmark to determine which rating is most appropriate.

5. Achievements that do not qualify as research income (but could be reported in the Service area, under the Institutional Advancement domain) include:

    a. Research commercialisation income (defined here)

    b. Consultancy

6. Research income achievement standards have been established based on analysis in 2022 (see below) of performance at ACU and across the sector. These standards may be adjusted in future revisions of this schedule.

Data Used to Inform Research Income Benchmarks

Academic Staff in FHS (proxy for citation disciplines)				
B	27	$70,499	$73,867	116%
C	26	$37,828	$61,257	77%
D	16	$106,673	$60,213	184%
E	23	$139,516	$74,446	236%
Subtotal	92	$84,811	$67,959	147%
Academic staff in FLB, FTP, FEA (proxy for peer review disciplines)				
B	10	$21,410	$17,583	69%
C	25	$40,151	$32,150	110%
D	17	$94056	$35,666	235%
E	17	$117,365	$40,690	354%
Subtotal	69	$69,741	$32,927	195%

Note: Excludes executive staff (e.g., Institute Directors and Executive Deans) and academic staff outside facilities. Most recent (2018) sector benchmarks (here).

Research Engagement and Impact

	Achievement Standard 1	Achievement Standard 2		Achievement Standard 3	
Points	*1*	*2*	*4*	*7*	*10*
Academic Level B	*Engagement* Participates in engagement activities with end-users to guide research and deliver a positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia. *Impact* Demonstrates an understanding of research impact and the process of conducting research to deliver a positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 1 in Knowledge Creation domain.	*Engagement* Conducts self-driven engagement activities with end-users to guide their research (or research they are involved in) and deliver a positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia. *Impact* Has built an understanding of research impact and developed strategies for their research (or research they are involved in) to deliver a positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 1 in Knowledge Creation domain.		*Engagement* Develops a program of engagement activities with end-users to guide their research and deliver a positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia. *Impact* Has established a research program with a clear pathway to deliver a positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 1 in Knowledge Creation domain.	
Academic Level C	*Engagement* Conducts self-driven engagement activities with end-users to guide their research (or research they are involved in) and deliver a positive, Mission-	*Engagement* Develops a program of engagement activities with end-users to guide their research and deliver a positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia.		*Engagement* Leads a program of engagement activities with end-users to guide their research and deliver a positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia.	

	Achievement Standard 1	Achievement Standard 2		Achievement Standard 3	
Points	*1*	*2*	*4*	*7*	*10*
	aligned contribution to society beyond academia. *Impact* Has built an understanding of research impact and developed strategies for their research (or research they are involved in) to deliver a positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 1 in Knowledge Creation domain.	*Impact* Has established a research program with a clear pathway to deliver a positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 1 in Knowledge Creation domain.		Has developed ongoing mutually beneficial collaborations with key partners in their field beyond academia. Leads other academic staff members across the School or Institute (at minimum) to develop their ability to conduct engaged research. *Impact* As a result of their research, has delivered a significant positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia. Leads other academic staff members across the School or Institute (at minimum) to develop their ability to achieve Mission-aligned research impact. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 1 in Knowledge Creation domain.	
Academic Level D	*Engagement* Develops a program of engagement activities with end-users to guide their research and deliver a positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia. *Impact*	*Engagement* Leads a program of engagement activities with end-users to guide their research and deliver a positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia. Has developed ongoing mutually beneficial collaborations with key partners in their field beyond academia.		*Engagement* Leads a comprehensive program of engagement activities with end-users to guide their research and deliver a positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia. Has developed ongoing mutually beneficial collaborations with key end-users in their field beyond academia.	

	Achievement Standard 1	Achievement Standard 2		Achievement Standard 3	
Points	*1*	*2*	*4*	*7*	*10*
	Has established a research program with a clear pathway to deliver a positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 2 in Knowledge Creation domain.	Leads other academic staff members across the School or Institute (at minimum) to develop their ability to conduct engaged research. *Impact* As a result of their research, has delivered a significant positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia. Leads other academic staff members across the School or Institute (at minimum) to develop their ability to achieve Mission-aligned research impact. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 2 in Knowledge Creation domain.		Leads other academic staff members across the Faculty (at minimum) to develop their ability to conduct Mission-aligned, engaged research. *Impact* As a result of their research, has delivered a highly significant positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia. Leads other academic staff members across the Faculty (at minimum) to develop their ability to achieve Mission-aligned research impact. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 2 in Knowledge Creation domain.	
Academic Level E	*Engagement* Leads a program of engagement activities with end-users to guide their research and deliver a positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia.	*Engagement* Leads a comprehensive program of engagement activities with end-users to guide their research and deliver a positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia.		*Engagement* Leads a national or international program of engagement activities with end-users to guide their research and deliver a clear, positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia. Has developed ongoing mutually beneficial collaborations with key end-users in their field	

Points	Achievement Standard 1	Achievement Standard 2		Achievement Standard 3	
	1	2	4	7	10
	Has developed ongoing mutually beneficial collaborations with key partners in their field beyond academia. Leads other academic staff members across the School or Institute (at minimum) to develop their ability to conduct engaged research. *Impact* As a result of their research, has delivered a significant positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia. Leads other academic staff members across the School or Institute (at minimum) to develop their ability to achieve Mission-aligned research impact. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 2 in Knowledge Creation domain.	Has developed ongoing mutually beneficial collaborations with key end-users in their field beyond academia. Leads other academic staff members across the Faculty (at minimum) to develop their ability to conduct Mission-aligned, engaged research. *Impact* As a result of their research, has delivered a highly significant positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia. Leads other academic staff members across the Faculty (at minimum) to develop their ability to achieve Mission-aligned research impact. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 2 in Knowledge Creation domain.		beyond academia, with a national or international footprint. Leads other academic staff members across the University and/or beyond the University to develop their ability to conduct Mission-aligned engaged research. *Impact* As a result of their research, has delivered a highly significant positive, Mission-aligned contribution to society beyond academia, at a national or international scale. Leads other academic staff members across the University and/or beyond the University to develop their ability to achieve Mission-aligned research impact. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 2 in Knowledge Creation domain.	

Notes:
1. ACU uses the ARC definition of research engagement; that is, the interaction between researchers and research end-users outside of academia, for the mutually beneficial transfer of knowledge, technologies, methods or resources. An end-user is an individual, community or organisation *external to academia* that will directly use or directly benefit from the output, outcome or result of the research. The positive contribution to society beyond academia should align with ACU's Mission, Values and Strategic Priorities.
2. ACU uses the ARC definition of research impact; that is, research that contributes to the economy, society, environment or culture, *beyond its contribution to academic research*. The positive contribution to society beyond academia should align with ACU's Mission, Values and Strategic Priorities.

Research Training and Development

	Achievement Standard 1	Achievement Standard 2		Achievement Standard 3	
Points	*1*	*2*	*4*	*7*	*10*
Academic Level B	*Research Training* Have research active status and be a registered HDR supervisor. *Research Development* Completed research-related professional development activities. Engaged with research related mentoring (as the mentee). *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 1 in Knowledge Creation domain.	*Research Training* Currently be supervising at least one HDR (who has satisfactorily completed their mid-candidature review). Other achievements and/or contributions to research training that have impacted the applicant's own HDR candidate(s). *Research Development* Completed research-related mentoring and professional development activities with demonstrable impact on the applicant's own work. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 1 in Knowledge Creation domain.		*Research Training* Have at least one HDR student on-time completion. Other achievements and/or contributions to research training that have impacted the applicant's own HDR candidate(s) and other HDR candidates. *Research Development* Completed research-related mentoring and professional development activities with demonstrable impact on the applicant's own work and the work of other ACU academic staff. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 1 in Knowledge Creation domain.	
Academic Level C	*Research Training* A research student supervision load of at least 2 EFTSL (enrolled + graduated students over the period of assessment). A median consumed EFTSL level below 4.0 per completed PhD student. A HDR student non-completion rate below 20% (withdrawals &	*Research Training* A research student supervision load of at least 2 EFTSL (enrolled + graduated students over the period of assessment). Having a median consumed EFTSL level below 4.0 per completed PhD student.		*Research Training* A research student supervision load of at least 2.5 EFTSL (enrolled + graduated students over the period of assessment). Having a median consumed EFTSL level below 4.0 per completed PhD student.	

	Achievement Standard 1	Achievement Standard 2		Achievement Standard 3	
Points	*1*	*2*	*4*	*7*	*10*
	terminations over the period of assessment).	A HDR student non-completion rate below 20% (withdrawals & terminations over the period of assessment).		A HDR student non-completion rate below 15% (withdrawals & terminations over the period of assessment).	
	Other achievements and/or contributions to research training that have impacted the applicant's own HDR candidate(s).	Other achievements and/or contributions to research training that have impacted the applicant's own HDR candidate(s) and other HDR candidates.		Other achievements and/or contributions to research training that have impacted HDR candidates across the applicant's School or Institute (at minimum).	
	Research Development Completed research-related mentoring and professional development activities with demonstrable impact on the applicant's own work.	*Research Development* Completed research-related mentoring and professional development activities with demonstrable impact on the applicant's own work and the work of other ACU academic staff.		*Research Development* Completed research-related mentoring and professional development activities with demonstrable impact on the applicant's own work and the work of academic staff across the applicant's School or Institute (at minimum).	
	Knowledge Creation Threshold Meets at least Achievement Standard 1 in Knowledge Creation domain.	*Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 1 in Knowledge Creation domain.		*Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 1 in Knowledge Creation domain.	
Academic Level D	*Research Training* A research student supervision load of at least 2 EFTSL (enrolled + graduated students over the period of assessment). Having a median consumed EFTSL level below 4.0 per completed PhD student.	*Research Training* A research student supervision load of at least 2.5 EFTSL (enrolled + graduated students over the period of assessment). Having a median consumed EFTSL level below 4.0 per completed PhD student.		*Research Training* A research student supervision load of at least 3.5 EFTSL (enrolled + graduated students over the period of assessment). Having a median consumed EFTSL level below 4.0 per completed PhD student.	

Points	Achievement Standard 1	Achievement Standard 2		Achievement Standard 3	
	1	2	4	7	10
	A HDR student non-completion rate below 20% (withdrawals & terminations over the period of assessment). Other achievements and/or contributions to research training that have impacted the applicant's own HDR candidate(s) and other HDR candidates. *Research Development* Completed research-related mentoring and professional development activities with demonstrable impact on the applicant's own work and the work of other ACU academic staff. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 2 in Knowledge Creation domain.	A HDR student non-completion rate below 15% (withdrawals & terminations over the period of assessment). Other achievements and/or contributions to research training that have impacted HDR candidates across the applicant's School or Institute (at minimum). *Research Development* Led research-related mentoring and professional development activities with demonstrable impact on academic staff across the applicant's School or Institute (at minimum). *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 2 in Knowledge Creation domain.		A HDR student non-completion rate below 15% (withdrawals & terminations over the period of assessment). Other achievements and/or contributions to research training that have impacted HDR candidates across the applicant's Faculty or across the University. *Research Development* Led research-related mentoring and professional development activities with demonstrable impacted academic staff across the applicant's Faculty or across the University. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 2 in Knowledge Creation domain.	
Academic Level E	*Research Training* A research student supervision load of at least 2.5 EFTSL (enrolled + graduated students over the period of assessment).	*Research Training* A research student supervision load of at least 3.5 EFTSL (enrolled + graduated students over the period of assessment). Having a median consumed EFTSL level below 4.0 per completed PhD student.		*Research Training* A research student supervision load of at least 4.5 EFTSL (enrolled + graduated students over the period of assessment). Having a median consumed EFTSL level below 4.0 per completed PhD student.	

Points	Achievement Standard 1	Achievement Standard 2		Achievement Standard 3	
	1	*2*	*4*	*7*	*10*
	Having a median consumed EFTSL level below 4.0 per completed PhD student. A HDR student non-completion rate below 15% (withdrawals & terminations over the period of assessment). Other achievements and/or contributions to research training that have impacted HDR candidates across the applicant's School or Institute (at minimum). *Research Development* Led research-related mentoring and professional development activities with demonstrable influence on academic staff across the applicant's School or Institute. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 2 in Knowledge Creation domain.	A HDR student non-completion rate below 15% (withdrawals & terminations over the period of assessment). Other achievements and/or contributions to research training that have impacted HDR candidates across the applicant's Faculty or across the University. *Research Development* Led research-related mentoring and professional development activities with demonstrable impact on academic staff across the applicant's Faculty or across the University. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 2 in Knowledge Creation domain.		A HDR student non-completion rate below 15% (withdrawals & terminations over the period of assessment). Other achievements and/or contributions to research training that have impacted HDR candidates across the applicant's Faculty or across the University. *Research Development* Led research-related mentoring and professional development activities with demonstrable impact on a national or international level. *Knowledge Creation Threshold* Meets at least Achievement Standard 2 in Knowledge Creation domain.	

Applicant Notes Relating to Research & Enterprise (Including Leadership in Research & Enterprise)

1. An applicant should not refer to the same achievement in more than one domain. Examples where this principle would apply include (but are not limited to):
   a. Achievements related to honours supervision would typically be considered in the Teaching and/or Supporting Learning domain. In some instances, however, an applicant may choose to include achievements related to honours supervision in the Research Training and Development domain.
   b. Some achievements in the Knowledge Creation domain may be relevant to Educational Scholarship domain (e.g., peer-reviewed research on teaching and learning). In that scenario, the staff member must choose in which area to describe the achievement.
   c. Some achievements that are relevant in the Research Engagement and Impact domain may also be relevant to another domain (e.g., Research Training and Development domain or External Service to the Discipline, Sector, or Profession). In that scenario, the staff member must choose in which domain to include the achievement.

2. The following activities are not relevant in the Research and Enterprise (but may be relevant in the Service area):
   a. Journal reviewing or editing unless a clear connection can be made with Research Training and Development domain e.g., experiences as a journal editor/reviewer led the applicant to develop a training workshop for ACU staff on effective writing for publication).
   b. Grant agency reviewing/panel membership unless a clear connection can be made with Research Training and Development domain (e.g., experiences as an ARC/NHMRC panellist led the applicant to develop a training workshop for ACU staff on effective grant writing).
   c. Supervising research students at other universities.
   d. Contributions to scholarly societies or professional organisations unless a clear connection is made to how these contributions helped to develop ACU research.
   e. Examining research theses/candidates at other universities.
   f. Other contributions to research outside ACU (e.g., presentations, workshops, and training seminars) unless a clear connection can be made with achievement in one of the domains. For example, a keynote presentation might be included as evidence of esteem in the narrative that contextualises the metrics related to knowledge creation.

3. At least one month before the application deadline, applicants should contact the Academic Promotions Executive Officer (ACUAcademic.Promotions@acu.edu.au), to gain access to a Research & Enterprise Achievements Summary Report for Promotion. This document will provide evidence from university databases (e.g., Orion) relating to the applicant's achievements in the Research & Enterprise area. Applicants should carefully check the accuracy of the data in the relevant University systems and work with the relevant data caretakers (res.performance@acu.edu.au) to correct any errors in the databases that provide the basis for this summary. Applicants must include the report with their application and must not alter the content of the summary themselves.

Evidence Relating to Achievements in Knowledge Creation

The knowledge creation section of the Research & Enterprise Achievements Summary Report for Promotion will include:

1. A table outlining relevant details for each output during the period of assessment.

2. A table summarising research outputs for the period of assessment, including:
   - Total publication points, including:
     - the total publication points in peer review disciplines
     - the total publication points in citation disciplines
   - Total publication points as:
     - Lead author
     - Second author (relevant in disciplines where the senior author typically second in the authorship order)
     - Final author (relevant in disciplines where the senior author typically last in the authorship order)
   - For peer reviewed disciplines, the % of publication points in outlets on Faculty journal lists, including:
     - % of publication points in 4-ranked outlets (or equivalent)
     - % of publication points in 5 or 5*-ranked outlets (or equivalent)
     - % of publication points in 4, 5 or 5*-ranked outlets (or equivalent)

   - For citation disciplines, the average:
     - Source Normalize Impact per Paper (SNIP) score (*Note*: SNIP scores from the year of publication).
     - Field Weighted Citation Impact (FWCI) score

Notes:
1. Output refers to ERA eligible publications and/or non-traditional research outputs.
2. Outputs with more than 100 authors will not be included in an applicant's quality calculations, unless the applicant can demonstrate they had a substantial role in the publication (e.g., lead or senior author).
3. "Citation disciplines" and "peer review disciplines" refer to the most recent ERA designations.
4. Each output's discipline will be based on the most recently assigned Field of Research code(s) in Orion. If an output has been classified as both citation and peer review then it will count in quality calculations in both broad disciplines.
5. Publication points = 5 points for a research book (A1), 1 point for a research chapter (B1), and 1 point for a research article (C1).
6. Non-research outputs (e.g., C2 publications) will not be included in the Research & Enterprise Achievements Summary Report for Promotion.

7. Applicants may provide a brief narrative that contextualises the metrics related to knowledge creation. Evidence of quality could include (but would not be limited to) indicators of esteem, such as awards, book reviews, fellowships, and keynote speaking invitations. Descriptions of leadership achievements (e.g., initiating a successful collaboration) could also be included as evidence of the role the applicant played in knowledge creation activities.
8. For non-traditional works, applicants should include a brief statement that specifically identifies the research component of the work. They should also provide evidence of the quality of these non-traditional research outputs, such as reviews of exhibitions, musical compositions and performances, and lists of commercial catalogues.
9. In Application and Case for Promotion Form, applicants should provide a list of research outputs that have been accepted but have not yet been verified by Orion and, therefore, do not appear in the Research & Enterprise Achievements Summary Report for Promotion. A digital object identifier (doi) should be provided for these recently accepted outputs. Where a doi is not available, a pdf copy of an acceptance email (or similar) must be included as an attachment.

Evidence Relating to Achievements in Research Income

The research income section of the Research & Enterprise Achievements Summary Report for Promotion will include:
1. A table with relevant details for each grant *awarded* during the period of assessment
2. A table summarising grants *awarded* during the period of assessment including:
    -   Total value of funding (Cat 1-4) to ACU as a lead investigator
    -   Total value of funding (Cat 1-4) to ACU as a non-lead investigator
    -   Grand total of funding (Cat 1-4) to ACU
    -   Total of funding to ACU in each field of research,
    -   The 5-year sector benchmark for each field of research,
    -   The weighted 5-year sector benchmark (weighted by relevant fields of research), and
    -   The grand total of funding expressed as a percentage of the weighted 5-year sector benchmark
3. A table with relevant details for each grant application *submitted* during the period of assessment (*only considered for applications to Academic Level B*)

No narrative statement is required for the research income domain. However, applicants may include a brief statement, if they believe that the promotions committee would benefit from an understanding of the context surrounding their achievements in this domain.

Activity and Evidence Relating to Achievements in Research Engagement and Impact

ACU does not currently have well-developed repositories for storing research engagement and impact data. Thus, the Research & Enterprise Achievements Summary Report for Promotion will not include data on research engagement or impact. As and when the university develops these databases, evidence relating to achievements in this domain will be added to the report.

Applicants should provide a narrative that provides examples of activity and evidence of achievements in this domain. Examples are provided below. These lists are not exhaustive, and the various academic disciplines lend themselves to different types of research engagement with end-users.

Examples of Research Engagement activity, may include but are not limited to:
- Established networks and relationships with research end-users
- Significant institutional partnerships—e.g., various global research consortia, OECD, World Bank, World Health Organisation, UN, UNESCO
- Research funding bids with industry or community partners—e.g., CRCs, ITRHs, ITTC, CRC-Ps
- Philanthropy linked to research support
- Repeat engagements with research end-users
- Co-funding of research outputs with research end-users
- Co-authorship of research outputs with research end-users
- In-kind support from research end-users
- Involving users at all stages of the research, including working with user stakeholder and participatory groups
- Memoranda of Understanding (MOU)/Agreements with realised benefits
- Mobility of researchers (i.e., researchers employed or placed outside academia, and/or research end-user employees that are employed or placed within academia)
- Shared facilities and equipment with research end-users
- Training programs and mentoring programs for research end-users
- Public lectures, seminars, open days, school visits
- Presentations to practitioner communities
- Co-designing and collaborating on performances and exhibitions
- Serving on external advisory boards
- Policy engagements
- Consultation with/advice to community groups, professional/practice organisations, government and government bodies

- Expert witness in court cases
- Contributions/submissions to public enquiries
- Media engagements and social media campaigns
- HDR students in internships/placements
- HDR students with an Associate Supervisor (End-user)
- Start-up/spin-out companies
- Patents granted
- Licensing agreements
- Book sales

Examples of Research Engagement evidence could include, but are not limited to:
- Positive testimonials from research end-users
- Copies of MOUs or contracts
- Letters of invitation or thanks
- Awards or citations

Examples of Research Impact could include, but are not limited to:
- Research-enabled realised benefits for people, society or the environment
- Contribution to end-user knowledge and/or practice
- Translation of research outcomes into new products, new services, new laws/standards or new trainings with realised benefits for end-users
- Impact on public policy enabled by research outcomes
- Development of IP with a realistic pathway to commercialisation

Research Impact evidence could include a wide variety of verifiable, explicit evidence. Examples could include, but are not limited to:
- Public policy that led to changes in behaviour, with policy documents citing the applicant's research
- Independent reports, with analyses showing evidence of uptake and benefit of the applicant's research

Activities and Evidence Relating to Achievements in Research Training and Development

The Research Training and Development section of the Research & Enterprise Achievements Summary Report for Promotion will include:

1. Research Training
   - A table outlining relevant details for each current and non-current HDR candidate the applicant is supervising or supervised previously.
     - Current milestone completion status
   - A table outlining relevant details for each non-current HDR candidate the applicant supervised
   - A table summarizing relevant details for research training during the period of assessment, including:
     - Current research students' milestone completion status
     - Research student supervision load (enrolled + graduated students over the period)
     - Median consumed EFTSL level per completed PhD student
     - HDR student non-completion rate (withdrawals &+ terminations)

2. Research Development
   ACU does not currently have well-developed repositories for storing research development data. Thus, the Research & Enterprise Achievements Summary Report for Promotion will not include data on development. As and when the university develops these databases, evidence relating to these achievements will be added to the report.

Applicants should provide a narrative that that contextualises the Research Training metrics. They should also provide additional evidence regarding research training and research development achievements.

Examples of Research Training activities may include, but are not limited to:
- Success in HDR supervision of students from equity groups
- Interdisciplinary research student supervision
- End-user involvement in the supervision process via end-user supervision, PhD internships, and/or industry funding of HDR scholarships.
- Preparing research students for post-graduation pathways (e.g., graduate destinations)

Research Training evidence may include, but is not limited to:
- Testimonials from current and former HDR students, fellow supervisors, or end-users
- Links to student-led publications in high quality outlets
- Internal or external awards for HDR supervision

Examples of Research Development activities may include, but are not limited to:
- Leading activities that support research culture (e.g., workshops or seminars)
- Contributing to formal mentoring schemes

Research Development evidence may include, but is not limited to:
- Testimonials from mentees, mentors, workshop participants, or fellow participants in research communities of practice
- Internal or external awards relating to research development activity

Glossary

Academic Career Pathway (ACP)	A staff member's ACP is established through the appointment process and/or as an outcome of the Progress Plan. There are 5 ACPs as set out in ACU Enterprise Agreement.
Academic Promotions Committee	The relevant committee that is responsible for assessing promotion applications.
Achievement relative to opportunity (ARtO)	An evaluative framework in which the overall quality and impact of achievements is given more weight than the quantity or total volume of achievements. ARtO is a positive acknowledgement of what a staff member can and has achieved given the opportunities available; it is not about expecting lower standards of performance.
Achievements	Outcomes that are the result of academic staff activities. Achievements are demonstrated by the quality and/or the impact of the staff member's activities. In some instances, quantity is an indicator of achievement (e.g., research grant income). Time spent doing an activity does not inherently indicate achievement. However, it is expected that staff will typically achieve more in domains where they have been allocated more workload (i.e., spent more time).
Activities	The work academic staff undertake in Education, Research & Enterprise, and Service aligned with ACU's Mission and supporting its strategic priorities.
Agreement	Refers to the Australian Catholic University Staff Enterprise Agreement.
Approaching	In the context of research income assessment, the *exact* percentage of the 5-year sector average that has been awarded will be calculated and then rounded *up* to the next highest 5%. This rounded figure, not the exact figure, will judged against the stated benchmarks.
Areas of academic activity	The three broad areas of academic activity for promotion are: 1. Education (including Leadership in Education) 2. Research and Enterprise (including Leadership in Research and Enterprise) 3. Service (including Leadership in Service)
Assessor	An expert in the discipline/field who is able to offer the Academic Promotions Committee a balanced and confidential assessment of a promotion application. Assessors are external to ACU.

	To be independent, an assessor cannot include your PhD supervisor/s, co-authors, co-editors or other collaborators as provided in the *Application and Case for Promotion Form* or have a material personal interest that would impact their ability to objectively perform in the role.
Citation disciplines	Research disciplines, as indicated in the most recent ERA Discipline Matrix (Australian Research Council, 2018)
Consumed EFTSL level	EFTSL = equivalent full-time student load. A measure of a full-time student's annual study load. Consumed EFTSL for Higher Degree Research students refers to the number of full-time years (or equivalent) needed to complete the degree.

Domain	The criteria for promotion are specified under three areas of academic activity, each of which includes four domains of achievement (i.e., 12 domains in total):
	
	 • Education (including Leadership in Education)
	      1. Designing Learning Activities and/or Programs
	      2. Teaching and/or Supporting Learning
	      3. Developing Effective Learning Environments
	      4. Educational Scholarship
	 • Research and Enterprise (including Leadership in Research and Enterprise)
	      5. Knowledge Creation
	      6. Research Income
	      7. Research Engagement and Impact
	      8. Research Training and Development
	 • Service (including Leadership in Service)
	      9. Internal Service to the University
	      10. Institutional Advancement
	      11. External Service to the Discipline, Sector or Profession
	      12. Community Engagement

End-user	An individual, community or organisation *external to academia* that will directly use or directly benefit from the output, outcome or result of the research.
ERA	Excellence in Research for Australia (here)

Evidence	Information that verifies the applicant's achievements. When evaluating a staff member's achievements against the criteria, the committee will consider the quality and the impact of the work, along with the strength of the evidence that has been supplied. Thus, a case for promotion with more robust evidence will be considered stronger than a case with evidence that is less clear. Where is feasible, staff should ensure that evidence is recorded within ACU systems. If two pieces of evidence are similar, one that is drawn from an ACU database will be considered stronger than one that is not from a university system.
FWCI	Field Weighted Citation Impact
Orion	The University's research management system software which provides information for staff on their research outputs and achievements.
Peer review disciplines	Research disciplines, as indicated in the most recent ERA Discipline Matrix (Australian Research Council, 2018)
Professional Experience (ProfEx)	A survey instrument used to assist in the evaluation of learning and teaching for coursework units identified by the relevant Faculty as having significant work integrated learning components. Refer to the *Policy on Evaluation of Learning and Teaching* and the *Evaluation of Learning and Teaching Procedure*.
Progress Plan	A plan that documents work goals, career aspirations and development goals for staff and the specific targets and progress towards achieving those goals. The Progress Plan is an online tool that supports staff and supervisors in managing the performance development cycle.
Promotion	Advancement to a higher level of appointment from the current substantive position as approved by the Vice-Chancellor and President.
Publication point	Publication points = 5 points for a research book (A1), 1 point for a research chapter (B1), and 1 point for a research article (C1).
Referee	A person nominated by the applicant who is willing and able to comment, in an informed manner, on the applicant's work.
Research development	Activities that enhance staff capability and capacity in research and enterprise.
Research engagement	The interaction between researchers and research end-users outside of academia, for the mutually beneficial transfer of knowledge, technologies, methods, or resources.

Research income	Research income must be reportable to HERDC and includes Category 1-4 grants (defined by the Department of Education here). Achievements that do <u>not</u> qualify as research income (but could be reported in the Service area, under the Institutional Advancement domain) include research commercialisation income (defined here) and consultancy.
Research impact	Research that contributes to the economy, society, environment, or culture, *beyond its contribution to academic research*. The positive contribution to society beyond academia should align with ACU's Mission, Values and Strategic Priorities.
Research training	A formal course of graduate study leading to the acquisition of advanced skills, techniques, and knowledge in the conduct of research (TEQSA, 2022).
RQR	Research Quality Rating
SNIP	Source Normalized Impact per Paper (Elsevier, 2022)
Student Evaluation of Learning &Teaching (SELT)	A survey instrument used to assist in the data collection process for unit and teaching evaluation. Refer to the *Policy on Evaluation of Learning and Teaching* and the *Evaluation of Learning and Teaching Procedure*.
Teaching and Research ACP	This career pathway includes roles that involve teaching, scholarship of teaching, research, administration and academic leadership/service to the University as outlined in the MSALs and as detailed in *Schedule 3: Academic Promotions Criteria*.