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Macquarie University Research Fellowship

Overview

The Macquarie University Research Fellowships (MQRF) Scheme has three main objectives:

- To provide support to researchers within three years of the conferral of their PhD who have an outstanding track record (relative to opportunity) and/or who show evidence of excellent research potential.
- To provide an incubation research period for early career researchers, allowing them to increase their competitive edge in securing research funding from non-University sources.
- To enhance the research capabilities of existing and emerging areas of research strength at Macquarie University. To contribute to one or more of the University’s five Future-Shaping Research Priorities and detail the expected benefits to Macquarie University.

Macquarie University will offer up to 10 Research Fellowship positions commencing in 2024. The Fellowships must commence by 30 June 2024, (in exceptional circumstances a request can be made to vary this date).

The salary range for the Fellowship will be awarded at Step 6, 7 or 8 of Level A of the Academic Salary Scale, plus annual leave loading and 17% employer superannuation. These salary levels will be adjusted in line with movements in the Academic Salary Scale (see the Academic Staff Agreement).

Successful applicants will be funded $50,000 over three years for project costs (up to a maximum of $20,000 in any one year).

Application preparation

- Great care should be taken in preparing the application. The application must be informative to non-experts in the field, such that readers can understand what it is that the applicant is proposing to do, how this might be achieved, and why it is important. Unexplained jargon and/or overuse of discipline-specific language is strongly discouraged.
- Please avoid copying and pasting standard form text, particularly in relation to sponsor fit and environment. These sections should demonstrate real engagement between the sponsor and fellow, and a detailed understanding and analysis of Macquarie University’s appropriateness as the project location.
- Note the EOI form will be functional in Microsoft Word and Word for MAC.

Eligibility

Applicants are eligible only if their PhD has been conferred on or after 1 March 2020 (or if they have successfully made a case at Expression of Interest stage for an exemption to this rule in Section 4 of the EOI application form); or their thesis will be submitted on or before 8 August 2023. The Fellowship cannot commence until the PhD has been conferred, which must be by 30 June 2024.

Applicants who do not meet the eligibility criterion set out above, must make a convincing case for early career researcher status in their Expression of Interest application (Section 4). Circumstances establishing early career status could include career interruptions due to non-research employment, debilitating illness, childbirth, international relocation, disaster management, unemployment, misadventure or carer responsibilities.
Each period of career interruption must be significant, extending for a period of greater than 60 calendar days, and not overlapping.

At the time of applying for a MQRF Expression of Interest (EoI), applicants must have Australian Citizenship, Australian Permanent Residency or an existing entitlement to work in Australia for the duration of the Fellowship (2024-2026).

Applicants who have been invited to apply for a Global Talent Visa are eligible to apply for an MQRF in 2023.

Fellows must be in full-time attendance at Macquarie University for the entire term of the Fellowship, except for approved field work and travel.

Applicants who were/are PhD candidates at Macquarie University, or who have had full-time, part-time, or casual employment at Macquarie University since the beginning of 2020 must make a case (in Section 6 of the Expression of Interest Form) for why it is appropriate for them to continue or recommence their research career at Macquarie University.

Applicants may be subject to review under the Autonomous Sanctions Act 2011 (Cth). This Act restricts Australian organisations (including Macquarie University) from interacting with people or organisations associated with countries on the sanctions list.

Applicants for any Macquarie University internal grant scheme must not have any overdue reports for internal grants on which they are a current or past lead investigator.

**Sponsors**

It is the responsibility of the applicant to identify and secure the support of an appropriate Fellowship Sponsor.

Applicants and their proposed Fellowship Sponsor must consult closely with one another in developing the MQRF Expression of Interest.

Each Fellowship candidate must nominate a Sponsor from within the Host Department/School at Macquarie University. In addition to having a research profile appropriate to the proposed Fellowship project, the Sponsor’s association with an area of recognised or emerging research strength within the University is important. Applicants must work with their Sponsor to identify how the proposed research aligns with existing strengths or emerging areas of strength for Macquarie University. Sponsors should only agree to sponsor applicants who they believe unreservedly have the capacity to undertake the MQRF.

A Sponsor may be named on only one Expression of Interest, and subsequent Full Proposal, per round of the MQRF Scheme. This limit applies to both Primary Sponsors and Co-Sponsors (i.e., it is not possible to be a Sponsor on one application, and a co-sponsor on another).

Adjunct staff members and those holding University honorary positions are eligible to act as Sponsors provided their on-going research is primarily carried out at Macquarie University, such that their affiliation in respect of authorship of published work is given as Macquarie University.

A Sponsor’s contract should cover the whole period of the Fellowship.

The Fellowship Sponsor must endorse the Full Proposal to confirm that Macquarie University has the required resources, systems, facilities (including animal facilities) and core research infrastructure in place to complete the proposed Fellowship project.
Selection criteria: applications will be evaluated on the following criteria.

Applicant (40%)

- Track record of the applicant relative to opportunity and career stage.
- Research performance and potential.
- All applicants must be able to demonstrate a promising track record based on high-quality publications, generation of research funding, and other achievements such as scholarships, awards and prizes.

Project (total 60%)

Significance (15%)

- Does the research address an important problem within the discipline?
- Will the anticipated outcomes advance the knowledge base within the discipline?
- Are the project aims and concepts significant and innovative?
- Will new methodologies or technologies be developed?
- What are the potential benefits to Australia?

Approach and Methods (15%)

- Are the conceptual framework, design, methods and analysis adequately developed, well integrated and appropriate to the aims of the project?

Feasibility (15%)

- Are there sufficient and appropriate resources (infrastructure and/or financial) available for the project?
- Has the budget justification provided sufficient rationale (reasons why) for the items requested (relevant for full proposals only)?
- Is the project timetable realistic and achievable?
- Have issues such as ethics and workplace safety been addressed where appropriate?

Sponsor Relationship, Environment, and Benefit to Macquarie University (15%)

- Is the intellectual environment appropriate to foster a successful outcome for the project and provide a strong foundation for the Fellow’s career?
- Does the Sponsor have the appropriate track record and the capacity to provide mentoring and intellectual leadership in the subject area of the proposed project?
- Has the applicant made clear why Macquarie University is the appropriate place for this project?
- Will the applicant and the project be integrated into a current or emerging research strength of Macquarie University?
- How will the University benefit from the conduct of this project, including tangible benefits (such as publications, research, commercialisation, other income, capacity building and research impact), and intangible benefits, such as an enriched research culture, enhanced research reputation for the University and demonstrated engagement and impact for the wider community (this is especially important for applicants who hold a PhD from Macquarie, are already employed, or have been employed since the beginning of 2020 by the University).
Key dates and contacts

Key dates 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wed 8 March</td>
<td>Applications open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Wed 29 March 5PM</td>
<td>Pre-EOI closes for the Faculty of Arts applicants only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Tue 11 April</td>
<td>Notification to complete the EOI form for the Faculty of Arts applicants only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 26 April 5PM</td>
<td>EOI form closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early June</td>
<td>Notification to complete the full proposal – by invitation only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late June / early July</td>
<td>Full application closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late August</td>
<td>Outcomes announced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MQRF team</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MQRF@mq.edu.au">MQRF@mq.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="https://www.mq.edu.au/research/research-funding-and-grant-">https://www.mq.edu.au/research/research-funding-and-grant-</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                         | opportunities/fellowship-and-grant-opportunities/internal_funding/mq-
|                         | research-fellowships                                           |
| Location                | Research Services                                               |
|                         | Ground floor, Lincoln Building                                  |
|                         | Macquarie University                                            |
|                         | Sydney, NSW 2109                                                |

Resources

EOI guidelines

Located on the [website](https://www.mq.edu.au/research/research-funding-and-grant-opportunities/fellowship-and-grant-opportunities/internal_funding/mq-research-fellowships) covers essential information about the Fellowship. Please ensure you have read the guidelines in full before applying.

Webinars

Make sure you attend the webinars to meet the MQRF team! We will walk through the application process and provide you with an opportunity to ask questions. The webinar links and dates are available on the [website](https://www.mq.edu.au/research/research-funding-and-grant-opportunities/fellowship-and-grant-opportunities/internal_funding/mq-research-fellowships). The recording and slides will be available after each session.

Question bot

[Ask Frank!](https://www.mq.edu.au/research/research-funding-and-grant-opportunities/fellowship-and-grant-opportunities/internal_funding/mq-research-fellowships) Frank the Bear is an intelligent question bot designed to answer all of your MQRF questions 24/7. Did you know you can visit Frank on campus? See Frank at the School of Natural Sciences.
EOI form – email MQRF@mq.edu.au by 26 April 5PM (AEST)

Complete the EOI form with the accompanying attachments in the order below. The EOI form and attachments must be submitted as a single PDF file and should be named according to the following convention: “Surname_MQRF_EOI

1. Completed EOI form
2. Proof of your Visa type, or invitation to apply for the Global Talent Visa (if you are not an Australian or NZ Citizen)
3. Copy of PhD conferral
4. 6-page maximum CV, including full publications list

Faculty of Arts applicants must submit a pre-EOI emailed to the relevant Director of Research and Innovation (DRI) by 29 March 5PM (AEST)

1. Provisional project title and a brief (up to 400 words) project description
2. Name of potential Sponsor (there is no need to contact the Sponsor at this stage)
3. Your PhD conferral date (or thesis submission date if the PhD is not yet awarded)
4. A copy of your CV as an attachment including a list of publications. Publications should be listed under the headings: books, book chapters, peer-reviewed journal articles and other. The CV should also briefly detail any career interruptions since the award of your PhD.
5. A copy of your Australian residency document – passport or visa.

Process workflow

MQRF opens 8 March
EOI form closes 26 April
Panel assesses EOI's
EOI outcomes early June
Full proposal invites early June
Full proposal closes late June / early July
Panel assesses full proposals
Final outcomes late August

*Faculty of Arts applicants have an additional step – applicants must submit a pre-EOI closing 29 March 5PM (AEST). Successful EOI applicants will be notified on 11 April to complete the same EOI form completed by all other applicants.

Assessment process

Expression of Interests will be assessed by the relevant Faculty in accordance with the selection criteria. Each Faculty will nominate a shortlist of proposals which will go forward to full application. Shortlisted applicants will be invited to submit a full application in accordance with the 2024 Full Proposal Guidelines.

The number of proposals on each Faculty’s shortlist is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Number of full applications permitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie Business School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine, Health &amp; Human Sciences</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty of Arts applicants have an additional step – applicants must submit a pre-EOI closing 29 March 5PM (AEST). Successful EOI applicants will be notified on 11 April to complete the same EOI form completed by all other applicants.
The EOI form

Is available on the website. Note the EOI form will be functional in Microsoft Word and Word for MAC. The form contains valuable information on how to fill out each section. Please fill out the form carefully and stay within the word limits. The following set of instructions are designed to accompany the guidelines and information on the form.

![Image of EOI form]

The ‘Applicant summary’ must be completed.

A copy of your residency i.e., a passport or visa must be attached to the EOI form. Note, applicants who have been invited to apply for a Global Talent Visa are eligible to apply and should attach a copy of the invitation.

To check on visa processing times, visit the Department of Home Affairs website.

Section 1.2 of the form must be completed if you have your PhD. Please attach a copy of your PhD completion or conferral to the EOI. Remember to fill out section 4 of the form if your PhD conferral was before 1 March 2020.

Section 1.1.2 of the form does not need to be completed if you have a PhD. The thesis submission must be on or before 8 August 2023. The Fellowship cannot commence until the PhD has been conferred, which must be by 30 June 2024.

The ‘Project title’ must be less than 20 words. Ensure the title succinctly reflects the project methods and is pitched for a lay audience.
2.2. Proposed Assessment Panel

The MQRF full applications are assessed by either a STEMM (science, technology, engineering, mathematics and medicine) or a HASS (humanities and social sciences) panel.

Please indicate which panel your project is most aligned with using the tick box below. Please note, your selection will be vetted by an internal panel, and Macquarie University reserves the right to reallocate your EoI to the other panel depending on the content of your EoI.

☐ STEMM  ☐ HASS

You must select only 1 option for the ‘Proposed Assessment Panel’, HASS or STEMM which will determine the assessment panel reviewing your application. If you are unsure which panel aligns with your project, discuss with your sponsor.

2.3. FoR Codes

Provide up to three 6-digit Field of Research (FoR) codes relevant to your proposed project. List the percentages highest to lowest (you cannot provide two codes 50/50). For a list of FoR codes, please refer to the ANZSRC 2020 FoR document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FoR Code</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The FoR codes will inform the assessors on your project’s research areas. You must select at least 1 and no more than 3 FoR codes. The % must be listed from highest to lowest and total 100%. The FoR codes are discipline classifications under the Australian and New Zealand Standard Research Classification system developed for use in the measurement and analysis of research and experimental development undertaken in Australia and New Zealand.

2.4. Interdisciplinary Research

If the proposed research project involves interdisciplinary research (i.e., combining two or more academic disciplines), please specify those disciplines.

Linguistics, Psychology

You do not have to answer this question if your proposal does not cross into other disciplines. If your project crosses into other disciplines, please specify those disciplines like the example above.

2.5. Does your project require animals?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Specify animal/s:

A response must be selected. This question is not about animal ethics but whether animals will be involved in your project so that the panel can consider your project’s feasibility. Please discuss with your sponsor on whether there are appropriate facilities to house the animals.
2.6. Host Department/School and Faculty

| Department/School | Faculty |

Must be completed. This is the Department/School and Faculty where your sponsor is located. You can search for your sponsor by name: [https://researchers.mq.edu.au/](https://researchers.mq.edu.au/) Department/School is featured in red text next to their picture. Click on the Department/School for Faculty details.

2.7. Fellowship Sponsor Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Primary Sponsor</th>
<th>Co-Sponsor (Optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title (e.g., Dr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Must be completed. You can search for a sponsor: [https://researchers.mq.edu.au/](https://researchers.mq.edu.au/) by name or by discipline. The sponsor’s title, email and phone number will be displayed which will assist in completing this section. Note, the sponsor must have agreed to sponsor, and sponsors are only allowed to sponsor one applicant per round (see section 6 of the guidelines).

3. Research Record Relative to Opportunity

Please provide this information under the respective headings on the following pages. There is a limit of 1 page (approx. 700 words) for each heading.

Research achievements, skills, and evidence of impact in your research field

- Focus on what makes your research achievements interesting and unique.
- Explain how your experience, skills and expertise will contribute to the success of the proposed project.
- Provide evidence of impact in your research field.
- If relevant, please mention any circumstances that may have slowed down your research and publications.

3.1. Research achievements, skills, and evidence of impact in your research field

Section 3.1 of the form is an opportunity to pitch to the assessors in approximately 700 words on how your research achievements and skills have impacted your research field. Evidence of impact may include research outputs like publications to presentations and awards. Be sure to address the bullet points on the EOI form.
Section 3.2 of the form is an opportunity to pitch to the assessors in approximately 700 words on how you have leveraged research opportunities in your career. The experience could be both negative and positive, an empowering to a learning experience etc. Be sure to provide examples to the bullet points on the EOI form.

3.3. Research funding

List up to 10 of your most significant research funding, either awarded or requested but not yet awarded. Do not include PhD scholarship or travel grants. To add more than 3 entries, click the blue ‘+’ at the bottom right corner of the table.

The Statement of competitiveness should indicate (for example) whether funding was an internal (institutional)/international/national competitive scheme, its success rate (if known), rigour of assessment process, etc. The statement is max 300 characters (approx. 50 words)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding body &amp; URL:</th>
<th>□ Requested</th>
<th>☑ Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Society for the Study of Labour History (ASSLH) and ANU. <a href="https://archives.anu.edu.au/eric-fry-labour-history-research-grant">https://archives.anu.edu.au/eric-fry-labour-history-research-grant</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project title: Sydney’s ‘green ban’: unionizing civic pride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All named investigators (and your role, eg. CI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years funded (e.g. 2020-2022)</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Amount (AUD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of competitiveness:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Eric Fry Labour History Research Grant. One award is made per year to HDR students working on a thesis in labor and social history. Selection criteria include academic capability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Must be completed but does not need to list up to 10 entries. The grants may either be awarded or requested and can be internal grants from institutions like universities. 'Requested grants' are grants submitted to the funder and awaiting outcomes. All requested grants must have already been submitted before 26 April 2023. Do not include grants which were unsuccessful.

The box above is an example of how to complete an entry. Be sure to only include funding awarded to you or to a team in which you were a named investigator. For example, as a Chief Investigator or an Associate Investigator, and not as a Research Assistant or Lab Assistant.
3.4. Awards, prizes, honours invitations:

List **up to 10** of your most significant awards, prizes, honours, invitations. The statement of competitiveness should indicate (for example) whether it is competitive, whether it is internal (institutional)/international/domestic, by nomination, how it is assessed etc. The statement is max 300 characters (approx. 50 words).

To add more awards, click the blue ‘+’ at the bottom right corner of the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of award/prize/honour.invitation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chancellor’s Research Excellence Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarding/inviting body</td>
<td>University of Technology. Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year awarded/invited</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award amount (if applicable)</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement of prestige/competitiveness:

This award is for an outstanding piece of research conducted by an individual early career researcher (ECR) or team of ECRs. It is by nomination, and I was awarded as an individual. Only one award is made per year.

Must be completed but does not have to list up to 10 entries. The awards, prizes, honours or invitations must have occurred before 26 April 2023. Be sure to note in 50 words or less the statement of prestige / competitiveness for each entry.

4. Case for Early Career Status (if applicable)

If your PhD was awarded before **1 March 2020** you must make a convincing case that you have not had more than three years of research opportunity since the award of your PhD, otherwise your application will be ruled ineligible.

Please note, evidence for listed career interruptions will be required if you are invited to submit a full application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible type of interruption</th>
<th>Period of time that can be claimed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disruption due to international relocation</td>
<td>A period of time commensurate with the interruption not exceeding three months per international relocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring responsibilities</td>
<td>A period of time commensurate with the interruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster management and recovery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited or no access to facilities and resources—such as through workplace interruptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-research positions (not concurrent with research employment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental leave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being the primary carer of a dependent child (inclusive of carer’s responsibilities and any maternity or parental leave)</td>
<td>Up to two-years, inclusive of parental leave, for each dependent child. If required, an additional period of time commensurate with the interruption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1. Details of interruption

List the details of the interruptions in the table on the next page. Comments (if made) should be brief and do not need to contain private information (e.g. diagnosis of illness).

Each period of career interruption must be for a period of 60 days (continuous) or more, and not overlap.

To calculate your total interruption, multiply the number of days by the Full Time Equivalent (FTE). For example:

To add rows to the table, click the blue ‘+’ at the bottom right of the last row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of interruption</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>End date</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Total (days)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caring responsibilities</td>
<td>01/02/20</td>
<td>30/11/20</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>Caring for a sick family member an average of one day per week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have career interruption(s) and/or PhD conferral earlier than 1 March 2020 indicated in section 1.2 of the EOI form, you must complete this section. Applicants invited to a full application will need to provide documents to substantiate the career interruption(s).

The box above is an example of how to complete an entry. FTE means ‘Full Time Equivalent’ and any figure below 0.8FTE is considered part-time, 0.8 FTE to 1 FTE full-time.

Keep any comments you make brief, and do not include personal or confidential information. For example, do not include detailed medical information if the interruption was due to a medical condition.

5. Proposed Project

Use the following page to promote your proposed project to the Panel. Avoid discipline-specific terms and jargon as your proposal will be reviewed by a multi-disciplinary panel. Make clear what you propose to achieve, why it is worth doing, and how you will do it.

Please use the following subheadings in this section:

- Project aims and background
- Significance and innovation
- Brief description of approach
- Expected outcomes and outputs.

Maximum 1 page (approx. 700 words.)

Project aims and background

- Consider using two subheadings – ‘Aims’ and ‘Background’
- The aims must be clear to non-experts, be ambitious and achievable
- Stick with approximately three aims and avoid vague terms
- The background should provide some context to the aims such as where your project fits in with your research field:
  - What are the limits to your research field?
  - How does the aims address knowledge gaps?
  - Will it strengthen existing theories / concepts or create new theories / concepts?
Significance and innovation
- Is about the quality of the project and innovation
- Consider using three subheadings – ‘Significance’ and ‘Innovation’
- Significance – is the problem significant? Is it a global issue? National issue?
- Innovation – are new technologies and methods involved? Will it have access to sought after cohort (health discipline) or archive (arts discipline) to further your research field?

Brief description of approach – describe your project methods but ensure it ties back to the aims.

Expected outcomes and outputs – what are the expected outcomes to your project? What new knowledge will you be expecting and / or types of data / insights will you be validating or invalidating or pioneering etc.?

For example, “Expected outcomes of this project include.../ enhanced capacity to build institutional/ disciplinary collaborations/ theory development/ refined methods/ improved techniques...”

Be sure to stick with your project outcomes and do not overstretch to translational outcomes such as changing national policies which does not relate to immediate outcomes.

For outputs, how will you disseminate the findings? i.e., conference presentation, publish in a high impact journal, book chapter, data repository, audio-visual media etc.

5.1. References cited in project description
Maximum 1/2 page.

References cited in the previous project description only (section 5.1 of the EOI form) must be listed in full under this section (maximum half a page). The reference style is up to you in considering discipline norms. Refer to Appendix I.

6. Benefit to Macquarie University and national benefit

Why is Macquarie University the appropriate place for this project, and what are the expected benefits to the University from this project? (Maximum 1,000 characters, approx. 200 words.)

Indicate below which of Macquarie University's Future-Shaping Research Priorities is most relevant to your project.

- Healthy people
- Resilient societies
- Prosperous economies
- Secure planet
- Innovative technologies

Please note, this is especially important if you have a PhD from Macquarie, are already employed, or have been employed since the beginning of 2020, by the University.

This is an opportunity to pitch to the assessors in approximately 200 words on how your project fits in with Macquarie University’s research priorities. Select the most appropriate areas and frame your response around these areas: https://www.mq.edu.au/research/research-expertise/research-strategy-and-framework
6.1. What are the potential benefits to Australia?

Must be completed. Be sure to address the three questions on the EOI form in approximately 200 words. Refer to the Australian Research Council’s National Interest Test statements at this link for examples and ideas in framing your response.

Describe the potential national benefits, addressing the following three considerations,

1. What is the project about and what research gap is it addressing for Australia?
2. How could the research benefit Australians (economically, socially, environmentally, commercially, or culturally)?
3. How might you promote your research outcomes beyond academia to maximise understanding, translation, use, and adoption of the research in the future?

It should be written in plain English and avoid technical explanations or jargon that would not be understood by an assessor without background in the area. Evidence-based outcomes directly related to the proposed research should be clearly articulated.

(Maximum 1,000 characters, approx. 200 words.)

7. Research quality

7.1. Publication norms

Must be completed. For guidance, refer to Appendix I.

Explain the publication “norms” in your discipline, including authorship norms, quality metrics, significance of non-traditional research outputs, and any information to help the Panel interpret the indicators of research quality in your discipline.

For example, in some disciplines published conference abstracts are more significant outputs than journal articles, in others monographs are the most highly regarded output; for disciplines where multi-author publications are the norm, the lead author might be listed first or last. In some HASS fields, indices such as Scopus may capture only a fraction of publications, affecting H-index scores and citation metrics. For comprehensive details of publication norms in key disciplines, refer to the MQRF Toolkit.

Maximum 1000 characters (approx. 200 words).

7.2. Publication record

Must be completed for metrics relevant to your discipline (refer to Appendix I). Only include numerical figures for each cell e.g., 15(10) which indicates the total number of publications 15 and the number of times as lead author 10. Do not add comments. Comments on discipline norms can be provided in the previous section 7.1 of the EOI form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your Scopus H-index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Google Scholar H-index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your total number Scopus citations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your total number of Google Scholar citations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of refereed journal articles (number as lead author)</td>
<td>e.g., 15 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3. Full list of published journals
Please provide a full list of journals in which you have published and their Journal Impact Factor.

Full list of published journals – name the journals and the impact factor which can be accessed from the JCR database. Do not use SJR – Scientific Journal Rankings.

7.4. Top career output
Please identify the single career output that you consider the most important, and a 30-word summary of its significance.

Select your top publication or research output with a summary on its significance / impact to your career and/or your discipline in approximately 30 words.

8. Curriculum Vitae
Attach CV, including full publication list, to your application, adhering to the requirements below.

- Maximum of 6 pages for the combined CV and publications list. Note that if the page limits are exceeded, the panel will not read the additional pages.
- The page size of the attachments must be A4
- Margins must be no smaller than 0.5cm
- Font size and style must be legible, with a minimum font size of 12pt Times New Roman or equivalent
- Ensure that the documents will print clearly in black and white
- Documents should be saved/printed as PDF from their native format (not scanned)

6-page maximum CV, including full publications list must be attached to the application. Be sure to adhere to the formatting specified above.

8.1. Publication list
List publications under the following headings and in this order:

1. Scholarly Books
2. Scholarly Book Chapters
3. Edited Research Books
4. Refereed Journal Articles
5. Refereed Conference Papers Published in Full
6. Other Research Outputs (including non-traditional research outputs)

The referencing requirements for the publications list are:

- Include the acceptance date for all “in press”, “forthcoming” or “accepted” publications using the following format DD/MM/YYYY.
The referencing style for the publications list is up to you in considering discipline norms. However, you must follow the additional referencing requirements as specified in the form. For example, [1] * Surname, A.B. & Surname, N.T. (in press) ... title, volume, any other known info ... etc. [2] * First name A. Surname & First name B. Surname 2019, ‘Chapter title’, Book title, Publisher Location, pp. XX–XX, doi:10.1007/XXXXXX (Book Chapter) (Cit: 100, Google Scholar)

8.2. Curriculum Vitae
Provide details of:
- Qualifications
- Employment history (e.g., details of previous positions you’ve held)
- Research appointments and/or experience
If applicable, you may also like to include additional details regarding the following:
- Awards, prizes, honours, invitations
- Professional disciplinary involvement (e.g., conference organisation, committee involvement, journal reviewing etc.)
- Supervision/team leadership
- Outreach activities (e.g., public lectures, working with schools, media involvement, etc.)
- Teaching
- Publications submitted and not yet accepted, or in preparation
- Anything else of note.

Once completed, please return this form and all attachments as a single PDF via email to mqr@mq.edu.au.

The CV must follow the formatting specified in the EOI form i.e., A4 page size, margins no smaller than 0.5cm, minimum font size 12pt Times New Roman or equivalent size. Attach the CV including the publications list in a single PDF file beginning with the EOI form. Do not include a cover page.
FAQs – Frequently Asked Questions

1. **How do I apply for an MQRF?**
   All applicants must submit an Expression of Interest (EOI) form and accompanying attachments to MQRF@mq.edu.au. Faculty of Arts applicants must submit a pre-EOI and will be notified on whether to proceed with the EOI form. Successful EOI applicants will be notified to submit a full application.

2. **Do I need to submit a full application?**
   Successful EOI applicants will be invited to submit a full application.

3. **What are the key dates?**
   EOI opens 8 March and closes 26 April. Faculty of Arts applicants require a pre-EOI due 29 March and will be notified on 11 April whether to proceed with the EOI form. Applicants invited to a full application will need to submit by late June / early July. Final outcomes will be announced late August.

4. **How do I find a sponsor?**
   You can search for a sponsor: [https://researchers.mq.edu.au/](https://researchers.mq.edu.au/) by name or by discipline. Note, the sponsor must have agreed to sponsor, and sponsors are only allowed to sponsor one applicant per round (see section 6 of the guidelines).

5. **Can I commence my MQRF later than 2024?**
   The Fellowship must commence no later than 30 June 2024.

6. **Do I need to be at Macquarie University for the entire term of the Fellowship?**
   Fellows must be in attendance at Macquarie University for the entire term of the Fellowship, except for approved field work and travel.

7. **What happens if I need to take time off during my Fellowship? For example, Annual Leave, Sick Leave, Parental Leave etc.**
   This will be subject to the award conditions in line with Macquarie University’s Academic Staff Enterprise Agreement available at this link. You will also need to request a variation to the Fellowship for prolonged absences amounting to a career interruption.

8. **What if I contract COVID-19? Will this impact the Fellowship?**
   Please refer to Macquarie University’s COVID-19 FAQs under ‘internal funding schemes’ which will vary in line with NSW Health mandates. Prolonged absences amounting to a career interruption because of COVID-19 may require a variation to the Fellowship.

9. **I cannot make a deadline, can I request an extension?**
   Requests for extensions will be considered case by case and must be emailed to: MQRF@mq.edu.au. Requests will only be considered for unforeseen circumstances e.g., natural disasters; or exceptional circumstances affecting multiple applicants e.g., power / network outage, or due to unforeseen medical emergencies e.g., life-threatening injury, accident or death.

10. **Who will be on the panel of assessors?**
    The panel will consist of discipline experts from Departments / Schools within Faculties. However, ensure the project description is understood by non-discipline experts.

11. **Will my sponsor be on the review panel?**
    Sponsors will not be a part of reviewing your application. Conflicts of Interest (COIs) will be managed in line with Macquarie University policies across all review processes.

12. **Is there an appeals process if I want to query the outcome?**
    Unsuccessful applicants have the right to seek a review of outcome, on procedural grounds only. Applicants should discuss their appeal with their Sponsor prior to submitting an appeal to Research
Services. To request a review of outcome, please write a brief email detailing the basis on which the review is requested. The email should be clearly marked “MQRF EOI- Confidential Appeal” and submitted to Dr Erin Semon (erin.semon@mq.edu.au) Director, Research Grants and Awards, Research Services.

13. Is ethics approval required at the application stage?
   Ethics approval is not required at the application stage but must be obtained before the research component of the Fellowship commences. Contact the relevant Ethics Secretariat (Human or Animal), Biosafety Secretariat, Gene Technology & Biosecurity Secretariat and/or the Export Controls Secretariat for further information, and discuss timeframes for ethics approvals with your sponsor.

14. Who will own the any Intellectual Property from the project?
   In advance of submission of an application, you should take steps to protect any existing intellectual property in the proposed research. If you are appointed as a Research Fellow at Macquarie University, all IP developed during the period of employment will become the property of Macquarie University under the normal terms of employment of Macquarie University. The University’s Intellectual Property Policy may be found on the Macquarie University website.

15. I am an external applicant (not from Macquarie University), can I still apply?
   External applicant are welcome to apply subject to eligibility and visa requirements. Refer to ‘eligibility’ in the guidelines (section 3).

16. When is the PhD conferral date?
   On or after 1 March 2020.

17. Do I need to provide a copy of my PhD?
   You’ll need to attach a copy of your PhD completion or conferral to the EOI form. However, it does not need to be provided if you have not yet submitted your thesis. Note, the thesis submission must be on or before 8 August 2023. The Fellowship cannot commence until the PhD has been conferred, which must be by 30 June 2024.

18. Do I need to organize my Visa before applying?
   At the time of applying for an EOI, you must have Australian Permanent Residency, Australian Citizenship or an existing entitlement to work in Australia for the duration of the Fellowship (2024 – 2026). If you have been invited to apply for a Global Talent Visa you are also eligible to apply.

19. Can I undertake the Fellowship part-time?
   Fellowships are awarded for 3 years on a full-time basis. The Fellow may, during the term of the Fellowship, request approval from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) for conversion of the Fellowship to part-time status for periods of time.

20. What counts as a career interruption?
   Career interruptions include disruptions due to international relocation, disability, caring responsibilities, medical conditions, disaster management and recovery, limited or no access to facilities and resources, parental leave, as listed under Appendix 1 of the guidelines.

21. What happens to the MQRF if I'm successful on another Fellowship?
   Multiple Fellowships cannot be held concurrently and the MQRF cannot be converted to project funds. You will need to decide which Fellowship to relinquish.

22. I’ve previously applied and was unsuccessful, can I apply again?
   Yes, you can apply more than once if you still meet the eligibility criteria.

23. Who can I contact about accessing facilities and resources for my project?
   Please discuss with your sponsor.
24. **Formatting for the Project description.**
   The project description is a set field in the EOI form. Please follow the pre-set formatting i.e., minimum font size 12pt Times New Roman or equivalent size.

25. **Which reference style can I use for the publications?**
   The preference for formatting references is up to the applicant in considering discipline norms.

26. **What type of research outputs can I include?**
   Research outputs may include: scholarly books, scholarly book chapters, edited research books, refereed journal articles, refereed conference papers published in full and other research outputs (including non-traditional research outputs). Refer to the section on ‘discipline norms’ in this EOI toolkit for guidance.

27. **Can I include webpage addresses/URLs and hyperlinks?**
   The inclusion of webpage addresses/URLs and hyperlinks should only be used under certain circumstances such as publications that are only available online and letters of support. Webpage addresses/URLs and hyperlinks should not be used to circumvent page limits, nor should they provide information that is not contained in the application. All information relevant to the application must be contained within the application.

28. **How many pages and formatting for the CV including the list of publications?**
   Limit of 6 pages for the CV which includes the publications list **Publications should be listed under the headings: books, book chapters, peer-reviewed journal articles and other. The CV should also briefly detail any career interruptions since the award of your PhD.** and must be formatted as follows:
   - Page size must be A4
   - Margins no smaller than 0.5cm
   - Font style must be legible
   - Minimum font size 12pt Times New Roman or equivalent size
Appendix I – Discipline norms
Macquarie University Research Fellowships (MQRF) Scheme

Discipline Norms to Guide Applicants
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Faculty of Arts – Discipline Norms for Ancient History

1. **Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):**
   - Monographs are better regarded than journal articles and book chapters.
   - Journal articles in top journals are usually better regarded than book chapters, but book chapters in important collections are well regarded.
   - A monograph/book is expected (e.g., for tenure) following the PhD.
   - A recently graduated PhD may instead have a contract for a monograph/book, since some presses take a while to publish.
   - A monograph/book would count for roughly 5 journal articles or chapters.
   - Many Ancient History graduates will have conference presentations from national/international conferences. Paper presentations at prestigious, selective conferences are highly regarded; an invited paper in a symposium is rare among junior academics and is a sign of impact and esteem.

2. **Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):**
   - Sole authorship in Ancient History is the norm.
   - If there is joint authorship, order of authors typically is alphabetical.
   - If co-....authors are not in alphabetical order it will usually signify that the first author has done more work.
   - Large groups of authors are relatively rare in the discipline except in archaeological reports.

3. **Quality indicators and how to interpret them:**
   - For monographs and books, the best guides to quality are the reputation of the publisher, the editors and the contents of a collection (e.g., UK and American University Presses are best regarded but this is not a hard and fast rule).
   - There is no citation data or Impact Factor data available for journals in the discipline.
   - Rely on expert advice (Referees and Independent Reviewers) to help judge the quality of books/monographs/journals.

4. **A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:**
   - Candidates should be publishing a book within three years post PhD, and should at least be trying to meet Level A research activity for B1 or C1 publications, which is 1 per year for a teaching/research academic.
   - Outstanding would be a higher rate than this; good quality publications arising during the PhD (e.g., articles in highly regarded refereed journals), plus a monograph/book published or in press.
Faculty of Arts – Discipline Norms for Modern History

1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):
   • Monographs with an esteemed publisher (i.e., a university press, a respected commercial academic publisher such as Routledge, or else a book that is part of an established series) are better regarded than journal articles and book chapters.
   • C1 publications in top journals are usually better regarded than B1 publications, but book chapters in important collections are well regarded, especially when these are invited. C1 publications in new journals are esteemed if the editorial board are recognised experts in their field and if the journal is the only one in an emerging field, or it presents a new approach to an existing discipline.
   • A monograph/book is expected (e.g., for tenure) following the PhD, but it is very rare for a Modern History graduate to produce a monograph within 3 years of graduation. A recently graduated PhD may instead have a contract for a monograph/book, since some presses take a while to publish.
   • A monograph/book is equivalent to 5 journal articles or book chapters.
   • Many Modern History graduates will have conference presentations from national/international conferences. Paper presentations at prestigious, selective conferences are highly regarded; an invited paper in a symposium is rare among junior academics and is a sign of impact and esteem.

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):
   • Sole authorship in Modern History is the norm.
   • If there is joint authorship, order of authors typically is alphabetical.
   • If co--authors are not in alphabetical order it will usually signify that the first author has done more work.
   • Large groups of authors are very rare in the discipline unless the work is interdisciplinary in focus (e.g., written in collaboration with the sciences).

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them:
   • For monographs and books, the best guides to quality are the reputation of the publisher, the editors and the contents of a collection.
   • There is no citation data or Impact Factor data available for journals in the discipline.
   • Rely on expert advice (Referees and Independent Reviewers) to help judge the quality of books/monographs/journals.

4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:
   • Expected output for a good MQRF candidate would be: at least two B1 or C1 publications during PhD candidature, at least one per year post---PhD, and a monograph in press or with contract issued.
   • An outstanding MQRF candidate would exceed the above standard.
Faculty of Arts – Discipline Norms for English

1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):
   • A monograph with an esteemed publisher (i.e., a university press, a respected commercial academic publisher such as Routledge, or else a book that is part of an established series) would be expected of an outstanding MQRF candidate (or at least a contract for a monograph.)
   • Invited book chapters are an indication of esteem but these are not subject to the same review process as a refereed journal article.
   • Refereed journal articles are most common.

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):
   • Sole authorship is most common.
   • If a publication has been co-authored, authors’ names are listed alphabetically. It should also be assumed that each author has contributed equally to the publication.

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them:
   • Impact factors and citations typically are low in Humanities disciplines, and are therefore not the most effective indication of research dissemination.
   • Other indicators of impact are: positive reviews of monographs in peer-reviewed journals, invitations to contribute to edited collections, etc.

4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:
   • Expected output for a good MQRF candidate would be: 1—2 journal articles during PhD candidature, at least one per year post-PhD, and a monograph.
   • Expected output for an outstanding MQRF candidate would be 3—4 journal articles during PhD candidature, at least one per year post-PhD, and a monograph.
   • Current expectations for a Level A/Level B staff are one publication per year – but an outstanding MQRF candidate should exceed this.
Faculty of Arts – Discipline Norms for International Studies

The Department of International Studies comprises the subsections of Chinese Studies, Croatian Studies, French and Francophone Studies, German Studies, Italian Studies, Japanese Studies, Modern Greek Studies, Polish Studies, Russian Studies and Spanish and Latin American Studies. Scholars in the department undertake research in a variety of disciplines including linguistics, literature studies as well as historical, socio-political and cultural studies. Therefore, the Department of International Studies cannot be seen as representing one discipline.

1. **Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):**
   - The most common types of publications are journal articles and book chapters.
   - Book chapters would appear with respected academic publishers, some of whom would not be as well known in the Australian context as others because publications would often be in languages other than English.
   - Publishers with limited reputation in the Australian context (such as e.g. ‘Lang’) can be chosen as publication avenues because they publish series particularly pertinent to a specific research area, so publishers’ reputation should be considered with that in mind. This holds true for the publication of monographs as well.

2. **Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):**
   - Monographs are occasionally co-authored, but sole authorship is most common.

3. **Quality indicators and how to interpret them:**
   - Impact factors and citations are low in the fields represented in the Department and therefore are not considered an effective measurement of research dissemination.
   - Impact is more typically evidenced through positive reviews and invitations to contribute to edited collections etc.

4. **A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:**
   - Expected output for a good MQRF candidate at the time of completion of their PhD would be 1--2 journal articles/book chapters and a monograph under way.
   - An outstanding candidate would exceed this and would have published 3--4 journals/book chapters at the time of completion of their PhD and at least one article for every year after completion, as well as having published a monograph or having it accepted for publication.
Faculty of Arts – Discipline Norms for Studies in Human Society
Anthropology, Human Geography, Sociology

These norms are common to the disciplines of Anthropology, Human Geography and Sociology unless otherwise indicated below.

1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):
   - Publication of book chapters and journal articles in scholarly national and international journals remain the principal outlet for scholarship and research. In Human Geography and Anthropology, book chapters are usually accorded the same status as journal articles although journal articles are more common. In Sociology, journal articles are considered to be higher status outputs than book chapters.
   - While discipline-specific journals are often the preferred outlet, with emphasis on publication in high impact international journals and the major Australian disciplinary journals, it is common to publish either in interdisciplinary journals or in journals of other disciplines.
   - Book publications, and less commonly monographs, are seen as a sign of research excellence.
   - Other outputs include reports for government bodies and other agencies; invited contributions to research workshops or conferences (and the ensuing published record of proceedings); research contributions to specialist or popular atlases and encyclopaedias; and commentaries or short review articles in journals, newspapers and other media.
   - Authors are often called on to tailor the output from their scholarship and research to a student audience, whether through University classes, textbooks, geographical education journals or professional development courses for geographical educators.

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):
   - Single and joint authorship of publications are common. In Anthropology, single authorship is much more common than joint authorships. In Sociology, joint authorship is more common among quantitative sociologists and those doing policy based sociology than social theorists or qualitative researchers. In Human Geography and Anthropology papers jointly authored by PhD students and their supervisor/s are becoming increasingly common.
   - Joint authorship order can be based on author contributions to the paper, it can be alphabetical or it can rotate between authors in collaborative teams. Candidates should expand on their contribution to joint publications.

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them:
   - The quality and reputation of the publisher is important in judging the quality of books and monographs.
   - The quality and reputation of the editor/s and publisher is important in judging the quality of edited books and book chapters.
   - Emphasis is on high impact journals. However, because much work in human society relates to issues specific to Australian society and Australian social policy, respected Australian journals are considered to be of similar status to international discipline based ones.
   - Rankings and impact factors help to judge the quality of journal articles; however, it is also important to take into account the audience that the author/s wish to reach – hence sometimes lower-ranking journals are chosen so that author/s’ research reaches a certain audience, such as a community of research specialists – and this should be taken into account. Some anthropologists consider it crucial to publish some work in the language or languages of the region where the fieldwork is conducted, for ethical reasons as well as social benefits.
   - Other indicators of impact should be given equal weighting, including reviews, referee reports and invitations to contribute to special collections.
4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:

- We try to judge work based on quality rather than quantity although a base expectation would be 1 publication per year.
- Publication of a book or monograph within the first few years of completing a PhD would be seen as outstanding.
- 2-3 journal articles and/or book chapters in good quality journals/books would be expected following completion of a PhD. Anything beyond this in quantity or quality would be seen as outstanding. It would be expected that students who complete a PhD by publication would have 2-3 more publications than those who do a conventional PhD.
- Quantitative Sociologists and those working in social policy tend to have a higher rate of publication output than social theorists and those who do qualitative research.
- Completion of policy-oriented or applied studies with practical outcomes and/or demonstrable social impact from the research activity are valued.
- Emphasis is on careful, high standard scholarship. This can be in the form of rapid multi-authored research outputs, or slower in-depth and more reflective, often single authored publications. For this reason a high number publications does not always equate to superior scholarly research profile.
Faculty of Arts – Discipline Norms for Philosophy and Applied Ethics

1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):
   - In analytic philosophy broadly construed the standard means of publication is via refereed journal articles. It is not unusual for an early career researcher not to have a book. Monographs with leading academic presses (Oxford, Cambridge, MIT) are highly regarded. Wiley Blackwell is also a well-respected publisher. Book chapters in collections with prestigious presses are usually invited and a mark of esteem. The same criteria apply for Continental Philosophy. Other well-respected presses for Continental Philosophy, aside from Oxford and Cambridge, are American university presses, like Columbia University Press and Northwestern University Press, as well as presses publishing in other areas in the humanities, like Polity, Routledge and Verso. Some European publishers are also well-regarded, like Springer and De Gruyter.
   - In Applied Ethics, the standard means of publication is via refereed journal, and these journals may draw from a variety of disciplines, including biomedical as well as philosophical. Books are unusual for ECRs. Book chapters in collections with prestigious presses are usually invited and a mark of esteem.

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):
   - Most publications in philosophy are sole authored though joint authorship is not uncommon. Alphabetical ordering of authors indicates equal contributions by the authors, otherwise the first named author is the lead author. The same applies for Continental Philosophy.
   - Publications in Applied Ethics may be sole or multi-authored. Authorship is usually in order of contribution.

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them:
   - Top general philosophy journals have extremely low acceptance rates, usually around 5%. A ranked journals would have acceptance rates of around 15%. There are a number of very highly regarded specialist journals in sub-disciplinary and cross disciplinary areas and these are often where good ECRs are publishing. The situation is similar for Applied Ethics and Continental Philosophy.
   - Journal impact factors (where available) are lower than for the sciences since publications have long lead times and authors usually only cite sources that they directly discuss. Some applied ethics journals do have impact factors and other citation bibliometrics but generally these are low compared to biomedical journals (eg the majority are between 1 and 2).
   - Google scholar is becoming the standard source of information on citation rates for philosophy. Young scholars will typically not have high citations because of long lead times so articles with citations in double figures indicate very strong impact.
   - Any policy impact should be rated very highly, as this is difficult to achieve for ECRs and indicates research held in high esteem.

4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:
   - In Analytic Philosophy 2-3 publications in good journals at PhD completion is above the norm. For an ECR 2 articles per year in good places is considered excellent and anything above that is outstanding. Publications in prestigious journals will be regarded more highly than sheer number of publications. An outstanding candidate just out of a PhD might have 4-5 publications with 2-3 of those in top journals.
   - In Applied Ethics: at 3 years post PhD a strong scholar might have 3-6 articles, weighted towards specialist applied ethics journals. Articles in journals of the target discipline (eg biomedicine, environment etc) should be highly regarded.
• In Continental Philosophy, 1-2 publications in good journals at the time of PhD completion is above the norm. 2 articles/chapters in good journals per year after PhD is excellent, anything above is outstanding.
Faculty of Arts – Discipline Norms for Cultural Studies

1. **Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):**
   - Monographs are ranked far more highly than journal articles or book chapters.
   - Journal articles in key peer-reviewed journals are important but book chapters in prestigious edited collections (e.g., Sage, Routledge, Palgrave MacMillan and any key university press) are equally important because they provide evidence that the author was invited as an expert to contribute on a topic.
   - A monograph is normally required to progress beyond a Lecturer Level B position. Recent PhD graduates are unlikely to have a published monograph but one would expect that they have a proposal and are in negotiation with a publisher.
   - A monograph/book is equivalent to 5 journal articles or chapters.

2. **Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):**
   - Both sole and co-authorship are increasingly the norm in Cultural Studies. Co-authorship demonstrates a capacity to collaborate on research that is critical to secure funding in the contemporary environment. In the case of numerous co-authorships, however, it is important that the author has a number of publications where she/he is lead author.
   - If there is joint authorship, the order of authors reflects the contribution the author made to the article. If authors have made equal contributions then the article or chapter will be ordered alphabetically.

3. **Quality indicators and how to interpret them:**
   - For monographs and books, the best guides to quality are the reputation of the publisher, the editors and the contents of a collection (Key University presses are well regarded but by no means the only indicator of quality. There are well established commercial academic presses which apply a rigorous peer review process including Routledge, Sage and Palgrave MacMillan).
   - There are now numerous tools for capturing quality impact factors in the Humanities including Scopus, Web of Science and Google Scholar for citation data. Each database will give different results. Measuring Impact Factor in the Humanities is still an emergent field but it is now normal for applicants for grants to give some indication of citation and impact.
   - Expert advice (through referee reports and reviewers) to judge the quality of books/monographs/journals.

4. **A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:**
   - Candidates should be publishing a book within two years post PhD, and should be publishing two articles a year post PhD.
   - Outstanding would be: five good quality publications arising during the PhD (e.g., articles in highly regarded refereed journals/book chapters), plus a monograph/book published or in press.
   - Outstanding would also include evidence of external grant funding (Category 1 and 2).
Faculty of Arts – Discipline Norms for Law/Legal Studies

**General Overview:**
Given the primarily national nature of law, some areas do not lend themselves to an international audience; nevertheless, high quality work in these areas can have a major impact on law at a national level through informing judicial opinion, government policy, academic scholarship and professional practice. Other legal scholarship is inherently international and comparative in nature.

Given the interdisciplinary nature of Law, legal scholars may publish in journals devoted to other disciplines—such as History, Sociology, Economics, Philosophy or Medicine. These publications should be assessed in the same way, and accorded the same weight, as publications in legal journals. The market for legal monographs of mainly Australian relevance is small. It is also important to note that there is no comprehensive database for legal citations, comparable to those available in some other disciplines.

Finally, in Law, the presentation of scholarly material to a professional audience—for example, judges or legal practitioners—is an important vehicle for the dissemination of scholarly research. Such activities generally are indicative of the individual academic's high scholarly standing and reputation amongst the professional group.

1. **Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):**
The most noteworthy would be A1, C1 and B1 publications, in that order. However, the listing of A1 comes with the caveat already mentioned that it can be difficult for some law scholars to secure publication of monographs if they are focused on Australian or state law. A scholar in the area of international law, for example, would be better positioned to be able to publish an A1 and I would have a greater expectation that they'd do so.

On C1s, the ERA ranking of journals remains instructive albeit not definitive. To be accepted in a general law journal as opposed to a specialised law journal may be more prestigious (eg better to be in the Melbourne University Law Review than the Melbourne Journal of International Law), although there may be preeminent journals in a subdiscipline that are extremely well regarded (eg American Journal of Comparative Law). Generally, publications that are at least 20 pages (eg 8000 words long) are more impressive than the 4-5 page articles (eg 3000 words).

For B1 publications, the relevant markers of quality would be the reputation of the editors, the standing of the publishing house (eg Cambridge University Press) and, sometimes, the purpose of the volume (eg a Handbook that is intended to be a definitive collection of a subdiscipline of law). There is mixed practice as to whether B1 chapters are separately peer reviewed outside the editorial team. The B1s can be a good indicator of research collaborations, networks and research leadership.

2. **Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):**
Traditionally, legal academics have written as solo authors. This has changed in recent years with the greater emphasis on collaborative work, as well as recognising mentoring relationships. There is no standard order of authorship; it may be alphabetical, by seniority, or by extent of contribution. It is good practice for someone to indicate the extent of their responsibility for any co-authored piece.

3. **Quality indicators and how to interpret them:**
This is difficult to note in the abstract. Much will depend on the sub-discipline of law. Invitations to conferences, keynote addresses, recognition by the profession (eg invited consultancies; contributions to government publications, reports, meetings), judicial recognition (eg citations in judgments or other interactions with courts); requests to be involved in community engagement activities (eg talks to community groups, media interactions and interviews) could be examples.
4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:
This would need to be assessed relative to opportunity. Someone teaching for the first time or being in practice would have less publications than someone in a more research-oriented position. An example of outstanding would be 3-5 C1 publications (length of 6000-8000 words) per year.
Faculty of Arts – Discipline Norms for Creative Works

1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters): For a screen-research academic you would expect the research to predominantly have been produced in screen forms. There is a growing movement in media practice and creative arts disciplines that both challenges the primacy of text-based research outputs that are traditional to the academy, and appreciates the capacity for audio-visual works to communicate new knowledge. As David MacDougall (2011) notes “[a]udio-visual recording has evolved to become a means of exploring the full gamut of human social experience, including ideas, feelings, verbal and non-verbal expression, aesthetics, the role of the senses, and the formal and informal interactions of everyday life”1.

You could expect the majority of a creative works researcher’s publications and research activity to be listed under the final category: ‘Other’.

The Faculty of Arts Creative Works Sub-Committee (which reviews and verifies creative works for the purposes of the Faculty’s Research Active survey and for inclusion in ERA submissions) used the University’s criteria for assessing whether a creative work is a Major Creative Work (J1) or a Minor Creative Work (J2).

- J1s usually greater than 45 minutes for DVD/video/radio, greater than 30 minutes for musical recordings and performances, book-length for creative writing and poetry. (These are considered to be equivalent to an A1 monograph and it would be highly unusual for a researcher to be able to produce more than one J1 output in any 2-year period)
- J2s usually more than 10 minutes for DVD/video/radio programs, greater than 10 minutes for musical recordings and performances, short texts. (These are considered to be equivalent to a B1 or C1).

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):
For traditional publications:
- Sole authorship is most common.
- If a publication has been co-authored, authors’ names are listed alphabetically. It should also be assumed that each author has contributed equally to the publication.
Creative works are very often collaborative productions, especially in the screen production disciplines. The researcher should indicate their role in the production.

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them:
These may include, but are not limited to:

- External funding (Australia Council, ArtsNSW, screen agencies, philanthropic sources)
- Peer review curatorial or selection processes
- Quality of publication outlet or presenting organisation (e.g. publisher, record label, broadcaster, distributor, festival, gallery)
- Awards, citations and reviews
- As a broad principle, quality creative outputs will be able to demonstrate external validation that sits at arm’s length from the author. In some cases this validation may continue for some years after the output is produced and is closely aligned to notions of research impact.

4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding” might look like:
- Broadly speaking, a Level A (teaching and research), just post-PhD, in the Humanities and Creative Arts disciplines would be expected to be publishing an average of 1 x B1 or C1
publications per annum. “Outstanding” would be higher than this, and in most HCA disciplines there would be a monograph published or at least contracted.

- For creative works outputs, you should assume that a major creative work (J1) is equivalent to a monograph, and a minor creative work (J2) is equivalent to a B1 or C1.

1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):
   - Refereed journal articles are the norm and most highly regarded.
   - Chapters in edited collections are common. Most chapters are peer reviewed and deemed equivalent to journal papers.
   - It is common for students to publish in refereed conference proceedings. Peer reviewed conference papers are regarded as good but a little below journal articles.
   - Publication of monographs is less common and is usually limited to mid-career/senior academics. It would be rare for an ECR to have published a monograph. If the student does have a monograph, this is highly regarded.

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):
   - Number of authors can range from sole authored to up to four authors. It is uncommon for there to be more than 4 authors.
   - For ECRs a mixture of sole authored and co-authored (usually with PhD supervisor) would be expected.
   - Authors are listed in the order of their contribution to the article.
   - Students are typically first author on PhD outputs with supervisor/collaborators as co-authors.

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them:
   - Journals generally have an impact factor (IF) ranging from 0.5 to 2.5. An IF of 2.5 or greater is identified as a very high quality journal.
   - Students in urban and regional planning publish in a range of journals, including Australian (particularly for domestic candidates) and international journals.
   - At least one high quality international publication would be expected.

4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:
   - Number of publications depends on whether the PhD was completed via dissertation or publication
     - For students completing a dissertation 2-3 refereed outputs would be considered adequate (most likely 2 journal papers/book chapters and 1 refereed conference paper)
     - For students completing a PhD by publication at 4-6 refereed outputs would be considered adequate (at least 4 journal/book chapters)
   - Post-PhD at least one journal/book chapter per year would be expected for a teaching/research academic.
   - These are minimum expectations and outstanding candidates will exceed these levels.
1. Typical publications in your field and how are they viewed?

- As a general rule, refereed journal articles are the norm and are most highly regarded. Edited books and chapters in edited books are also well regarded, especially those in high quality research publications by reputable publishers (e.g., Springer, Routledge, Open University Press). Research books or monographs are rare but are highly regarded.
- In some areas of Education (e.g., specialist education studies, child development, special education and health), refereed journal articles are the most highly regarded. Researchers in ICT and Mathematics, usually publish in combination of refereed journal articles and papers in high impact peer reviewed conference proceedings and these two types of publication can be considered equally. Researchers in areas of curriculum (other than ICT and Mathematics), leadership, policy and education systems generally have refereed journal articles and book chapters as their main publication outlets. Researchers in curriculum and policy areas may also give priority to publishing in Australian rather than international journals.
- Many education researchers will include research-based chapters in text or practitioner books in their publication strategy. As an applied research discipline, the practice of translating research findings for communication to a professional or student audience is a respected means of engagement. However, contributing multiple chapters in the same volume is less well regarded, especially if the publication is ‘in house’ (i.e. the editor is a member of Department of Educational Studies).

2. Norms for Authorship

- Most journal publications would be co-authored, and sole authorship is neither rare nor common. Sole authorship of book chapters is more common. Sole authorship should not be regarded as a sign of higher or lower quality.
- The position of the author generally indicates the relative contribution of each author, with the major contributor as first author.
- PhD students are generally the first author on any publication from their thesis. Supervisors are generally (but not always) co-authors.

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them

- There is no clear metric to assess journal quality in Education. Not all education journals have impact factors, and some areas, such as special education and educational psychology have higher impact factors than others. If an impact factor exists, IF>1 is strong for Education journals. In some education areas, e.g., early childhood education, journals rarely have impact factors, so other quality indicators are used (see below).
- Scimago Journal Ratings are regarded as a general indication of quality, with Q1 and Q2 most desirable.
- A strategic journal choice for an education researcher will often include a mix of national and international journals. E.g., those who publish in locally relevant topics (e.g., educational policy and systems) may choose to publish in a National journal rather than a higher ranking International journal.
- As many journals are not captured by Scopus or Web of Science citation databases, Google Scholar is regarded as the best indicator of citation counts. Citations in policies, government papers, texts, as well as research outputs are positive indicators of impact.
- Journals and impact in education have long lag times, with citations often not appearing for over two years after publication. As such, citations take some time to build for ECRs. Again,
the sub-discipline needs to be considered here as some sub-disciplines build citations more quickly than others.

- Book and chapter quality can be judged by the publisher (e.g., Springer, Routledge, Open University Press), and the audience of the publication (i.e., academic; student; professional)

4. A general guide to what is expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what “outstanding” might look like

- Many educational researchers (e.g., those conducting field-based studies, multiple time points etc) employ time-intensive research methods. Research methods need to be considered when judging the quantity of publications post PhD.
- An “Outstanding” PhD output would be 4 or 5 peer reviewed publications, with at least one in a Q1 journal or high quality edited book publisher, with a minimum of 2 accepted outputs 12 months post completion.
- Level A positions in education are rare. Level B ECR academics would be publishing 2 articles per year within two years of appointment, the majority being first author. Publication sources should be high quality / highly respected.
- ECRs are encouraged to apply for funding to establish their research careers, but opportunities will vary depending on the ECR’s university. It is rare for an education ECR to attract substantial external funding within 3 years of appointment.
- An “Outstanding” MQRF applicant would have at least 4 high quality publications from their PhD, and an average of two more per year since completion with a majority being first author. A publication record of between 8 and 10 publications within three years of completion is an outstanding achievement. Relative to opportunity, it would be expected that they have at least one successful grant application within 2 years of commencing their post PhD appointment.
1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):

- Monographs and book chapters are highly regarded although journal articles in A*/A (Australian Business Deans Council- ABDC journal list) are considered more prestigious.
- Journal articles in top journals are usually better regarded than book chapters, but book chapters in important collections in quality publishers are well regarded.
- A monograph/book is not necessary (e.g., for tenure) following the PhD. Articles in quality journals is an expectation.
- A recently graduated PhD may instead have an article acceptance, since some journals have a lead time of two to three years to publish.
- A monograph/book would count for roughly 5 journal articles or chapters.
- Paper presentations at prestigious, international conferences are highly regarded; an invited paper in a symposium is rare among junior academics and is a sign of impact and esteem although not regarded as a research output.

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):

- Joint authorship in Management/Marketing is the norm. However while sole authorship is rare, it is an important indicator of scholarship in highly regarded journals and books/monographs.
- If there is joint authorship, order of authors is only sometimes alphabetical.
- If co-authors are not in alphabetical order it will usually signify the order of contribution, i.e. that the first author has done more work.
- Large groups of authors are the norm as part if large international research projects.

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them:

- For monographs and books, the best guides to quality are the reputation of the publisher, the editors and the contents of a collection (e.g., UK and American University Presses are best regarded but this is not a hard and fast rule).
- While citation data or Impact Factor data is available for journals in the discipline these can be misleading and the ABDC journal list is normally regarded as the best sign of quality.
- Importantly expert advice peer review and assessment (Referees and Independent Reviewers) to help judge the quality of books/monographs/journals.

4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:

- Candidates should at least be trying to meet Level A (ABDC journal list) research activity for C1 publications, with 1.5 publications per year for a teaching/research academic workload. Research intensive positions are expected have greater research activity/output (e.g. 2 publications per year for Level B).
- Outstanding would be a higher rate than this; good quality publications arising during the PhD (e.g., articles in highly regarded refereed journals eg A* on the ABDC journal list - top 4-5 per cent of journals), or a monograph/book published or in press with a prestigious publisher.
1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):

- Journal articles in A* /A (Australian Business Deans Council- ABDC journal list) are considered to be clearly more prestigious than book chapters.
- A monograph/book is not necessary (e.g., for tenure) following the PhD. Articles in quality journals is an expectation.
- A recently graduated PhD may have article acceptances (but not yet publications), since some journals have a lead time of two to three years to publish.
- A monograph/book would be rather unusual for an Early Career Researcher, may count for roughly 5 journal articles or chapters, however, only if it is with a high quality publisher.
- Paper presentations at prestigious, international conferences are highly regarded; an invited paper in a symposium is rare among junior academics and is a sign of impact and esteem although not regarded as a research output.

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):

- Joint authorship in Economics and Finance is the norm. However while sole authorship is rare, it is an important indicator of scholarship in highly regarded journals and books/monographs.
- If there is joint authorship, order of authors typically is alphabetical.
- If co-authors are not in alphabetical order it will usually signify that the first author has done significantly more work.
- Large groups of authors are rather unusual, but can be the norm as part of large international research projects.

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them:

- For monographs and books, the best guides to quality are the reputation of the publisher, the editors and the contents of a collection (e.g., UK and American University Presses are best regarded but this is not a hard and fast rule).
- While citation data or Impact Factor data is available for journals in the discipline these can be misleading and the ABDC journal list is normally regarded as the best sign of quality. On the other hand, the ABCD list has a number of contentious A vs B assignments. Its A* vs A assignments are more reliable. Moreover, well-cited publications in B journals benefit FBE more than uncited A articles.
- Importantly expert advice peer review and assessment (Referees and Independent Reviewers) to help judge the quality of books/monographs/journals.

4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:

- Candidates should at least be trying to meet Level A (ABDC journal list) research activity for C1 publications, with 1-2 publications per year for a teaching/research academic workload. Research intensive positions are expected to have potentially higher activity/output (2-3 publications per year).
- Outstanding would be a higher rate than this; good quality publications arising during the PhD (e.g., articles in highly regarded refereed journals eg A/A* on the ABDC journal list). Note that A* articles stand out when ERA evaluations are being conducted. Accordingly, they are especially valuable to FBE.
1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):

- Monographs and book chapters are highly regarded although journal articles in A* /A (Australian Business Deans Council- ABDC journal list) are considered more prestigious.
- Journal articles in top journals are usually better regarded than book chapters, but book chapters in important collections in quality publishers are well regarded.
- A monograph/book is not necessary (e.g., for tenure) following the PhD. Articles in quality journals is an expectation.
- A recently graduated PhD may instead have an article acceptance, since some journals have a lead time of two to three years to publish.
- Paper presentations at prestigious, international conferences are highly regarded; an invited paper in a symposium is rare among junior academics and is a sign of impact and esteem although not regarded as a research output.

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):

- Joint authorship in Accounting is the norm. However, while sole authorship is rare, it is an important indicator of scholarship in highly regarded journals and books/monographs.
- If there is joint authorship, order of authors typically is alphabetical.
- If co-authors are not in alphabetical order it will usually signify that the first author has done more work.
- Large groups of authors are the norm as part of large international research projects.

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them:

- For monographs and books, the best guides to quality are the reputation of the publisher, the editors and the contents of a collection (e.g., The ERA publishers a list of accepted publishers).
- While citation data or Impact Factor data is available for journals in the discipline these can be misleading it does point to impact.
- Importantly expert advice peer review and assessment (Referees and Independent Reviewers) to help judge the quality of books/monographs/journals.
- Staff should stay away from predatory journals which now account for nearly 50% of all journals in management, accounting and finance.

4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:

- Candidates should at least be trying to meet Level A or B (ABDC journal list) research activity for C1 publications, with 1 publication per year for a teaching/research academic workload. Research intensive positions are expected have far greater research activity/output.
- Outstanding would be a higher rate than this; good quality publications arising during the PhD (e.g., articles in highly regarded refereed journals e.g. A on the ABDC journal list).
Faculty of Medicine, Health and Human Sciences - Discipline Norms for Public Health and Health Sciences Research (Australian Institute of Health Innovation)

1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed:
   - Articles in international peer-reviewed journals are the usual approach and tend to be most highly regarded.
   - Review articles and book chapter publications are often only by invitation, and so are less likely for ECRs, unless as co-authors or first author on a review invited from supervisor, however, if sole or senior author this would indicate early recognition of specific skills and/or discipline knowledge by an ECR.
   - Oral or poster presentations at top international conferences are well regarded. Outputs from such presentations vary. Occasionally a full article may appear in conference proceedings or a special issue of a journal, but it is far more likely to be a published abstract (E3 publication) that has been reviewed by an editorial committee and accepted for presentation. Invited presentations at a conference, in a symposium or at workshops, or being invited to give seminar presentations are not so common for ECRs, and indicate high impact and esteem.

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):
   - Within the field, collaborative research is the disciplinary norm, so single-author publications are rare.
   - It is the disciplinary norm for the first author on the published article to be the individual who conducted the majority of the research, interpreted the results and drafted the manuscript. The last author is recognised as the person who has led the research in conception and planning and in interpreting the results and contributing to writing the manuscript. Thus, first and last authorship on a paper are both considered major authorship contributions.
   - The remaining authors are listed in descending order of their contribution, with the exception of the second last author who may be a major contributing senior author.
   - The authorship protocol for a conference abstract is as for a journal article.

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them:
   - For journal articles, metrics that may be taken to provide some estimate of quality and/or impact include journal impact factors (IFs), quartile rankings specific to the field and citations to the paper.
   - Web of Science (Journal Citation Reports) and Scientific Journal Rankings (SJR) provide journal quartile rankings based upon specialist disciplines, and these serve as a good indicator of the relative quality of specialist journals.
   - For journals, generally IF > 3 is outstanding. For example, JAMIA is AMIA’s premier peer-reviewed journal for biomedical and health informatics and has an IF of 3.7.
   - Citation rates take several years to become a meaningful metric, especially for ECRs.
   - Any broad-audience journal publication (such as Nature/Science/PNAS) is exceptional, but these tend to be uncommon (particularly first author).
   - h-index can vary markedly for ECRs within three years of PhD. As a baseline most ECR researchers should have an h-index that equals or exceeds time since PhD (i.e. an h-index of at least 1).

4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:
   - Consistent with successful recipients of NHMRC Early Career Fellowships, an outstanding MQRF applicant at two to three years since PhD would typically have:
     - 10–15 publications, with approximately half of these as first author, and a number of them in the mid-to-top tier of the specialist field.
     - Presented at several national and international conferences.
     - Been a reviewer for research articles in well regarded journals.
     - Some form of research grant funding as first investigator – typically smaller grants – and/or perhaps a competitive fellowship. A role (typically as a co-investigator) on larger scale Category 1 grant is rare at this stage, but if present indicates high-quality contribution.
     - Some early form of peer recognition such as ECR prizes or awards.
Faculty of Medicine, Health and Human Sciences - Discipline Norms for Biomedical Sciences & Clinical Medicine

1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed:

- Articles in international peer-reviewed journals are the norm and are most highly regarded.
- In general, Journals should be indexed by PubMed, unless very recently published.
- Review articles and book chapter publications are often only by invitation, and so are less likely for ECRs, unless as co-authors or first author on a review invited from supervisor, however, if sole or senior author this would indicate early recognition of specific skills and/or discipline knowledge by an ECR.
- Oral or poster presentations at top international conferences are well regarded. Outputs from such presentations vary. Occasionally a full article may appear in conference proceedings or a special issue of a journal, but it is far more likely to be a published abstract (E3 publication) that has been reviewed by an editorial committee and accepted for presentation. However, typically international Biomedical meetings such as Neuroscience (SFN) or Experimental Biology do not peer review abstracts, but attendance is usually a sign of quality work. Full refereed conference papers (E1 publications) are common in biomedical engineering, which does place a lot of emphasis on conference publications. Invited presentations at national and international conferences, symposia or at workshops, or being invited to give seminar presentations are not so common for ECRs, and indicate high impact and esteem.

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):

- Within the field, collaborative research is the disciplinary norm, so single-author publications are rare.
- It is the disciplinary norm for the first author on the published article to be the individual who conducted the majority of the research, interpreted the results and drafted the manuscript. The last author is often the corresponding author and is recognised as the person who has led the research in conception and planning and in interpreting the results and contributing to writing the manuscript. Thus, first and last authorship on a paper are both considered major authorship contributions.
- The remaining authors are listed in descending order of their contribution, with the exception of the second last author who may be a major contributing senior author.
- On occasions, the first and second listed authors are noted to have ‘contributed equally to the work’.
- The ‘Corresponding Author’ may be the first author, indicating an individual who both conceived of and coordinated the study and undertook responsibility for submission of the manuscript.
- The authorship protocol for a conference abstract is as for a journal article.

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them:

- For journal articles, metrics that may be taken to provide some estimate of quality and/or impact include journal impact factors (IFs), quartile rankings specific to the field and citations to the paper.
- Web of Science (Journal Citation Reports) and Scientific Journal Rankings (SJR) provide journal quartile rankings based upon specialist disciplines, and these serve as a good indicator of the relative quality of specialist journals.
- For journals, generally IF > 10 is outstanding, IF > 5 is excellent, IF > 2 is good; however, in some disciplines, top-quartile journals (Q1) may have IF of 4–5 but may be considered primary target journals for that area, and hence quartile rankings are an important consideration. Examples of these areas include Pharmacology, Hypertension, Biochemistry, Physiology and Clinical Neuroscience.
- Citation rates vary by sub-discipline – biomedical engineering tends to be particularly low, being more akin to engineering than medicine – and take several years to become a meaningful metric, especially for ECRs. However, a substantial citation rate indicates work which has engaged the Discipline.
- Any broad-audience journal publication (such as Nature/Science/PNAS/NEJM/Lancet/BMJ/AJM) is exceptional, but these tend to be uncommon (particularly first author) and will typically have a very long list of authors.
- h-index can vary markedly for ECRs within three years of PhD. As a baseline most ECR biomedical researchers should have an h-index that equals or exceeds time since PhD (i.e. an h-index of at least 1).

4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:

- Consistent with successful recipients of NHMRC Early Career Fellowships, an outstanding MQRF applicant at two to three years since PhD would typically have:
  - A career total of 10–15 publications, with approximately half of these as first author, and a number of them in the mid-to-top tier of the specialist field.
  - Presented at several national and international conferences.
  - Could have undertaken review of research articles in well regarded journals.
  - Some form of research grant funding as first investigator – typically smaller grants from internal schemes and/or perhaps a competitive fellowship. A role (typically as a co-investigator) on larger scale Category 1 grant is rare at this stage, but if present indicates high-quality contribution.
May have received some early form of peer recognition such as PhD or ECR prizes or awards including travel awards, poster or oral prize arising from conference presentation or Commendation such as Vice Chancellors commendation based on PhD work. Having such recognition illustrates something of the quality of the candidate. However, the absence of such prizes or awards should not be regarded adversely, as it may simply reflect a lack of opportunity.
Faculty of Medicine, Health and Human Sciences – Discipline Norms for Chiropractic

1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):
   - Articles in international peer-reviewed journals are the most highly regarded publications in this field.
   - Book chapters are also highly regarded and are often by invitation. If sole or senior author, this would indicate early recognition of specific skills and/or discipline knowledge.
   - Oral or poster presentations at international conferences are well regarded. Outputs from such presentations vary. Occasionally a full article may appear in conference proceedings or a special issue of a journal, but it is far more likely to be a published abstract (E3 publication) that has been reviewed by an editorial committee and accepted for presentation. However, full refereed conference papers (E1 publications) do occur occasionally. Invited presentations at a conference, symposia or workshop or being invited to give seminar presentations are not so common for early career researchers (ECRs) and indicate high impact and esteem.

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):
   - Within the field, collaborative research is the disciplinary norm. Single-author publications are not common.
   - Within the field, part-time HDR candidates are common, therefore a pro-rata calculation of research output should be included in any assessment of research productivity.
   - The first author on a published article is usually the individual who has conducted the majority of the research, interpreted the results and drafted the manuscript. The last author is often the person who has led the research in conception and planning and in interpreting the results and contributing to writing the manuscript. Thus, first and last authorship on a paper are both considered major authorship contributions.
   - The remaining authors are listed in descending order of their contribution to the manuscript.
   - The authorship protocol for a conference abstract is as for a journal article.

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them:
   - For journal articles, metrics that may be taken to provide some estimate of quality and/or impact include journal impact factors (IFs), quartile rankings specific to the field and citations to the paper.
   - For journals, generally IF > 10 is outstanding, IF > 5 is excellent, IF > 2 is good.
   - Citation rates are an important indicator of the quality of a publication. However, they should be considered in conjunction with IFs of the journal they appear in.
   - ISI provide journal rankings based upon disciplines and these serve as a good indicator of the relative quality of a journal.
   - h-index can vary markedly for researchers in this field and especially for ECRs within five years of gaining a PhD. As a guide, most ECR researchers should have an h-index that equals or exceeds time since PhD.

4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:
   - An ‘average researcher’ in the field would be expected to produce at least one C1 article per year in a peer reviewed journal with an IF.
   - To be considered an outstanding candidate for an MQRF, an applicant with two to three years since gaining a PhD would typically have:
     o 5–10 publications, with approximately half of these as first author, and a number of them in the mid-to-top tier journals in the field.
     o Presented at several national and international conferences.
o Been a reviewer for research articles in peer reviewed journals with IFs.

o Some form of research grant funding as first investigator – typically smaller grants – and/or perhaps a competitive fellowship. A role (typically as a co-investigator) on larger scale Category 1 grant is rare at this stage, but if present, indicates high-quality contribution.

o Some early form of peer recognition such as ECR prizes or awards.
Faculty of Medicine, Health and Human Sciences – Discipline Norms for Linguistics

1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):
   - In some areas of Linguistics (e.g., language sciences) refereed journal articles are the norm and most highly regarded due to their more stringent peer-review process.
   - Book chapters are equally common in other areas (e.g., systemic functional linguistics, applied linguistics), and can be regarded equally highly depending on the status of the editor/publisher. Chapters appearing in more “in-house” publications (e.g., Macquarie staff members as editors) may be less highly valued than chapters in other volumes.
   - Authored books/monographs are rare even among more senior academics, while edited books are more common.
   - Many Linguistics graduates will have conference presentations from national and/or international conferences.
   - Paper (moreso than poster) presentations at prestigious, selective conferences are highly regarded. Invited papers are rare among junior academics and are a sign of impact and esteem.
   - Full written refereed conference papers are in general less highly regarded than other peer-reviewed outputs in Linguistics, though could be rated highly depending on the quality of the conference and stringency of the acceptance criteria.

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):
   - Sole authorship in Linguistics is less common in areas such as language sciences, but is seen more often in some areas of applied linguistics. If a sole-authored paper appears in a high impact journal, it should be highly rated.
   - Authorship typically is joint (especially in areas such as language sciences), with order of authorship representing the degree of contribution to the research (no special meaning is attached to the position of last author).
   - Publications with more than five or six authors are relatively rare in Linguistics, with the exception of more clinical areas.
   - PhD students typically are first author on their PhD outputs, and often (but don’t always) include their supervisor(s) as co-authors.

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them:
   - For journal articles, quality measures include journal impact factors (JIFs) and/or journal rankings. A JIF > 1 is strong in Linguistics, with fewer than 30% of journals having JIFs at or above this level. According to ISI rankings, the top journal in the discipline is “Journal of Memory and Language” with a JIF of 4.237; just 6 journals have JIFs > 2; and just 19 journals have JIFs > 1.5. The median JIF = 0.549.
   - The quality of individual C1 journal articles can sometimes be assessed via citation rates (e.g., in areas such as language sciences), but in more applied areas, citation rates are not as relevant. When referring to citation rates, Google Scholar is more relevant than Scopus or Web of Science due to its broader coverage of relevant published resources. Media attention or a demonstrated influence on, for example, teaching practice, would be rated highly.
   - Linguistics academics generally publish in specialist journals that target specific areas of Linguistics (e.g., speech, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, etc.), or journals intended for specific, applied audiences (e.g., clinicians, teachers). Especially in applied and systemic functional linguistics, papers may also appear in “out of area” journals (e.g., a discourse analytic study of accounting interactions may appear in an accounting journal). All outputs are valued.
4. *A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:*

- In Linguistics, academic staff members are expected to publish a minimum of 2 peer-reviewed book chapters or journal articles per year for their 40% research allocation.
- An outstanding MQRF applicant would have publications during the PhD period (approximately 3), and then 2 or more B1 or C1 publications/year since PhD. A good proportion of these would be first author (e.g., from the PhD). National and international conference papers also would be expected.
- Note, however, that research involving longitudinal data collection; that is, data collected at multiple time points over long periods (e.g., from clinical groups or from children), will result in fewer publications and should be taken into account.
Faculty of Medicine, Health and Human Sciences – Discipline Norms for Psychology and Cognitive Science

1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):
   • Refereed journal articles are the norm and most highly regarded. Authored books/monographs are rare even among more senior academics. Edited books and especially book chapters in edited volumes are somewhat common, especially for more senior academics.
   • Journal articles are considered more prestigious than book chapters (which although often invited don’t tend to have the same review process), but an invited chapter in an edited volume published by a good publisher (e.g., Oxford University Press) and edited by leaders in the field is a sign of impact and esteem.
   • Many Psychology/Cognitive Science graduates will have national/international conference presentations.
   • Paper (more so than poster) presentations at prestigious, selective conferences are highly regarded; an invited paper in a symposium is rare among junior academics and a significant sign of impact and esteem (especially if the symposium is not chaired by the PhD supervisor).
   • At some very large, peer reviewed conferences, junior academics often are only permitted to present posters (e.g., Psychonomics). So posters in these cases should not be given less weight than papers when these are the only avenues of presentation at these meetings.
   • Full written refereed conference papers are rare in Psychology/Cognitive Science. However, in some sub-disciplines (e.g., clinical psychology), junior academics may have a record of published abstracts for conference presentations. This means that a particular conference routinely publishes the full set of abstracts and may provide additional exposure. Such abstracts (and the accompanying conference presentation) might be weighted just a little higher than a conference paper/poster.

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):
   • Sole authorship in Psychology/Cognitive Science is relatively rare and should be rated highly (especially in a high impact journal).
   • Authorship typically is joint, with order of authorship representing the degree of contribution to the publication (authors are listed in the order of their contribution to the article).
   • Typically there is no special meaning for the position of last author; the final author is not necessarily the team leader and made the least contribution to the paper (unless the paper represents interdisciplinary work with medical or clinical sciences where the norms may be different).
   • PhD students typically are first author on their PhD outputs with their supervisor/s as co-authors.
   • Very large groups of authors are reasonably rare except perhaps in clinical studies. Most publications probably have between 2 and 5 authors.

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them:
   • For journal articles, quality measures include journal impact factors (IFs) and/or journal rankings. An IF > 2 is very strong in Psychology/Cognitive Science and even the best journals in the field rarely have IFs > 10 (only 5 of 557 Psychology journals have IFs > 10; the median is < 1.5). Where a Cognitive Science graduate publishes in neuroscience journals, expect IFs to be routinely higher.
   • The quality of individual articles can be assessed via citation rates (and relatedly by H-
index) but citation rates are determined by the size of the sub-disciplines (e.g., citation rates are much higher in neuroscience than autobiographical memory because neuroscience is a huge sub-field). An additional, often more relevant measure of impact is who is citing the work and/or who has adopted the methods.

- Psychology/Cognitive Science academics publish in general journals that target broad academic audiences, specialist journals that target specific parts of Psychology/Cognitive Science, or journals intended for specific, applied audiences (e.g., clinicians, teachers). All outputs are valued.
- We rarely publish in outlets such as Nature or Science. Journal publishers such as the American Psychological Association are highly regarded (with very high rejection rates).
- ERA rankings mostly were agreed on in the discipline.

4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:

- A recent discipline profile for promotion of research intensive staff in Cognitive Science at MQ included the following publishing expectations: Level A, 2 C1 publications/year is "very satisfactory"; Level B, 3 C1 publications/year is "very satisfactory"; Level C, 3 C1 publications/year is "very satisfactory"; Level D, 4 C1 publications/year with publications in particularly high prestige journals becoming apparent.
- An analysis of publication rates of teaching/research academics in Psychology at Group of Eight Universities indicated that the average publication rate across ALL LEVELS was 2 C1 publications/year. Publishing 2 C1 publications/year would place a candidate above the 90 percentile of Level B academics surveyed by McNally (Level B academics published on average 1.5 papers/year).
- Current minimum standards communicated for PDR purposes at MQ specify > 2 CI publications/year for Level A and Level B academics.
- So truly outstanding for the purposes of the MQRF would be publications above (or perhaps double) the rate of a research intensive Level A or teaching/research Level B (i.e., publications during the PhD period then 2-4 C1 publications/year since PhD). A good proportion of these would be first author (e.g., from the PhD) and perhaps one or two in a high quality journal. You also would expect to see national and international conference papers.
- Note, however, that research that involves longitudinal data collection -- that is, data collected at multiple time points over long periods (e.g., from clinical groups or from children) -- will result in fewer publications and should be taken into account.
1. **Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed:**
   - Refereed journal articles are the norm and most highly regarded.
   - Books/monographs, book chapters and full conference papers accumulate with seniority (and are likely to be rare for ECRs – especially books).
   - Journal articles are generally considered more prestigious than book chapters but invited chapters in edited volumes from a quality publishing house (e.g. Oxford, Cambridge, Academic Press, Wiley, etc.) and edited by leaders in the field indicates impact and esteem.
   - HDR graduates should have conference presentations from national/ international conferences. Typically, conference papers do not result in peer-reviewed proceedings.
   - Paper (>poster) presentations at prestigious international conferences are highly regarded; invited papers in symposia are rare for ECRs (although may occur if awarded as part of a Society prize) and indicate high impact and esteem.

2. **Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):**
   - Sole authorship is rare. Any sole-authored papers should be considered an indicator of substantial independence and initiative.
   - Authors are generally listed in order of descending contribution to the article (and alphabetically within sub-groups contributing equally) although it is not unusual for the senior author (lab leader) to be listed last.
   - Students typically first author on PhD outputs with supervisor/collaborators as co-authors.
   - Most publications have 2–5 authors.

3. **Quality indicators and how to interpret them:**
   - For journal articles, quality measures include impact factors (IFs) and/or rankings (e.g. ERA).
   - Any publication in *Nature* or *Science* publication is truly exceptional, especially with the recent proliferation of high-impact second-tier journals from those publishers (*Nature Ecology & Evolution; Nature Plants; Science Advances*; etc). Publications in those second-tier journals, as well as any publications in PNAS, Current Biology, Trends in Ecology and Evolution, etc. (i.e. IF ~10 or better, should also be highly regarded).
   - IF >4 outstanding, IF >2.5 excellent, IF >1.5 good.
   - Citation rates vary by discipline and take several years to become a meaningful metric.
   - Outputs in more general Journals are increasingly valued over taxon-specific journals, although this generally scales with IF. A mix of such outputs is to be expected.
   - ERA rankings were mostly agreed on in the discipline.
   - H-indices are rarely informative for ECRs, because there has been too little time for citation rates to reflect paper quality as judged by peers. The m-index may be more appropriate as it takes into account the number of years since first publication but must be used carefully as it assumes an uninterrupted research career (or must be adjusted for any interruptions).
4. **A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications):**

- MQ discipline profile for 40:40:20 (Research/Teaching/Admin) academics in Biology suggests the following as expectations (Note that these guidelines are for 40% research active academics):
  - Level A: 1–2 C1 paper/year
  - Level B: 2–4 C1 papers/year; conference papers useful but not as a substitute

5. **An "outstanding" MQRF applicant:**

- 0–1 years out of PhD: 5 quality publications (with some sole or first authored and in high quality, i.e. IF>2.5 journals).
- 3 years out of PhD: 10–15 publications (with several sole, first or senior authored and in high quality, i.e. IF>2.5 journals).
- Several national and international conference presentations (if funding has allowed them to travel internationally – certainly cannot be assumed).
- And potentially:
  - Evidence of peer-esteem in the form of Society prizes, invited conference presentations, invited book chapters
  - Evidence of initiative and success with small research grants (up to $10k), including society travel grants, student awards, society research grants etc.
  - DECRA (or equivalent) application in the works.
  - Evidence of engagement with the broader scientific community, society, government or industry, e.g. media coverage, Conversation articles, engagement with museums, schools
  - Evidence of impact or influence, e.g. influencing policy, very high altimetric scores, etc.
Faculty of Science and Engineering – Discipline Norms for Engineering

1. **Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed:**
   - Conference articles are more common than journal articles, but journal articles are the most highly regarded.
   - Journal articles are often built from conference papers, working out the material in a more thorough and complete way. Often material in a journal article will have been presented earlier in conferences in simpler form (the turnaround time in many electrical engineering journals is quite long, up to two years, so publication first in conferences is the norm). Usually, a researcher will have about two conference papers for every journal paper.
   - Refereed journal articles are more highly regarded, and if a researcher has a much higher ratio than 2:1 (conference: journal) then this is not such a good sign.
   - That said, some conferences are very prestigious with very low acceptance rates (10% or less) and these conference papers are highly regarded. This is particularly true in computer science or computer networking fields (e.g., Sigcomm and Infocom conferences are very prestigious, other fields have similar top ranking conferences).
   - Books/monographs, book chapters and full conference papers accumulate with seniority (and are likely to be rare for ECRs – especially books).
   - Journal articles are generally considered more prestigious than book chapters, but invited chapters in edited volumes from a quality publishing house (e.g., Oxford, Cambridge, Academic Press, Wiley etc.) and edited by leaders in the field indicates impact and esteem.
   - HDR graduates should have conference presentations from national/international conferences. Paper (or poster) presentations at prestigious international are highly regarded; invited papers in symposia are rare for ECRs (although may occur if awarded as part of a Society prize) and indicates high impact and esteem.

2. **Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):**
   - Sole authorship is rare.
   - Authors are listed in the order of their contribution to the article.
   - Students are typically first author on PhD outputs with supervisor/collaborators as co-authors.
   - Number of authors:
     - Most fundamental/theory publications have 2 - 5 authors.
     - Many experimental/practical publications have 4 - 8 authors.
     - Cross-disciplinary publications typically have 5 - 10 authors.

3. **Quality indicators and how to interpret them:**
   - For journal articles, quality measures include impact factors (IFs) and/or rankings
   - In Electrical Engineering fields, IEEE journals are highly regarded, particularly selected topics journals (e.g., IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications).
   - Any Nature/Science publication is exceptional.
   - IF > 4 outstanding, IF > 3 excellent, IF > 2 very strong, IF > 1.5 good. But some high IF journals are lightweight – if they are magazines e.g., IEEE Communications Magazine. One magazine article in a CV can be good, but not too many.
   - Citation rates vary by discipline and take several years to become a meaningful metric.
   - H---index is difficult to gauge in ECR cases.
   - Most conference publications are fully refereed, with acceptance rates typically between 20-50%.
4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications)
   • MQ discipline profile for 40:40:20 (Research/Teaching/Admin) academics in Engineering suggests the following as expectations (Note that these guidelines are for 40% research active academics):
     • Level A, 1--2 refereed conference papers/year; 1 refereed journal article per year;
     • Level B, 1--3 refereed conference papers/year; 1--2 refereed journal articles per year;
     • Level C, 2--4 refereed conference papers/year; 1--3 refereed journal articles per year;
     • Level D, 3--6 refereed conference papers/year, 2--3 refereed journal articles per year, and occasional book chapter;
     • Increasing international recognition in the invited papers, best paper prizes, invited talks.

5. An "outstanding" MQRF applicant:
   • >10--15 publications (depending on year since PhD graduation), many if not most senior-authored, and at least several in high quality (IF > 2.2) journals (e.g., IEEE journals/transactions).
   • Several national and international conference presentations.
   • And potentially:
     • Evidence of peer-esteem in the form of Society prizes, invited conference presentations, invited book chapters;
     • Evidence of initiative and success with small research grants (<1--5K), including society travel grants, student awards, society research grants etc.;
     • DECRA (or equivalent) application in the works.

6. Sub-Discipline Comparisons
   • In Electronics, the field of solid-state electronics has many more publication opportunities compared to the field of circuits and electrical engineering
   • Engineering covers a wide range of activities from fundamental theory to practical/experimental, in fields ranging from Electrical, Mechanical, Biomedical and Civil, to Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics. As such, there is a wide variety of sub-disciplines where the publication norms can vary significantly.
Faculty of Science and Engineering – Discipline Norms for Solid Earth Sciences

1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed:
   • Refereed journal articles are the norm and highly regarded.
   • Books/and book chapters are much less common, but their value is considered high. Many contributions to edited books/series, especially of geological society publications carry comparable weight to journal articles.
   • Conference papers most usually appear as special issues in international journals, in which case they count as equivalent to journal articles. Two to three-page extended abstracts are generally not reviewed and are not viewed as full publications.
   • HDR graduates should have conference presentations from national/international conferences. Oral and Poster presentations at prestigious international conferences are highly regarded (depending on the Conference, posters have equal value with oral presentations). Invited papers in symposia are rare for ECRs and indicate high impact and esteem.

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):
   • Collaborative research has become the norm, so that single-authored publications are rare, reflecting the importance of team research in Earth Sciences. Indeed, if a junior researcher has mainly single-authored papers, this may indicate a lack of interest in, or ability for, teamwork.
   • The first-listed author is expected to have conducted most of the research and written a substantial proportion of the article. Placement of the supervisor’s (or team leader’s) name on contributions is inconsistent; some favour second place, others last place. In many cases, the order of authorship reflects the proportional input to the paper, but this is not universal or binding.
   • Students thus typically first author PhD outputs with supervisor/collaborators as co-authors. There can be exceptions where very large PhD projects are carried out in tandem and may have alternate first authorship by the postgraduate students involved.
   • Authorship customs for abstracts are similar to those for papers.
   • Review articles by ECRs are taken to indicate early recognition of exceptional overview of the discipline.

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them:
   • For journal articles, quality measures include impact factors (IFs) or stakeholder relevance (e.g., J. Geol. Soc. Aust; Economic Geology; Journal of Asian Earth Sciences).
   • Any Nature group/Science/PNAS publication is exceptional.
   • IF > 4 outstanding, IF > 3.0 excellent, IF > 1.5 good (lower IF journals may have higher value if relevant to specific stakeholder groups, and appropriately justified in the application).
   • Citation rates vary greatly by discipline and because of slow publication rates. Individual papers and take several years to become a meaningful metric.
   • The average length of geoscience publications is longer than in any other science disciplines, meaning that writing time, publication time and consequently the time lag before appreciable citation is long and must be allowed for. Length is however, NOT a measure of quality: some very long ones are regarded just as highly as shorter ones.
   • H-index is difficult to gauge for ECRs because of the relatively slow publication process.

4. A general guide to expected output post-PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications):
   • The expected output for a research-only Level A position is one paper per annum, noting that 2-3 is required to be competitive for national grants. An ECR (i.e., pursuing a career in research) can be expected to produce 1-2 papers for each year post-PhD for the first three
years.

- It is now normal for a PhD student to write a thesis in the form of 3-4 publications, but it is not common for more than one of these to be already published at the time of completion. For an outstanding student, these will mostly appear in the first year post-PhD.
- Citations: because of the time lag that results from slow publication, a high number of citations cannot be expected two years after completion. The citation count and H-Index can be quite erratic.
- An outstanding ECR (with potential for MQRF) would have produced at least 2-3 publications per year. These people are more likely to have published more papers before completion of the PhD.
- An outstanding MQRF applicant in earth sciences should also have:
  * at least half his/her publications as first author
  * made presentations at several national/international conferences (depending on opportunity)

First-authored publications are the best guarantee of quality: other papers are a bonus at this stage.

5. An "outstanding" MQRF applicant:
- ≥3 publications (1 year out of PhD), in high quality (IF>3) journals and/or well justified stakeholder-relevant journals.
- Several national and international conference presentations.
- Evidence of transition to CI role in a post-PhD research project (including postdoc).

- And potentially and only according to opportunity
  - Evidence of peer-esteem in the form of Society prizes, invited conference presentations, invited book chapters;
  - Acted as a reviewer for international journals
  - Evidence of initiative and success with small research grants including society travel grants, student awards, society research grants etc.;
  - DECRA (or equivalent) application in preparation or submitted.
Faculty of Science and Engineering – Discipline Norms for Environmental Sciences

1. **Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed;**
   - Refereed journal articles are the norm and most highly regarded.
   - Authored books/monographs are likely to be rare for ECRs but are highly regarded.
   - Book chapters are often simply standard research papers but in an edited volume [they are usually peer-reviewed, but that is worth checking]. They are generally viewed as equivalent to a journal paper but will not attract as many citations (and are declining as a form of publication). They may be invited, perhaps after participation in a conference. Should not be confused with less prestigious encyclopaedia entries.
   - Conference papers range from substantial works in peer-reviewed publications, which are regarded as good but a little below journal articles. Abstracts or extended abstracts (check the number of pages!) are usually not peer-reviewed and are routine marks of participation in a conference: they are (despite some attempts in CVs) not regarded as substantial work and are being discouraged due to lack of citations.

2. **Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship;**
   - Sole authorship is rare, but one to several sole-authored papers is a sign of independence and initiative and rates highly.
   - Authors are listed in the order of their contribution to the article, although in some cases the final author may be group leader with all of the responsibilities and efforts of conceiving, funding and supervising the research. This will not normally apply at PhD or post-doctoral fellow career stage.
   - Students typically first author on PhD outputs with supervisor/collaborators as co-authors.
   - Most publications have 2 - 5 authors. Even on multiple-author papers there are often ‘ranks’ of contribution: check for authors ranked in alphabetical order, usually a marker of lesser contribution.

3. **Quality indicators and how to interpret them;**
   - For journal articles the only direct quality measure is citations, but these may be meaningless for papers less than 2 years old.
   - Any Nature/Science publication is exceptional.
   - IF > 4 outstanding, IF > 3.0 excellent, IF > 1.5 good. Lower IF journals may have higher value if relevant to stakeholder groups, and appropriately justified in the application.
   - Outputs in more generic international Journals are increasingly valued over national or very specific journals, although a mix of such outputs is to be expected.
   - H-index is difficult to gauge in ECR cases given the time it takes to generate citations on recently published papers. Having an H-index at all may be a sign of success.
   - There should be conference presentations from national and international conferences in the track record. Oral (>poster) presentations at prestigious international conferences are highly regarded, but at some large international conferences (e.g. EGU or AGU) posters or PICO presentations are considered highly; posters at lesser conferences are less well regarded; invited papers are rare for ECRs and indicate high impact and esteem.

4. **A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g. number and kind of publications;**

   Departmental research productivity expectations for academics suggest the following;
   - The expected output of a Level A 40:40:20 (Research/Teaching/Admin) academic is 1x C1 publication per year, noting that 2-3 is competitive for national grants. An ECR pursuing a career in research can be expected to produce 1-2 papers for each year post-PhD for the first three years.
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5. **An "outstanding" MQRF applicant:**
   - 10+ publication “events” weighted toward journal papers and book chapters, but possibly including full conference papers (for 0-2 yr. PhD graduates). Many if not most of these will be senior-authored, some sole-authored, and at least several in high quality (IF > 3.0) journals.
   - The increasing presentation of thesis-by-papers means that many graduates will already have 3-5 C1 papers accepted or submitted upon completion of their PhD.
   - Several national and international conference presentations.
   - Transition to CI role in a post-PhD research project (including postdoc).
   - Recognition in the form of prizes and awards. These may be for undergraduate or postgraduate performance, University Medals, or conference awards.

   - And potentially;
     - Evidence of peer-esteem in the form of conference prizes, invited conference presentations, invited book chapters;
     - Evidence of initiative (i.e. lead CI/applicant status) and success with small research grants (<1-5 k), including society travel grants, student awards, society research grants etc.;
     - DECRA (or equivalent) application in the works.
1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):
   • In most physics and astronomy fields, refereed journal articles are the norm and most highly regarded.
   • Books/monographs are rare even among more senior academics. Book chapters or editing of a book is somewhat more common but mostly among more senior academics.
   • Journal articles are considered more prestigious than conference publications. However, there are a few exceptions as listed below.
   • Full review with reports and resubmission as commonly found in computing and engineering is very uncommon, but most conferences in optics have technical assessment of all submissions and acceptance rates at the big meetings of 25-30% is not uncommon.
   • In quantum information physics some conferences that have a significant computer science contribution are of very high esteem.
   • In the astronomy and astrophysics, in the research domain of instrumentation, SPIE (conference proceeding papers) are more common than actual journal papers.
   • It is usual for Physics graduates to have disseminated their research at conferences. Many of the top Physics conferences have low acceptance rates (say 30%), but most conference papers are not actually peer-reviewed.
   • In the field of quantum information physics, a talk at Quantum Information Processing (QIP) or talks/papers at STOCS or FOCS indicated an exceptional candidate.
   • For Astronomy graduates, contributed talks in conferences can be common but in more recent times they do have a selection process since in major astronomy conferences contributed-talk limits can be reached.
   • Invited journal or conference papers are rare among junior academics and indicate impact and esteem.

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):
   • Sole authorship in Physics and Astronomy is rare and should be rated very highly (especially in a high impact journal).
   • Co-authorship is normal, but the number of authors can vary widely depending on the nature of the project.
     The order of authorship represents the degree of contribution to the publication (authors are listed in the order of their contribution to the article). The exception to this is the final author, which in Physics is typically the research group leader. For Astronomy, it is not usual that the group leader is the last author.
   • PhD students typically are first author on their PhD outputs with their supervisor/s as co-authors.
     Additional authors may be present. Most publications probably have between 2 and 5 authors.
   • Very large groups of authors are reasonably rare except where several specialised technology contributions from different groups were required to carry out the research that is the subject of the paper.
   • In theoretical physics, it is common (especially when all authors are beyond PhD) to list author names alphabetically.

3. Publication quality and impact indicators and how to interpret them:
   • For journal articles, quality is best measured in terms of the journal impact factors (IFs) and/or journal rankings. These vary widely between areas of Physics. As a rough guide, an IF > 2.5 is very strong for many areas of Physics. Journals such as Nature and Science have much higher impact factors and are a mark of very high esteem.
   • The impact of individual articles can be assessed by comparing the citation rates, the
time since publication and the impact factor for the journal. Recall the impact factor of a
journal measures the frequency with which the 'average article' in a journal has been
cited in a particular year or period, so this is a very good measure that should be free of
bias.
• The H-index also can be used as a guide to impact. H-index in excess of number of
  years since PhD is excellent, but really this is a better indication for senior
  academics.
• Other more qualitative measure of impact include who is citing the work and/or
  who has adopted the methods/built on the outcomes.

4. **A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of
publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:**
• As a rough guide, the (now defunct) discipline profile for promotion of research only
  staff in Physics at Macquarie included the following expectations for publication:
  Level A should have at least 1 C1 publication/year; Level B should have at least 2 C1
  publications/year.
• As a rough guide, 3-4 C1 publications stemming from a PhD is a very high standard.
  In addition, a similar number of conference papers could reasonably be expected.
• So truly outstanding for the purposes of the MQRF would be 3-4 first author publications
  from PhD, and 1-2 first author publications per year since that. Approximately 75% of
  these would be in high impact journals. Non-first author publications are a bonus, but the
  relative contribution needs to be considered. You would also expect to see a similar
  number of national and international conference papers. Citation rates above the journal
  impact factor is a robust indicator of impact.
• Evidence of initiative and success with small research grants - mostly travel grants to
  conferences, poster or talk prizes in conferences.
• In Astronomy and Astrophysics, getting time on a telescope (or a national supercomputing
  facility) is a very competitive process (often with high oversubscription rates) and qualifies
  equally to getting research funding.
• If an applicant is named as an inventor on a patent or provisional patent that is another mark
  of high achievement. Patenting is only relevant in some areas of physics but indicates research
  of potential commercial impact.
Faculty of Science and Engineering – Discipline Norms for Medical Biotechnology and Nanotechnology

1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):
   - Refereed journal articles are the norm and most highly regarded. Books/monographs are rare and highly regarded. Book chapters or editing of a book is somewhat more common.
   - Journal articles are considered more prestigious than conference publications.
   - Within this area, Engineers are more likely to present and publish original work in conference proceedings. Many conferences have low acceptance rates (below 30%), though the level of peer review, is extremely varied.
   - Invited journal or conference papers are rare among junior academics and indicate impact and esteem.

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):
   - Sole authorship in Medical Biotechnology and Nanotechnology is rare and should be rated very highly (especially in a high impact journal).
   - Co-authorship is normal, but the number of authors can vary widely. The order of authorship represents the degree of contribution to the publication (authors are listed in the order of their contribution to the article). The exception to this is the final author, which is typically the research group leader.
   - PhD students typically are first author on their PhD outputs with their supervisor/s as co-authors. Additional authors may be present.
   - Very large groups of authors are uncommon except where several specialised technology contributions from different groups were required to carry out the research that is the subject of the paper.

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them:
   - An early measure of journal paper quality is given by the journal impact factor (IF) and/or journal ranking. As a rough guide, an IF > 2.5 is reasonable, while IF > 6 might be considered high impact. Journals such as Nature and Science have much higher impact factors and are a mark of very significant work. Speciality journals often have low impact factors due to their limited readership.
   - The impact of articles can be assessed by comparing the citation rate, i.e. the number of citations per year. The impact factor of a journal measures the number of time an 'average article' in a journal has been cited per year. The actual citation rate may indicate an excellent paper that has had a high impact, but was published in a low impact journal.
   - The H-index also can be used as a guide to impact. H-index in excess of number of years since PhD is excellent, but really this is a better indication for senior academics.
   - Other more qualitative measure of impact include who is citing the work and/or who has adopted the methods/built on the outcomes. Paper downloads may also be considered.

4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:
   - The (now defunct) discipline profile for promotion of research only staff in Physics at Macquarie included the following expectations for publication: Level A should have at least 1 C1 publication/year; Level B should have at least 2 C1 publications/year.
   - As a rough guide, 3-4 C1 publications stemming from a PhD is a high standard. In addition, a similar number of conference papers could reasonably be expected.
   - Outstanding for the purposes of the MQRF would be 3-4 first author publications from PhD, and 1-2 first author publications per year since that. Approximately 75% of these would be in high impact journals. Non-first author publications are a bonus, but the relative
contribution needs to be considered. You would also expect to see a similar number of national and international conference papers. A citation rate above 6 per year is a robust indicator of impact.
Faculty of Science and Engineering – Discipline Norms for Chemical Sciences

1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):
   - Refereed journal articles are the norm and most highly regarded.
   - Contributions to chapters of specialist books (or books themselves) are also considered an important indicator of scholarship. These accumulate with seniority but comprise only a small percentage of publications for senior academics. They are also often by invitation. Publishing of scholarly books is rare but a sign of particular distinction when it occurs.
   - Journal articles are generally more prestigious than book chapters but invited chapters in volumes from a quality publishing house (e.g., Oxford, Cambridge, Academic Press, Wiley etc.) and edited by leaders in the field indicates impact and esteem.
   - Publication of review articles targeting a wider audience in a recognised review journal would usually be evidence of the high professional standing of the author.
   - ECRs should have conference presentations from national/international conferences. Paper/poster presentations at prestigious international conferences are highly regarded. Invited papers in symposia are rare for ECRs but indicate high impact and esteem. It should be noted that not all conference abstracts are automatically accepted, rather, some top conferences have low acceptance rates and abstracts may be peer-reviewed (though often at the level of the conference scientific organisers).

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):
   - Research is often highly collaborative and thus co-authorship is usual. The multidisciplinary nature of some studies may justify six or more authors.
   - Very large numbers of authors is not unusual in some disciplines (e.g. genomic based) but typically appear in high impact journals, or where research is cross-disciplinary, with contributions from different groups with specialised technological skills. Publications on cross-laboratory analysis method validations also have large numbers of authors.
   - Authors are listed in the order of their degree of contribution (data acquisition, analysis, interpretation, intellectual input) to the article. This can vary between different research groups and also in a multi-authored cross-disciplinary publication, which requires careful evaluation.
   - It is the disciplinary norm for the first author on the published article to be the individual who conducted the majority of the research (both data collection and analysis), interpreted the results and drafted the manuscript. The student is typically first author on PhD outputs with supervisor/collaborators as co-authors.
   - The group leader who has led the research in terms of conceptualising and planning the research, co-ordinating input from different co-authors and interpreting results, and handling the manuscript, is typically the last author.
   - First and last authorship on a paper are both recognised as major authorship contributions.
   - It is not uncommon to have equal roles represented by either joint first or last authorship as indicated in a footnote to the author list.
   - Sole authorship is very uncommon.
   - Where appropriate, granted Patents are also a mark of research productivity.

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them:
   - Objective measurements for quality of impact can include impact factor (IF) of the journal, ranking of the journal within the discipline and citation numbers for particular outputs. However, these measures can both be limiting and difficult to gauge in ECR cases as their work is often in specialised journals which by definition have lower impact. As a guide, IF >4 may be considered outstanding, IF >2.5 excellent, IF >1.5 good, for an ECR.
   - Scholarly Citation rates:
• The quality of journal articles can sometimes be assessed via citation rates although there is often a significant lag time before this can be used as a meaningful metric.” The time lag is especially true in the more physical and theoretical sciences.
• The H-index also can be used as a guide to impact. H-index in excess of number of years since PhD is excellent, but since it is based on citations is really a better indication for senior academics.
• Any Nature, Science, Cell, PNAS, JACS, Angewandte Chemie, Chemical Science publication is exceptional and a mark of very high esteem.
• Altmetrics measures can also be used to capture the immediate impact of the research through media such as articles in popular press, research blogs, testimony to government, committees, social media, shares, social usage/viewer statistics etc. although this newer form of measure can be subject to manipulation and lack of peer review.
• Measurement of quality should not be based on a single one-off high impact publication, rather the research activity as a whole.

4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) for an outstanding MQRF applicant:
• An “outstanding” MQRF applicant may have
  o >5-15 publications (depending on year since graduation) with the majority as first author (or senior author), and several in high quality journals in the discipline.
  o Compared to other sciences, it is not the norm for PhD theses in the Chemical Sciences to comprise 3 or more first author peer-reviewed publications. It is common for papers from thesis work to be published in the first year post graduation with typically a total of 2-4 publications stemming from an author’s PhD. A typical rate would be 1-2 lead-author publications/year following.
  o Several national and international conference presentations.
  o Potentially invited conference presentations, invited book chapters.
  o Evidence of success with small research grants, travel grants, student awards (Society prizes)
  o Evidence of application for other fellowships.
  o Evidence of engagement with industry and technology transfer activities (e.g. research contracts, submission of patents, entrepreneurial activities).
1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed:
   o Conference articles are more common than journal articles, and in fact some of the very best conferences are typically harder to have a paper accepted in than journals. The best conferences are typified by the quality of the conference steering committee.
   o Journal articles take much longer to appear than conference papers (up to two years). Some are extended from previously published conference publications with new material to give a deeper account of the research.
   o Books/monographs, book chapters and full conference papers accumulate with seniority (and are likely to be rare for ECRs – especially books).
   o Journal articles are generally considered more prestigious than book chapters, but invited chapters in edited volumes from a quality publishing house (e.g., Oxford, Cambridge, Academic Press, Wiley etc.) and edited by leaders in the field indicates impact and esteem.
   HDR graduates should have conference presentations from national/international conferences. Paper (or poster) presentations at prestigious international are highly regarded; invited papers in symposia are rare for ECRs and indicates high impact and esteem.

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):
   o Sole authorship is rare, but one to several sole-authored papers is a sign of independence and initiative and rates highly.
   o There is a range of conventions for listing authors in computing papers. Some authors always list authors alphabetically, and some with the order of the contribution. There is little to be concluded from the order of listed authors as the candidates might have spent time in different groups following a different convention.

3. Quality indicators and how to interpret them:
   o In Australia the CORE peak body maintains a ranking of conferences. The ranking should be used as a guide only, but those conferences ranked A or A* do tend to be more prestigious than those ranked B or C: http://portal.core.edu.au/conf-ranks/
     http://portal.core.edu.au/jnl-ranks/
   o Some conferences are local/national and ECRs who have submitted to these venues are indicating that they are participating in and supporting activity in their vicinity. It would not be impressive however if the list of papers only consists of local venues.
   o For journal articles, quality measures include impact factors (IFs) and/or rankings (e.g., ERA). There is a range of styles for journals depending on the discipline. In some very theoretical fields of research, articles can be up to 40+ pages and so the publication rates in those fields can be generally lower than in other fields where contributions rely less on theoretical developments.
   o Nature/Science articles are generally not relevant in Computing.
   o Citation rates vary by discipline and field of research and take several years to become a meaningful metric. Google scholar is usual for citing publications.
   o H---index is difficult to gauge in ECR cases.

4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications)
   o MQ discipline profile for 40:40:20 (Research/Teaching/Admin) academics in Computing suggests the following as expectations (Note that these
guidelines are for 40% research active academics, and assume that more senior ranked academics have access to funding which translates to outputs):

• Level A, 1 refereed conference/journal papers/year;
• Level B, 1—2 refereed conference/journal papers/year;
• Level C, 2—3 refereed conference/journal/book chapters per year;
• Level D, 3—4 refereed conference/journal/book chapters per year.

5. An "outstanding" MQRF applicant:
   o At least 3 A/A* (or similar quality) publications (depending on year since PhD graduation).
   Potentially also:
   o Several national and international conference presentations.
   o Evidence of peer—esteem in the form of prizes, scholarships, invited book chapters;
   o Evidence of initiative and success with small research grants (<1–5K), including travel grants, student awards, research grants etc.;
   o Evidence of leadership potential by organising a workshop attached to an international conference;
   o DECRA (or equivalent) application in the works.

6. Discipline Norms across fields of research in Computing

   Discipline norms can vary widely across the fields of research in computing. In some subfields (e.g., those which are essentially branches of mathematics) the publication rates can be as low as 1 or 2 substantial papers per year, even for very senior researchers.
Facility of Science and Engineering – Discipline Norms for Mathematics and Statistics

1. Typical publications in your field/discipline and how they are viewed (e.g., book chapters):
- Publication practices vary widely between various sub-fields of mathematics, so these comments can only be seen as a general guide. Some mathematicians (particularly, applied mathematicians) and statisticians sometimes publish in allied fields, where practices can vary again.
- Refereed journal articles are the norm and most highly regarded; book chapters are often treated as equivalent. Books/monographs are fairly rare even among more senior academics.
- Journal articles are considered more prestigious than conference publications.
- Increasingly the publication of comprehensive software packages on the Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN) are viewed as a high level publication. These will often be accompanied by, or followed up with, an archival journal publication detailing the computational methodology underlying the package.
- The length of papers can vary substantially, and should not be treated as a measure of quality.
- The number of authors is generally not taken into account in assessing output.
- Traditionally there has been a significant delay between acceptance and publication of a paper. This delay is becoming increasingly shorter, with early online access to accepted papers becoming the norm. As a result of these delay, the discipline regards papers that are accepted as being equivalent to those which have appeared in print.
- Presentation at a conference is generally a separate process to publication. In particular, if a conference publishes proceedings, these will be separately refereed and occasionally may contain papers not presented at the conference.
- Invited journal or conference papers are rare among junior academics and indicate impact and esteem.

2. Norms for authorship (e.g., sole vs joint, order of authorship):
- In Pure Mathematics, authors of papers are usually listed alphabetically. In Applied Mathematics and Statistics, authors are normally listed in the order of their contribution to the article.
- Most mathematics papers would have between 1 and 5 authors. It is rare for an Applied Mathematics paper to have less than two authors, and Applied Statistics papers can have many more.
- In Pure Mathematics, it is common, but by no means always the case, that PhD supervisors are not listed as co-authors, regardless of their contribution. In Applied Mathematics and Statistics, PhD supervisors are allocated authorship according to their contribution, as in any other paper.

3. Publication quality and impact indicators and how to interpret them:
- Publication rates are generally slow (sometimes up to two years, or more, from submission to publication) and citations rates are relatively low in Mathematics when compared to other natural and physical sciences. Publications often have a relatively long citation “half-life”. Simple citation based metrics are a poor measure of quality, especially for recent publications.
- Journal impact factors do not necessarily reflect journal quality in most of the mathematical sciences; the exception is within Applied Statistics where journal impact factors are often a good measure of the quality of the research.
- The ERA 2010 ranked list of journals, developed in under the auspices of the Australian Mathematical Society and the Statistical Society of Australia, are still seen as an unofficial quality measure for archival publications, and are often quoted internationally. Care must be taken with relatively new journals, and discipline specific expert judgement is required in these cases.

4. A general guide to expected output post PhD and per year/level (e.g., number and/or kind of publications) as well as what "outstanding" might look like:
- As a rough guide, a teaching/research academic at Level B might expect to publish 1 journal article per year. This varies between disciplines in mathematics and statistics. Applied
Mathematics and Applied Statistics tend to have slightly more than this.
- Research level mathematicians at Level A would generally be postdocs.
- As mentioned above, the number of co-authors is generally not taken into account, although within 3-4 years post-PhD you might expect to see either at least one solo paper, or some variation in the co-authors. Sole authorship is not as valued outside of Pure Mathematics, although developing a collaborative network through new co-authors is valuable.
- An outstanding candidate might have published (or had accepted) 5 papers within 3 years of a PhD, with 2-3 in A or A*-ranked journals (this is field dependent for reasons mentioned earlier).