1. Introduction

The mission for the Faculty of Science is to deliver excellent teaching and research that has a major impact on the challenges facing humanity. This mission is commensurate with our vision of being amongst the leading Science faculties nationally and internationally and can only be achieved if we attract and retain high performing staff across all areas of activity. This document outlines the minimum performance standards for academic staff in the Faculty and is designed to provide clear and unambiguous guidance on the expectations and minimum performance standards of staff across three key areas:

- Research
- Teaching
- Leadership

2. Principles

It is expected that these academic standards will be used to:

a) Guide and support the career development of individual academic staff in the Faculty;

b) Support the Faculty’s vision and mission;

c) Inform Faculty policies for supporting research and teaching; and

d) Contribute towards the financial sustainability of the Faculty.

Additionally, the Academic Standards seek to:

- Provide fair assessment and evaluation, relative to opportunity, taking into account academic level, workload balance and appointment period
- Encourage teamwork and a supportive culture in the Faculty and discourage internal competition
- Support the career development of individuals by recognizing their respective strengths
- Support the UWA PDR and PAR processes
- Support UWA’s academic performance management processes
- Provide clearly defined expectations for staff applying for promotions, tenure or sabbatical
- Provide clearly defined and publicly available expectations to prospective staff
- Be clearly aligned with University and Faculty goals of delivering excellence in research and in teaching and learning.

It is expected that all performance criteria will be regularly reviewed and adapted to the changing needs of the Faculty and the external environment. In addition, all performance expectations and targets are predicated on the assumption that all units in the Faculty operate a transparent and managed workload allocation process.

This document provides a framework that is clear and generally applicable to all academic staff in the Faculty of Science, with an expectation that it is then moderated by the line manager (Head of School, Director of Centre or Institute) recognising disciplinary differences. It should also be read in the context of the University’s policies in these areas.
3. Research Performance

The University has identified staff performance as an important management priority and has recently extended the existing Professional Development Review (PDR) and the Commencing PDR (CPDR) process to include a Performance Appraisal Review (PAR). The University requires Faculties to revise their definitions of research active, to introduce a set of KPIs against which research performance can be monitored and to make these KPIs available to all staff. The purpose is to provide a framework whereby Faculties, and individual staff, can assess performance relative to agreed, Faculty-wide criteria.

KPIs can be fairly blunt management tools that sometimes fail to recognise that staff contribute quite differently to teaching, research and service in the University. In developing these KPIs it is recognised that those with direct line management responsibility for staff are best placed to assess individual staff performance; this includes Heads of School, Institute and Centre Directors and Research Group leaders. However, it is important that all staff in the Faculty achieve a minimum level of performance in our three key areas of Research, Teaching and Leadership. It is reasonable therefore to expect that there should be some differentiation in performance expectations for academic staff at each of the levels A to E.

Research performance of individual staff will be monitored at the end of each calendar year as part of a Faculty wide analysis (the Faculty’s review of performance relative to its KPIs) and the reports passed to HoS/Institute/Centre Directors for subsequent action. In those cases where minimum standards have not been met, Heads and Director’s will be required to provide a report individual staff. These reports will be discussed with the Dean. Where failure to meet these minimum standards cannot be justified, Heads and Directors must arrange an immediate PAR to identify appropriate remedial action. Thus, failure to meet minimum standards or to show good cause as to why these minimum standards could not be met will constitute a ‘career trigger point’.

Based on analysis of current performance it is expected that the majority of staff will perform above the Faculty’s minimum criteria and that Schools, Institutes and Centres should apply additional criteria depending on whether staff are teaching or research intensive. Research intensive staff are expected to have higher research income and produce more high quality outputs than teaching intensive staff whilst teaching intensive staff are expected to be at the forefront of pedagogical developments and to produce higher and more consistent SURF scores.

Principles: In setting these benchmarks the University recognizes that what constitutes ‘research active’ at a particular grade (A to E) in one Faculty may be quite different from that in another Faculty and as such these KPIs should not be compared across Faculties. There is also a case for arguing that they are not readily comparable between disciplines and that some moderation internal to the Faculty might be necessary. It is also recognized that some schools operate their own, discipline specific work-load and performance models. Whilst it is not the intention at this time to replace these models, there is a need to establish a minimum set of standards and procedures at Faculty level that facilitate equitable comparisons across the Faculty. In this context it is expected that all staff:

- have been made aware of their duties and the expectations of them by their Head of School or line manager
- should demonstrate career proficiency and maturity commensurate with their position requirements and their experience
- should be recognized for the contributions they do make and be encouraged and supported to improve their performance
Methodology: Research performance targets for 2013 are established against 4 criteria, research quality, research publications, research income and HDR supervision. The methodology recognizes that all academic staff are expected to contribute to research and research training and to teaching and recommends a set of indicators for each level A to E. Research performance has been set using the publications database compiled for the Excellence in Research Australia (ERA) 2012 exercise. This database has been fully audited by the University and, since the objective is to establish a set of benchmark data, is ideally suited to developing KPIs across levels A to E. The methodology recognizes that different staff contribute to the University in different ways and identifies 5 categories according to whether staff make their major contribution through research (Research:Teaching, 80:20) or through teaching (Research:Teaching, 20:80). The approach does not take into account service and administrative roles provided by staff and it is anticipated that these minimum performance measures can be moderated at PDR when individual staff will, in discussion with their line managers, identify where they sit on the scale between teaching and research intensive. The approach recognizes that for many staff the extent to which they are research or teaching intensive varies throughout their career and provides the Head of School or other line manager with the flexibility to manage staff expectations according to whether they are performing at the level agreed in their PDR. Thus, where staff identify themselves as research intensive (R:T, 80:20) but do not meet the Faculty minimum standards at their particular level, and where there are no issues of equality of opportunity, the Head of School can expect that these staff should assume other duties including a higher teaching load. Similarly, academic staff who are employed on teaching intensive positions (R:T, 20:80) should expect that their teaching loads would be decreased if they increase their research performance.

Minimum Quality Standards (Table 1)

Quality is a very difficult indicator to measure yet we all know what constitutes quality research. Although ARC has dispensed with the definition of outputs as category A*, A, B or C for ERA purposes the data indicates that staff at UWA are nonetheless aware of the key, high impact journals in their respective fields. As such UWA has continued to collect and report publications against the ERA 2010 categories. The advantage of using these categories is that they are transparent and as a performance indicator are relatively easy to implement. However, it is recognized that for some fields these categories do not always reflect the best journals. It is expected that in assessing performance relative to KPIs, line managers will be receptive to arguments about the need to consider other journals. Driving up the quality of outputs is a priority for the Faculty and it is likely that these measures will be revisited later in the year.

Research Outputs in the Science and Engineering Faculties (Table 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Total Outputs</th>
<th>C1 Outputs</th>
<th>A*(%)</th>
<th>A(%)</th>
<th>B(%)</th>
<th>C(%)</th>
<th>A*+A (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FECM</td>
<td>2954</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLPS</td>
<td>3530</td>
<td>3227</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNAS</td>
<td>3808</td>
<td>3322</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDHS</td>
<td>5062</td>
<td>4751</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that over the ERA period (2005-2010) the science and engineering faculties published around 60% (mean 58.7) of their C1 outputs in journals regarded as either A* or A. As a minimum quality expectation staff in the Faculty of Science are therefore expected to publish at least 60% of their outputs in C1 journals ranked either A or A*. This target is considered commensurate with our objective (OPP 2013-2017) of having no FoR 4 figure codes ranked below 4 by the next ERA exercise (date as yet undecided).
Research performance targets for 2013 have been established against 4 criteria, research quality, research publications, research income and HDR supervision. Research performance has been set using the publications database compiled for the Excellence in Research Australia (ERA) 2012 exercise. This database has been fully audited by the University and, since the objective is to establish a set of benchmark data, is ideally suited to developing KPIs across levels A to E.

Table 2 shows the variability in staff research performance as judged using C1 journal outputs (ERA 2012 data). The publication profile presents as a long-tail distribution. It is of concern that across all levels there are staff with limited publication outputs (range data). Staff can now check their individual position in the distribution using Socrates.

### Median Outputs for Staff in the Faculty of Science (Table 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Staff Nos.</th>
<th>Distribution¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLA</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>50 – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLB</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>25 – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLC</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>92 – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLD</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>288 – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLE</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>116 - 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Refers to the number of C1 publications published between 2005 and 2010 (6 years)

² Publication targets are not measured pro-rata (where points are divided by the number of UWA co-authors)

This analysis of recent performance has been used, recognizing the need to increase the both the quality and quantity of our research outputs, to determine the minimum research outputs required of staff in the Faculty of Science. The targets recognize that all staff should, unless wholly funded on external funding, contribute to research. The targets also recognize the fact that many externally funded Fellowships allow for some contribution to teaching.

### Minimum Expected Research Outputs for Staff in the Faculty of Science (Table 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Ratio of Research to Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20:80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLB</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Publication targets are annualized and are not measured pro-rata (where outputs are divided by the number of UWA co-authors)

2. Quality maintained by expecting that at least 60% of these outputs should be published in the equivalent of A*/A journals

### Research Income (Table 3)

It is no longer feasible that individual research programmes can be funded from recurrent income through the FFM. This means that research needs to be supported using external funding. It is appropriate therefore, that our minimum standards for research active include an expectation that all research active staff should be able to secure external funding. In addition, it is important that these
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staff demonstrate the capacity to secure external funding from national competitive grant sources. Table 3 provides guidance on minimum research income for staff in the Faculty of Science. It is recognized that disciplinary differences may exist, so Heads of Schools / Directors of Centres and Institutes are encouraged to use judgment to moderate the use of Table 3.

Minimum Expected Research Income for Staff in the Faculty of Science (Table 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Ratio of Research to Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20:80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLB</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLC</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLD</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLE</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Income targets (AUD$k) are annualized over a 3 year period and are not measured pro-rata (where outputs are divided by the number of UWA co-authors).

Research students (Research Masters and PhD, Table 4)

Higher degree by research students (HDR) are considered integral to our vision of national and international excellence and are critical for financial sustainability and for maintaining our market position internationally. Given the importance of HDR students to our overall research performance it is expected that all staff should engage in postgraduate research supervision. Thus, targets for the different levels are being introduced as part of the minimum standards of research performance. The Faculty OPP has set an overall target over the planning period of 2 PhD students per research active staff member. Recently introduced changes to supervisory practices (April 2012) have made co-supervision mandatory. They have also made it easier for early career researchers to be named PhD supervisors. Both of these measures are likely to impact on the distribution of supervision between levels and the minimum standards for research supervision may need to be adjusted (up) at a later date.

Faculty of Science Minimum Targets for HDR supervision (Table 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Ratio of Research to Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20:80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLB</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVLD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. HDR targets are not measured pro-rata where supervision divided by the number of UWA co-supervisors.

4. Teaching Performance

The Faculty has identified the UWA Teaching Criteria Framework (TCF) as providing a best fit to meet the Faculty’s vision and needs in regard to Academic Standards for teaching performance. The Framework, with the accompanying Core Knowledge and Professional Values, provides strong guidance for staff, particularly in the context of the overarching Minimum Standards for Academic Levels (MSALs).
The Framework consists of six areas of activity, six areas of knowledge and six professional values. The intention is that staff collect evidence of practice in the six areas of activity. However, the evidence presented should demonstrate an understanding of the core knowledge and commitment to the professional values. The areas of activity are as follows:

- Design and planning of learning activities and/or programmes of study
- Teaching and supporting student learning
- Assessment and giving feedback to learners
- Developing effective environments and student support and guidance
- Integration of scholarship, research and professional activities with teaching and supporting learning
- Evaluation of practice and continuing professional development

For each area of activity, examples of sources of evidence and types of evidence are provided.

It is proposed that of the various sets of criteria in the areas of activity be further clarified (or augmented) in the context of the Faculty needs for ensuring the quality of its educational programmes. This should also indicate expected levels of achievement (which will need to be reviewed and refined) and the types of evidence expected.

**The TCF Standard Descriptors**

**Lecturer (Level A)**

A Lecturer develops an understanding of the student learning experience through contributions to teaching which include implementation of effective teaching practices, a commitment to improvement and innovation in response to feedback, and the provision of support for students in the learning context.

**Assistant Professor (Level B)**

An Assistant Professor demonstrates an understanding of the student learning experience through a commitment to high quality effective teaching practice, including the ability to incorporate research, scholarship and/or professional practice into teaching activities, and a commitment to improvement and innovation in response to feedback.

**Associate Professor (Level C)**

An Associate Professor demonstrates an understanding of the student learning experience through high quality effective teaching practice, including the incorporation of research, scholarship and/or professional practice into teaching activities. An Associate Professor promotes and supports student learning through mentoring and leadership roles (formal or informal), including a commitment to the development of learning and teaching communities, and ongoing improvement and innovation in response to feedback both personally and across the discipline.

**Professor (Level D)**

A Professor supports and promotes student learning through a significant contribution in a leadership role, including a demonstrated contribution to the development of learning and teaching communities, within both the university and more widely, and a significant role in peer review and mentoring. A Professor demonstrates an original contribution to the advancement of teaching and learning in the discipline and/or university community, including the incorporation of research, scholarship and/or professional practice into teaching activities.
Winthrop Professor (Level E) / Professorial Fellow (Teaching and Learning)

A Winthrop Professor or Professorial Fellow (Teaching and Learning) supports and promotes student learning through an outstanding contribution in a leadership role, including a demonstrated contribution to the development of learning and teaching communities, within both the university and more widely, and in peer review and mentoring. A Winthrop Professor or Professorial Fellow (Teaching and Learning) demonstrates distinguished, original and innovative contributions to the advancement of teaching and learning in the discipline and/or university community, including the incorporation of research, scholarship and/or professional practice into teaching activities.

5. Impacts of Minimum Standards on New Appointments and Probation

Introduction of minimum research performance standards for all staff will impact on the recruitment and probationary progress of new appointments. The Science OPP makes clear that the Faculty will enforce the policy of only appointing staff to T&R contracts who have the capacity ‘to compete nationally and internationally for research funding’. As such any appointment to a T&R contract must satisfy as a minimum, and at the time of appointment, the definition of research active at the advertised grade. Furthermore, since new appointments are a particularly effective means of increasing our overall performance it is expected that all new appointments must sit above the median score \(1\) (5, 7, 13, 19 and 38 career C1 outputs for levels A to E respectively) for their grade at the time of their appointment. As an example, we should not be appointing staff to level D positions with fewer than 19 C1 outputs in the 5 years prior to their appointment (Table 2). Where staff have fewer publications because of the time since their PhD or other extenuating circumstances, data on citations and journal impact should be taken into account when considering whether an individual appointment will shorten or lengthen the tail of our C1 output distribution.

Adopting these minimum standards will mean that staff on probation or on Fellowships and expecting to move to an on-going appointment should have automatically met the publication requirements of their appointed grade. However, new staff may find it difficult to demonstrate during the probationary period that they can secure external research income or to supervise PhD students. Thus, new appointments unable to match the minimum requirements in research (and teaching) within their probationary period will be judged not to have a ‘\textit{prima facie case}’ for transfer to an on-going contract and will therefore be required to demonstrate, through PAR, that they have the potential to strengthen both the Faculty’s research and teaching.

Where this is the case staff on probation should be able to demonstrate the following:

1. Research outputs during their probationary period equivalent to the Faculty’s minimum standards per annum (of their probationary period)
2. Submission of one competitive grant (as Chief Investigator) valued at over $150k over the 3 year probationary period. To show competitiveness against this indicator it is expected that even where not awarded the application is judged to sit amongst the top 30% of submissions. Other indicators that may be employed include the number and nature of applications and feedback from the panels.
3. All new appointments should expect to supervise a minimum of 1 PhD student and at the time of their performance review should be supervising a minimum of 2 PhD students. Although advisable, we will not insist that probationary staff agree to supervise an HDR student during the first year of their appointment.
4. As with all other staff, probationary candidates must be able to demonstrate competency in

\[1\] Refer to Table 2
teaching by the time of their review. Competency will be judged from student feedback with probationary appointments achieving at least the Faculty CEQ average score for Q6 (Overall satisfaction)

This ‘policy’ should be read alongside the UWA policy on academic tenure. For completeness the latter is reproduced below.

POLICY AND PROCEDURES – ACADEMIC TENURE

1. TENURE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Tenure is earned as an outcome of satisfactory job performance. To be eligible for Tenure, as a general rule, the staff member needs to obtain a Tenurable appointment. Tenurable appointments are subject to review annually (i.e. on probationary period). Periods for tenurable appointments are as follows:

- Level A Academics – 5 years. This period may be extended in exceptional circumstances
- Level B Academics – 3 years. This period may be extended by two periods of one year each (or further in exceptional circumstances) or shortened.
- Level C, D, E Academics – up to 3 years. This period may be extended by two periods of one year each (or further in exceptional circumstances) or shortened.

If a tenurable staff member is successful in attaining a promotion before the expiry of the review (probationary) period, tenure will automatically be granted from the date of promotion.

Exceptions: If a fixed term staff member is successful in attaining a promotion before the expiry of the review period or before the end of the appointment, the new appointment may be converted to tenured, subject to the recommendation of the Head of School, through the Dean, to the Vice-Chancellor. Regard will need to be had for the reason for a staff member being on a fixed term contract (e.g. external funding) and could result in a position not being eligible for tenure/tenurable track status. This does not affect the academic staff member’s application for promotion.

A staff member who has held fixed-term appointments who obtains a tenurable appointment will normally be required to go through the review period for tenurable appointments, even where a period of probation has been completed on a fixed-term contract. On the recommendation of the Head of School and Dean the review period may be shortened.

http://www.hr.uwa.edu.au/policy/toc/tenure_of_academic_staff/policy_and_procedures_for_academic_tenure

6. Leadership Performance

Leadership is a core value of the Faculty of Science and central to our ability to be successful and deliver on our mission. The UWA Leadership Framework and Code of Conduct define the leadership capabilities required of leaders and provide clarity with regard to behavioural expectations. There are five Leadership capabilities and behaviours. In some cases there are different expectations dependent on level of appointment.

1. Shaping/supporting strategic thinking

Level A academic staff are expected to:

- work closely with their supervisors to develop research and teaching plans;
- help in setting directions for HDR student projects, including helping to identify measures that will show success.

Level B academic staff are expected to:

- work with advice from senior academics, to develop research and teaching plans;
- with advice from senior academics to set directions for HDR student projects, including identifying measures that will show success;
• be actively involved in Faculty and School activities that set strategies, including FASE and appropriate Faculty Research Themes;
• with advice from senior academics, mentor Level A academics and HDR students to manage projects.

Level C academic staff are expected to:
• independently develop research projects and teaching directions that are compatible within the areas of focus for the School and Faculty;
• actively participate in core School management committees, including Teaching and Learning and Research Committees, to set and review the strategic directions for the School;
• take leadership in specific areas and projects related to operations in a School/Centre/ Research Group, such as in safety, outreach, and publicity;
• mentor Level A and B academics and HDR students to manage projects, develop their career goals and develop their teaching and research.

Level D academic staff are expected to:
• operate at a level that identifies and fosters synergies in activities between groups within the School/Centre, Faculty and University;
• collaborate with Level A, B and C staff, identify opportunities for these people and expand their interactions in teaching and research outside of their current associations;
• undertake and lead development of staff, including PDR and PAR;
• be involved at senior levels of committees as chairs and deputy chairs of the Research and Teaching and Learning Committees of Schools, including taking on roles as Research Theme Leaders, leadership in FASE and active membership of key University committees;
• be actively involved in leadership to set and review strategic goals within the School/Centre and Faculty;
• lead in the implementation of the strategic goals of the School and Faculty;
• take on the Head of School role when needed.

Level E academic staff are expected to:
• take on significant leadership roles in both teaching and research, thereby helping to develop strategic directions at a School and Faculty level;
• take on significant mentoring roles for all staff, including staff outside of their immediate research focus;
• undertake and lead development of staff, including PDR and PAR;
• be actively engaged at a University, national and international level in understanding and setting strategies around teaching and research;
• be engaged with and leading core committees within the School, Faculty and University that set and review major policies.
• work with other academics to identify, develop and realise major opportunities for research, teaching and community engagement;
• lead in the implementation of the strategic goals of Schools and Faculty;
• take on the Head of School role when needed.

2. Communicating with influence and respect

All academic staff are expected to:
• participate and actively contribute in committees and meetings;
• be respectful of other people’s views;
• actively consider issues from others’ perspectives before responding;
• appropriately challenge policies and strategies that are not working;
3. **Exemplifying personal drive and integrity**

All academic staff are expected to:

- contribute productively to the University, Faculty and School *in a range of areas*;
- operate from an ethical base that demonstrates integrity;
- be transparent, accountable and honest in their actions;
- understand that they work for the University, Faculty and School, and are part of a broad community that is striving to achieve the vision of the University, Faculty and School.

4. **Achieving results**

All academic staff are expected to:

- perform to the best of their ability;
- set personal performance goals that stretch and continue to enhance quality in research and teaching;
- meet or exceed all aspects of these guidelines for performance expectations.

5. **Cultivates/supports productive working relationships**

All academic staff are expected to:

- understand and work within the University’s code of ethics and conduct;
- be respectful of others in all activities.

### Mentoring and Professional Development

In addition to the above leadership capabilities, all academic staff in the Faculty of Science are expected to participate in mentoring and professional development activities relative to their level:

**Level A academic staff are expected to:**

- actively seek mentoring and participate in mentoring activities related to teaching, research and career development.

**Level B academic staff are expected to:**

- actively seek mentoring and participate in mentoring activities related to teaching, research and career development;
- participate in activities and professional development that build skills in effective communication and leadership.

**Level C academic staff are expected to:**

- actively seek mentoring and participate in mentoring activities related to teaching, research and career development;
- participate in activities and professional development that build skills in effective communication, leadership and team building;
- actively seek opportunities to be part of mentoring teams with Level A and B staff;

**Level D and E academic staff are expected to:**

- participate in activities and professional development that build skills in leadership, team building and management;
- actively seek opportunities to be part of mentoring teams with Level A, B and C staff;
- actively seek opportunities to help staff build their networks, both inside and outside the University;
- actively seek opportunities to build relationships with government, industry and leading academic institutions for the benefit of the University.