| | |
|---|---|
| S P Jain London School of Management | **Research and Scholarship Policy** |
| Document Type | Policy |
| Administering Entity | Dean, Director of Research |
| Latest Approval/ Amendment Date | October 2026 |
| Last Approval/ Amendment Date | 31 January 2024 |
| Approval Authority | Academic Board/Board of Directors |
| Indicative time of Review | October 2031 |

## 1. Purpose

a. The School delivers a range of undergraduate and postgraduate courses. As a higher education provider with New Degree Awarding Powers (NDAPS) in the UK and regulated by the Office for Students (OfS), the School has developed this *Research and Scholarship Policy* that sets out our approach to fostering, managing and undertaking research and scholarship. It applies the Research Strategy to research and scholarly activity at the School and to the expectations of individual members of staff. It replaces the Scholarship for Learning and Teaching Policy.

## 2. Scope

a. This policy sets out the School's approach to research, research training and scholarship where it applies to:

i. Students undertaking or participating in research projects.

ii. Academic staff with responsibilities for supervising students undertaking researchprojects.

iii. Academic staff undertaking or participating in research projects.

iv. Members of the S P Jain community involved in publication, authorship, and creation of intellectual property.

v. Members of the S P Jain community collaborating with any external partners for research.

vi. Academic staff with responsibilities for recording and managing research outputs.

vii. All academic staff, including adjunct teaching staff, in their scholarly activity.

## 3. Definitions

a. Adopting the UK Research Excellence Framework (REF), we define research as a process of investigation leading to new insights, effectively shared. It includes work of direct relevance to the needs of commerce, industry, and to the public and voluntary sectors; scholarship; the invention and generation of ideas, images, performances, and artefacts including design, where these lead to new or substantially improved insights; and the use of existing knowledge in experimental development to produce new or substantially improved materials, devices, products and processes, including design and construction. It excludes routine testing and

routine analysis of materials, components and processes such as for the maintenance of national standards, as distinct from the development of new analytical techniques. It also excludes the development of teaching materials that do not embody original research.

b. Scholarship is an activity concerned with gaining new or improved understanding, appreciation and insights into a field of knowledge, and keeping up to date with advances in the field. It includes advances in ways of teaching and learning and in professional practice, as well as advances in disciplinary knowledge through original research.

c. Outcomes of research and scholarship include the categories of output in Appendix 1:

   i. Journal articles;

   ii. Books and chapters;

   iii. Cases;

   iv. Practice articles;

   v. Conference papers;

   vi. Other scholarly or professional outputs, such as published reports, practice tools, competitive research awards and new academic programmes.

## 4. Research and Scholarship Culture at SP Jain London

a. The School's approach to research and scholarship focuses on the achievement of a critical mass of research outputs that are of a high quality by creating and sustaining a supportive, creative, collaborative, and vibrant culture. The research culture aims at a high quality of research engagement with students, academic and professional colleagues, industry, business, professional communities, and the wider community of stakeholders.

b. To support the School's vision and mission, SP Jain is committed to promoting and creating an environment for academic staff, professional staff and students. SP Jain is committed to developing a research culture to facilitate the following intended outcomes:

   i. Outcome for students: Develop individual and collaborative research skills and knowledge to facilitate career entry and progression, and study courses informed by current research and scholarship.

   ii. Outcome for Academic Staff: Develop research and scholarly profiles, facilitate academic promotion, and keep disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge current to inform teaching and learning.

   iii. Outcome for Industry Partners: For industry partners, research can inform emerging and developing trends in practices in the sector.

   iv. Outcome for SP Jain London: Contribute to the School's strategic objectives, enhance the research capabilities of the School and develop the global brand image for the school.

   v. Outcome for the wider Community of Stakeholders: Develop impactful research that can benefit the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life, beyond academia.

## 5. Research Principles

a. The School's approach to research adheres to the following research principles:

   i. Distinctive expertise: The basic principle of the research lies in its unique contribution that showcases researchers' disciplinary and interdisciplinary expertise.

   ii. Collaboration: The academic staff of SP Jain London are encouraged to conduct and

disseminate research for publication or for conference proceedings, including joint authorship with SP Jain students on research-based projects undertaken as a requirement for their course of study, other academic staff, including adjunct faculty, and experts from industry and other organisations, including educational institutions.

iii. Academic Freedom: SP Jain is committed to the protection and promotion of academic freedom and freedom of expression in research and scholarship. Individual researchers at S P Jain are guided by the *Freedom of Speech Policy.*

iv. Ethical and Safe: Research techniques must not violate recognised research ethics with respect to the health, safety, privacy, and other personal rights of those being researched. All research within the scope of the Research Ethics Policy must receive a written decision under the applicable route before data collection, recruitment or access to non-public information begins.

v. Originality: All research must respect intellectual property developed by others, and by citing the work of others accurately and appropriately recognising others' contribution to authorship.

vi. Theoretical and Applied: SP Jain supports an environment conducive to all forms of research with an emphasis on applied research to solve complex problems in the community and serve the needs of industry.

## 6. Fostering Research and Scholarship

a. The School fosters, manages and oversees research and scholarship through:

i. The Academic Board, which approves the Research Strategy, with the Education and Research Committee overseeing its implementation;

ii. Approving all research and scholarship activities according to the *Research Ethics Policy*;

iii. Implementing a faculty workload allocation model (WAM) that recognises time for research and scholarship, balanced against teaching and administrative duties.

iv. Running the Research Seminar Series, the Learning and Teaching seminar series and the annual Learning and Teaching Reflective Seminar, open to adjunct staff, and a structured programme of research development, including mentoring for early-career researchers, writing workshops and internal peer review of outputs before submission;

v. Conducting research that is of industry relevance through partnerships with students and/or external organisations.

vi. Maintaining an appropriate Research Misconduct Policy for staff and an Academic Integrity Policy for students.

## 7. Research Centres

a. The School organises its research through research centres, each bringing together academic staff, students and external partners around a shared theme.

b. The first centre, the Centre for Leadership, Innovation and Analytics (CLIA), is being established as the School's interdisciplinary research hub and the principal vehicle for outputs submitted to the Research Excellence Framework (REF). Further centres may be established as the School's research grows, with the approval of the Academic Board on the recommendation of the Education and Research Committee.

c. Research is directed to the School's centres wherever possible. This builds the critical mass that the REF and research funders look for; gives academic staff, especially those early in their careers, collaborators, mentors and shared resources; strengthens the School's impact case

studies; and gives students and partners a single point of engagement with the School's research.

## 8. Academic Pathways

a. The Research Strategy establishes two complementary academic pathways, which it refers to as routes: the Research pathway, aimed at attempting a submission for the Research Excellence Framework (REF) and described in the Strategy, and the Scholarly Academic pathway.

b. Each member of academic staff is designated on one pathway, which reflects the expectations of their role. The designation is agreed between the member of staff and the Dean, in consultation with the Director of Research, and recorded in the workload allocation.

c. A change of pathway follows a lasting change in the expectations of the role, such as when the member of staff has developed the skills and research independence the Research pathway requires and the School can provide the time and resources it involves. The member of staff must present a reasonable plan for progression on the new pathway, and the change must be approved by the Dean, in consultation with the Director of Research. Pathways are not changed from year to year.

d. Staff on the Research pathway are identified through the process for determining significant responsibility for research and research independence set out in the School's REF Code of Practice. The pathway determines the member of staff's HESA staff return: staff on the Research pathway are returned as carrying significant responsibility for research, and staff on the Scholarly Academic pathway are not.

## 9. Expectations of All Academic Staff

a. Expectations follow from the member of staff's academic pathway and are agreed annually with the Dean in consultation with the Director of Research. For employed staff, the annual performance and development review assesses progress against them, and research and scholarship are one factor in the annual assessment for increments and bonuses. Adjunct staff hold no pathway; any expectations beyond their contract for services are agreed with their line manager and the Dean.

b. All academic staff engage in scholarship that keeps their teaching current, through activities such as those set out under the Scholarly Academic pathway below. For adjunct staff, currency in the subjects they teach is a requirement of their engagement.

c. Each member of academic staff keeps a record of their research and scholarly activity. The School collects it annually and uses it in the annual performance and development review of employed staff, in the annual record of academic staff development reported to the Education and Research Committee, and in accreditation returns. When requested, adjunct staff must provide the information needed for accreditation returns as set out in their contract for services.

## 10. Research Pathway

a. Staff on the Research pathway have a primary expectation of producing outputs capable of meeting the criteria of the REF. They receive protected time for research within the academic workload allocation model, reflecting their research pipeline, the proximity of REF 2029 and the School's priorities.

b. Staff on the Research pathway are expected to:

i. Produce enough outputs capable of meeting REF criteria at 3* or 4*, directed principally at journals ranked CABS 3 and above.

ii. Disseminate their research findings to be used in a variety of ways, such as engaging with industry and students.

iii. Make outputs eligible for the REF available in line with open access requirements.

iv. Foster a spirit of enterprise through research, education and practice.

v. Deliver high-quality theory development and/or practice-relevant research education.

**11. Scholarly Academic Pathway**

a. Staff on the Scholarly Academic pathway are not expected to produce REF-eligible outputs, while still maintaining systematic, current and peer-validated scholarship as required for Scholarly Academic (SA) status under the faculty qualification criteria in Appendix 3, and use it to inform curriculum, pedagogical approaches and course development.

b. Scholarly activities that keep teaching current, for all academic staff, may include:

i. Reading and reviewing current research or emerging practice in the discipline, industry or pedagogy, and being ready to present it;

ii. Attending relevant academic and professional conferences;

iii. Literature reviews shared with colleagues or used to inform teaching, learning and course design;

iv. Reflections on curriculum and assessment reviews or other benchmarking, shared with colleagues;

v. Development and evaluation of curriculum, assessment or teaching practice, including the use of digital and artificial intelligence tools, where the findings are shared with colleagues;

vi. Formal study in a higher degree within a relevant discipline, or a programme designed to enhance learning, teaching or assessment.

c. These activities keep teaching current but do not on their own maintain Scholarly Academic status. Staff on the Scholarly Academic pathway maintain that status mainly through peer-reviewed intellectual contributions, such as pedagogical research, teaching cases and applied or practice-based publications, supported by activities such as presenting papers at peer-reviewed conferences, editorial and reviewing roles and competitive research funding, to the level set out in Appendix 3.

**12. Recognising Research and Scholarship**

a. Appendix 1 sets the School's priorities for research and scholarship outputs based on their contribution to research (REF) and scholarship (AACSB), their impact on industry and their professional visibility. Journal outputs are graded by the CABS Academic Journal Guide. Books, chapters, case studies and practice-based contributions are recognised where they demonstrate quality and relevance to the Research Strategy.

b. Research and scholarly outputs are recognised in the academic workload allocation model. Outputs beyond the member of staff's allocation may attract payments, at amounts determined by the School.

**13. Research and Scholarship Support**

a. The School provides the following support for research and scholarship:

i. Training and development of research activities by internal as well as externalexperts.

ii. Regular meetings or discussions on matters of research interest with the Dean and the Director of Research.

iii. Financial support and leave to present papers at conferences, as set out in the Staff Development Policy;

iv. Sharing of research findings is encouraged with students in classes or workshops or seminars,

v. Access to research resources, collaboration opportunities and conference funding for adjunct staff whose wider participation in the School's research culture has been agreed under Appendix 3.

**14. Intellectual Property (IP)**

a. Intellectual property rights for research activities are set out in the *contract of employment for employed staff and in the contract for services for adjunct staff.*

**15. Research Partnerships and External Funding**

a. Where external resources and funding are involved, an MoU or agreement needs to be signed by all parties. Such an agreement should specify the contribution of each party to the research project, any IP and publication constraints, and the protections available to all parties if the research project proves to be not viable or if one or more parties no longer wishes to continue the research collaboration.

**16. Research Impact**

a. The School develops impact case studies that trace a pathway from research to change beyond academia, with evidence of influence on policy, business practice or society. The Centre for Leadership, Innovation and Analytics leads the School's impact case study portfolio, and at least one impact case study ready for the REF is kept in active development.

**17. Breaches of Research Integrity**

a. The School is committed to robust academic and research integrity as detailed in the *Research Misconduct Policy*.

**18. Student-Led Collaborations**

a. In the case of student-led research projects in collaboration with an industry mentor or partner, the research topic is finalised by the student(s), academic mentor and the industry mentor as a collaborator.

b. The student's research project is closely monitored by the academic mentor and/or an industry mentor in various stages of review, namely initial proposal, mid-review and final presentation.

c. When the draft project report is ready, the final presentation by the student(s) is carried out in the form of a public viva in which both academic and industry mentors may be present.

d. This process allows the student researcher to receive critical and constructive feedback and scrutiny, which may inform amendments or modifications to the research project.

**19. Management of Research Output**

a. The School records, documents and maintains all records relating to:

i. Research proposals and outcomes.

ii. Research ethics applications and outcomes.

iii. Contracts or funding agreements with external parties as research partners

iv. Intellectual Property claims or ownership records

v. Breaches of Research Integrity

vi. Research outputs including articles, publications, conference papers and otherpublic events where research has been disseminated.

b. The Director of Research, on behalf of the Dean, is responsible for ensuring the maintenance and management of records relating to the School's research activities, including the evidence required for the REF.

## 20. Monitoring

a. Progress against the Research Strategy and this policy is monitored through the KPI dashboard in Appendix 2, reviewed by the Dean and the Director of Research and reported annually to the Education and Research Committee and the Academic Board.

**Related Policies**

- Freedom of Speech Policy
- Intellectual Property and Copyright Policy (as outlined in staff contracts)
- Research Ethics Policy
- Research Misconduct Policy
- Research Strategy 2026–2029
- Staff Development Policy
- Observation and Development of Teaching Policy
- Learning and Teaching Enhancement Policy
- Learning and Teaching Strategy 2026–2029

**APPENDIX 1: PRIORITIES FOR RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP OUTPUTS**

The table sets the School's priorities for research and scholarship outputs. For each type of output it shows its likely suitability for REF submission, how it counts towards AACSB faculty qualifications and its impact and visibility for industry.

| Category | Research output | REF typical expectations | AACSB faculty qualifications | Industry impact and visibility |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Articles** | FT ranking journals | Strong | Peer-reviewed journal article for SA and SP | High |
| | Article in CABS 4* or 4 journal | Strong | Peer-reviewed journal article for SA and SP | Low to moderate |
| | Article in CABS 3 journal | Average | Peer-reviewed journal article for SA and SP | Low |
| | Article in CABS 2 journal | Acceptable if there is nothing else | Peer-reviewed journal article for SA and SP | Minimal |
| | Article in CABS 1 journal | Acceptable in theory, but try to avoid | Peer-reviewed journal article for SA and SP | None |
| | Not in CABS or ABDC: impact factor 1.0 or above | Average | Peer-reviewed journal article for SA and SP | Low |
| | Not in CABS or ABDC: impact factor 0.5 to 1.0 | Acceptable if there is nothing else | Peer-reviewed journal article for SA and SP | Minimal |
| | Not in CABS or ABDC: impact factor below 0.5 | Acceptable in theory, but try to avoid | Peer-reviewed journal article for SA and SP | None |
| **Books and chapters** | Book, quality publisher | Strong; may be double-weighted | Peer-reviewed contribution for SA and SP | High |
| | Chapter, quality publisher | Acceptable if there is nothing else | Peer-reviewed contribution for SA and SP | Low |
| | Book, second-tier publisher | Acceptable if there is nothing else, where peer review and original research are evident | Peer-reviewed contribution for SA and SP, where genuinely peer-reviewed; otherwise further scholarly activity | Moderate |
| | Chapter, second-tier publisher | Acceptable in theory, but try to avoid | Further scholarly activity for SA and SP | Negligible |
| **Cases** | Case study, quality publisher, involving company engagement | Not an output; may support an impact case study | Peer-reviewed contribution for SA and SP; professional activity for PA | High |
| | Case study, quality publisher, not involving company engagement | Not an output | Peer-reviewed contribution for SA and SP | Moderate |
| | Case study, second-tier publisher, involving company engagement | Not an output; may support an impact case study | Further scholarly activity for SA and SP; professional activity for PA and IP | Moderate |
| | Case study, second-tier publisher, not involving company engagement | Not an output | Further scholarly activity for SA and SP | Low |

| Category | Research output | REF typical expectations | AACSB faculty qualifications | Industry impact and visibility |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Practice articles** | Prestigious outlet (FT, Economist, HBR print): 2,500 words or more, resting on original research, data or a distinctive body of practice | Not an output; strong evidence for an impact case study | Intellectual contribution for SP and PA; further scholarly activity for SA | Highest |
| | Prestigious outlet: 1,200 to 2,500 words | Not an output; strong evidence for an impact case study | Intellectual contribution for SP and PA; further scholarly activity for SA | High |
| | Prestigious outlet: comment or opinion under 1,200 words | Not an output; supporting evidence for an impact case study | Professional activity for PA, SP and IP | Moderate to high |
| | Second-tier outlet or trade press: 1,000 words or more | Not an output | Professional activity for PA and IP | Low to moderate |
| **Conference papers** | Full paper accepted at a conference on the School's list of recognised conferences | Acceptable if there is nothing else, where fully published | Peer-reviewed contribution for SA and SP | Low |
| | Paper at a conference not on the list that counts as a peer-reviewed intellectual contribution (see notes) | Acceptable in theory, but try to avoid, where fully published | Peer-reviewed contribution for SA and SP | Low |
| | Paper at another peer-reviewed conference that counts only as a further scholarly activity | Not normally an output | Further scholarly activity for SA and SP | Very low |
| **Other** | Other scholarly or professional output, agreed with the Dean before the work begins | Case by case | Case by case | Case by case |

### Notes

REF panels assess each output on its own merits and do not use journal rankings or impact factors. The REF column shows how suitable an output is likely to be for submission: strong, average, acceptable if there is nothing else, acceptable in theory but to be avoided, or not an output.

AACSB faculty qualifications: SA Scholarly Academic; SP Scholarly Practitioner; PA Practice Academic; IP Instructional Practitioner. The column shows how an output counts under the faculty qualification criteria in Appendix 3, from the strongest: a peer-reviewed journal article, which SA status requires; another peer-reviewed or intellectual contribution; a further scholarly activity; a professional activity.

Journals are graded by the CABS Academic Journal Guide. Where a journal is not in the CABS guide, its ABDC rank applies: A* as CABS 4, A as CABS 3, B as CABS 2 and C as CABS 1. Where a journal is in neither list, its Web of Science impact factor applies.

An output counts in the academic year in which it is accepted for publication, unless otherwise agreed with the Dean.

For an output not listed, the Dean sets its classification before the work begins.

Conference papers are classified against the School's list of recognised conferences, approved annually by the Education and Research Committee, and not by the indexing of the proceedings. A paper at a conference not on the list is classified as a peer-reviewed intellectual contribution where it meets the criteria in Appendix 3, and otherwise as a further scholarly activity. Papers at conferences without genuine peer review, or run by organisers widely identified as predatory, are not recognised.

Recognition of papers at other conferences as a further scholarly activity is limited to one paper per member of staff in each academic year, and may stop for a conference found to accept papers with little selectivity.

**APPENDIX 2: RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP KPI DASHBOARD**

Progress is reported annually to the Education and Research Committee and the Academic Board using a traffic-light system: green (on track), amber (corrective action required), red (immediate intervention required). The Dean and the Director of Research are responsible for providing this information. The dashboard includes the REF 2029 KPIs of the Research Strategy 2026–2029. Output numbers are measured against the number of outputs the REF 2029 submission requires, which is 2.5 for each full-time equivalent of staff on the Research pathway, with no more than five linked to any one member of staff. Indicators on staff qualifications, teaching delivered by participating faculty, participation in the Learning and Teaching seminar series and the annual record of scholarly activity are monitored in the Learning and Teaching Strategy 2026–2029.

| KPI | Target (2026–2029) | Frequency | Evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| **A. Outputs** | | | |
| Outputs rated 3* or 4* in internal review | At least 1.5 times the number the submission requires | Annual | Internal review of outputs |
| Outputs rated 4* in internal review | At least one in four of the outputs the submission requires | Annual | Internal review of outputs |
| Average outputs per member of staff on the Research pathway | ≥ 2.5 | Annual | Annual REF output audit |
| Publications in CABS 3+ / ABDC A+ journals | Year-on-year increase | Annual | Record of research outputs |
| Outputs of Research pathway staff associated with a research centre | ≥ 25% | Annual | Record of research outputs |
| **B. Impact** | | | |
| REF-ready impact case studies in development | Minimum 1 | Annual | Impact case study tracker |
| External stakeholders engaged per case study | ≥ 3 per case | Annual | Impact case study tracker |
| Policy / practice citations of research | Year-on-year increase | Annual | Impact case study tracker |
| **C. Research environment** | | | |
| Research seminar participation rate | ≥ 80% of faculty | Quarterly | Seminar attendance |
| Internal peer review of papers before submission to a journal | 100% | Ongoing | Internal review of outputs |
| Open access compliance for eligible outputs | 100% | Ongoing | Record of research outputs |
| Early-career staff on the Research pathway with a research mentor | 100% | Annual | Research development programme |
| Applications for competitive external research funding | At least 1 per year | Annual | Record of research activity |
| **D. Scholarship and faculty qualifications** | | | |
| All faculty, participating and supporting, classified SA | ≥ 50%; never below 40% | Annual | Faculty qualification review (Appendix 3) |
| All faculty, participating and supporting, classified SA, PA, SP or IP | ≥ 95%; never below 90% | Annual | Faculty qualification review (Appendix 3) |
| Staff on the Scholarly Academic pathway meeting the SA criteria | 100% | Annual | Faculty qualification review (Appendix 3) |

| KPI | Target (2026–2029) | Frequency | Evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| Peer-reviewed intellectual contributions by staff on the Scholarly Academic pathway | Year-on-year increase | Annual | Annual record of scholarly activity |
| Supported conference papers presented at conferences on the list of recognised conferences | Year-on-year increase in the share | Annual | Conference applications |
| Post-conference reports returned | 100% | Termly | Conference applications |
| **E. Readiness and governance** | | | |
| Annual REF output audit completed | Annual cycle | Annual | Audit report |
| Impact case study development tracked | 100% tracked | Bi-annual | Impact case study tracker |
| Mock REF assessment exercises | At least 1 per year | Annual | Mock REF report |
| Faculty REF awareness and training | 100% completion | Annual | Training records |

**APPENDIX 3: FACULTY QUALIFICATION CRITERIA**

Each member of academic staff on either pathway is classified in one of the four faculty qualification categories used for AACSB accreditation. The classification is agreed in the annual performance and development review and rests on initial preparation and on engagement over the previous five years. Adjunct staff hold no pathway in principle, as supporting faculty. Any wider participation in the life of the School, and any faculty qualification category recorded for an adjunct member of staff, is agreed with their line manager in consultation with the Dean.

| Category | Initial preparation | Sustained engagement over the previous five years |
|---|---|---|
| Scholarly Academic (SA) | A doctorate in, or closely related to, the teaching field. Doctoral candidates who have completed all requirements but the thesis are SA for three years; staff are SA for six years from the award of the doctorate. | At least two peer-reviewed intellectual contributions, of which at least one, and ideally two, are peer-reviewed journal articles, and at least two further scholarly activities. |
| Practice Academic (PA) | A doctorate in, or closely related to, the teaching field. | At least three professional activities, at least one of them substantial, such as a consultancy, a board appointment or the design of an executive education programme. |
| Scholarly Practitioner (SP) | A master's degree in, or related to, the teaching field, and professional experience substantial in duration and responsibility at appointment. | At least two intellectual contributions, at least one of them peer-reviewed, and at least one further scholarly activity or professional activity. |
| Instructional Practitioner (IP) | A master's degree in, or related to, the teaching field, and professional experience substantial in duration and responsibility at appointment. | At least three professional activities. |

The activities that count are:

| Type | Examples |
|---|---|
| Peer-reviewed journal article | An article in a journal with genuine peer review, including the journals graded in Appendix 1. Articles in journals widely identified as predatory do not count. |
| Other peer-reviewed intellectual contribution | A book or chapter from a publisher that reviews submissions; a case from a recognised case publisher or case journal; a full paper at a conference on the list of recognised conferences; a paper at another conference run by a learned society, university or recognised academic body, where the full paper or an extended abstract is reviewed by peers under a published process, and the paper is presented and published in the proceedings. |
| Other intellectual contribution | A practice article in a recognised outlet, such as those in Appendix 1; a published research report; a textbook or teaching materials adopted beyond the School. |
| Further scholarly activity | Presenting a paper at a peer-reviewed academic conference, where not counted as a contribution; editorship, editorial board membership or regular reviewing for a peer-reviewed journal; a competitive research grant; a research award; a leadership role in a learned society; supervision of a doctoral thesis to completion; a pedagogical innovation evaluated and presented beyond the School. |
| Professional activity | Consultancy; design or delivery of executive education; a board or advisory appointment; a professional certification maintained; a presentation at a professional or industry event; a practice article or comment in the business press; for IP only, formal study towards a relevant qualification. |

Attending a conference without presenting, reading, and presentations within the School support scholarship but do not count on their own. Each output counts once: a paper presented and published in the proceedings is one contribution.