Institute of Psychiatry Psychology and Neuroscience at King's College London

Academic Performance Framework

Document history

Version	Date	Comments
1.0	Jan 2015	Released for internal consultation

Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience at King's College London

Academic Performance Framework

1. Context

The Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience ('IoPPN' or 'the Institute') is one of the global leaders in the fields of psychiatry, psychology and the neurosciences. Pivotal to our success is the outstanding performance of our academic staff; this Academic Performance Framework sets out the parameters within which we operate, and the performance levels we aspire to achieve.

The Academic Performance Framework is designed to inform the setting and monitoring of individual objectives during the annual performance and development review (PDR) cycle in a standard and transparent way. The framework is also intended to: a) provide guidance in evaluating staff at the time of hiring and promotion; b) provide a basis for individuals to judge their career performance, develop clear goals for the next and subsequent years, and decide whether or when to apply for promotion; and; c) help performance development reviewers identify those staff members who are exceeding expectations and should be considered for reward and recognition and those who need support in particular areas.

The framework focuses on four domains of academic achievement: Research; Education; Academic Leadership and Management; and Knowledge Dissemination and Impact. For each of these domains, examples of activity are provided and, where feasible, the expected level of achievement at each academic grade is outlined. These metrics are neither comprehensive nor absolute but provide a framework within which individual performance should be assessed.

It is recognised that individual circumstances vary greatly and thus levels of achievement in the four domains will vary, both across grades and within grades. In addition, the balance between domains may shift during the course of an individual's career. Hence it is unlikely that any one individual will excel in all areas; and exceptional achievements in one area will offset expectations in another. For example, those individuals whose research performance is exceptional, may receive allowance in other areas of performance; or, those with exceptional contributions to education (e.g. the Education-led career path) will have modified expectations in the Research domain. Furthermore, while the descriptions are based on the concept of a "standard" academic distribution of workload, it is acknowledged that many individuals have different responsibilities and circumstances and the "standard" will be appropriately modified to be fair to them. For example, clinical academics spend time in clinical activities as a part of their job description – and therefore allowance in expectations will be made to accommodate this. Similarly, many colleagues work part-time, have taken career breaks or periods of leave, or have significant caring or parenting responsibilities – fair and equitable account of these will be taken in interpreting this framework.

Identification of exceptional performance in all or many of the domains should lead to appropriate recognition and reward and this may include support for applications for promotion or consideration for salary review. If performance is not consistent with the guidance set out herein, after due consideration of current working arrangements, roles and responsibilities, additional support for improving performance will be offered and reviewed at subsequent PDR meetings. Persistent failure to meet acceptable performance, despite the provision of additional support, may result in formal performance management procedures, in line with current procedures.

This is the first year of application of the revised Academic Performance Framework. The experience of this PDR cycle will be reviewed in September 2015, and the APF modified as appropriate for the next cycle.

2.   Timelines and Link to Performance Development Review

The Framework has been designed to provide an integrated approach to the academic performance and support for academic staff. The Performance Development Review is a key component of this support, and usually includes a formal review meeting that usually takes place between April and July.

Key objectives of the PDR include:
- Setting objectives, with individual staff input, so that expectations are clear;
- Keeping track of progress and achievements;
- Providing and asking for feedback;
- Conversation of promotion, career development and progression;
- Identifying areas for improvement and agreeing support and improvement plans if necessary.
- Clinical academic staff are also required to adhere to Trust guidelines and this requires joint PDR/Appraisal with the designated clinical and academic leads.

The PDR review meeting will be informed by the following information:
- The PDR form which is completed by the individual academic.
- A summary statement of education and research grant activity, which utilises data from the Education Database and PURE, with contextual data for the Division and Faculty.
- A detailed statement of contributions for each individual from the Education Database.

The Heads of Department are responsible to ensure consistency of approach and parity of outcome within a Department and will review the outcomes of the individual PDRs with the reviewers. The Head of Department is also responsible for ensuring that aspects of reward/recognition and additional support that are identified are appropriately followed through.

Following the completion of the Departmental PDRs, the Vice Deans will meet with each Head of Department to review the overall outcome of the Departmental reviews and their implications for reward, recognition and support.

3.   Areas of endeavor and markers of achievement

Research

Publications: Academics are expected to produce original scientific publications of the highest quality that will significantly advance their field. It is also expected that research-led academics will maintain their research outputs at a level that would allow them to be submitted to the Research Excellence Framework at a quality level consistent with King's expectations – which is to submit "world leading" and "internationally excellent" publications for REF. It is worth noting that in the REF 2014 there was a very close similarity between the percentile citation rank of the UoA4 papers submitted by IoPPN and final REF outcome (e.g. 25%/56%/19% of the IoPPN outputs were rated 4*/3*/<3*; and 26%/58%/16% of our papers were in the top 1%/10%/below 10%ile). Thus, papers in the top 10%ile of their field would meet criteria of excellence. This is also borne out by similar REF/Citation data regarding UoA4 and UoA5. However, it may take publications 12-18 months to reach a stable trajectory of citations, therefore, the quality of a journal (impact factor) and the judgment of knowledgeable peers can be alternative indicators of excellence.

Grants: Grants are essential for most forms of research work and are critical to maintaining the research infrastructure of the Institute. Research-led academics at the IoPPN are expected to be Principal Investigators of grants themselves, and, where appropriate assist as co-investigators on grants led by others. Research Councils, NIHR grants, Wellcome Trust and EU grants are generally more competitive and will be held in higher regard. Participation in major international grant consortia is seen as a positive achievement, especially when the individual is in a leadership role. Industry and commercial funding, especially when the academic retains the right to publish, are

4

positively regarded. The grant funding rates are unfortunately rather low amongst the more competitive organisations and this often means that academics have to apply for two to four times the grants needed to sustain a group.

Size of group and grants. Carrying out high quality scientific work requires research teams. The cost of carrying out this research varies by field – technology-related fields usually being more expensive than psychology/social-science research. That said, the cost of research workers is similar (£40-60K per annum, with on costs and overheads, devoid of lab costs). Therefore, the framework provides guidance for the size of the research group that an academic should maintain as his or her academic productivity and career progresses.

Overheads: "Overheads" or "Indirects" pay the background costs of estates, professional services, utilities and administrative services etc. that are critical to carrying out the research. In the new "margin" model, King's charges IoPPN a flat rate of ~25% overhead cost for all its research turnover. Grants from the MRC and other Research Councils pays these overheads well. Grants from several charities (e.g. Wellcome, CRUK, BHF) pay such overhead costs via the parallel QR mechanism (usually 28%). Industrial grants, if properly costed to include PI time, bring in the appropriate overheads. However, several charities or other organisations do not pay explicit overheads. In some such cases it may also be possible to negotiate the coverage of expenses by the charity in question, which would normally be considered to be overheads (e.g. IT support, office space, stationery, etc) and this will be recognized. Research grants not recovering their overheads are a net cost to the Institute that must be covered by other grants and activities. So while it may be entirely appropriate to apply for non-overhead bearing grants, e.g. at the early stage of one's career (e.g. starting lecturers) as an initial grant to generate pilot data or for some other tactical reasons the Institute overall must maintain an average of 25% overheads for its research portfolio.

H Index and Citation Impact: These are good objective measures of the scientific impact of publication. Citations of individual papers are now more important than just the 'impact factor' of the journal. H-indices are field specific, with indices being higher in biomedical than social sciences, and H-indices increase with academic longevity. Thus, like the REF, evaluations should only be informed, not determined, by such metrics. The guidance values provided refer to Scopus values.

Research Students: training the next generation is one of the most enduring outputs of any research group – and is separately accounted for and remunerated by the HEFCE. Depending upon the rank of the academic, they would be expected to provide primary and secondary supervision to PhD students (or DClinPsych, MD, MDRes), as well as 'placements' for undergraduate and PGT students. This is captured in the Education Database.

Peer Recognition and Esteem: in keeping with the Institute's desire to be the international leader in its field, it is expected that our academics will be receiving recognition for their research in a manner commensurate with rank and on equal footing with the very best in the world e.g. international invitations for talks, awards, scientific leadership of consortia, organizing conferences/symposia, editorship, membership of granting councils and committees.

Future sustainability: Sustaining a research program requires careful planning of grant acquisition so that teams can be maintained during grant transition and academic ideas can be sustained as one moves from one set of funds to another. This entails careful planning for future grants, collaborations and transitions.

Education

Education is central to the mission of the IoPPN and our academics teach in a number of undergraduate and postgraduate courses. All academics are expected to contribute to direct teaching, assessment and feedback, individual guidance (e.g. student advisor/personal tutor), provision and supervision of research projects and clinical placements where appropriate. Academics are also expected to contribute to course development, organization and management and contribution to overall educational governance and quality enhancement activities.

The increasing rigor and sophistication in educational methods requires that the future academics receive formal training in Educational methods. Courses, such as the PGCAP offered by the King's Learning Institute, can be helpful in this regard. As academics progress through the ranks we expect them to continue to make contributions to education, though the nature of the contribution may shift from direct teaching/supervision to leadership and governance of courses.

Academics who wish to develop a career as educational leaders and scholars (the Education-led careers) will have a different set of academic expectations which are highlighted in a later section. Those wishing to follow such a career path should do so with prospective discussion and explicit approval of their Head of Department and the Dean of Education at the IoPPN.

Academic Citizenship, Management and Leadership

Line management of staff in one's own team is expected of each academic. Similarly, it is expected that each academic will contribute via involvement in administration and communal activities of the Faculty and University (e.g. committees and panels related to education, research, recruitment, publicity, safety, industrial liaison, etc.). Certain special roles (Course organizer, Head of Department, Head of Graduate studies (Research), Vice-Dean etc.) are additional management roles, and where these roles demand a substantial additional commitment, performance in these roles will balance expectations in the other areas. The Dean's role is one with predominant responsibilities for academic leadership and management, the performance expectations for that are set in discussion with the Vice-Principal and Principal.

In addition to these formal roles, there are a myriad of acts of "citizenship" that academic colleagues carry out every day that are essential to the day-to-day functioning of academia. This ranges from anonymous peer review, sitting on appointment panels within and beyond the Institute, examining PhDs within and beyond, reviewing each other's grants, helping colleagues prepare for interviews, helping to deal with disputes between colleagues in a wise and fair manner. This list is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive, but, is mentioned here to recognize the importance of "academic citizenship" in the life of a Faculty. This will be formally recognized within the APF.

Knowledge Dissemination and Impact

Knowledge dissemination refers to transfer of knowledge beyond the standard academic settings – to clinicians, patients, carers, private sector interests, government or public at large. Academics achieve this through the press, talking at meetings/conferences/workshops and symposia, and addressing special groups. Other means may include the use of the web and social media to disseminate and propagate knowledge.

Impact is defined as an effect on, change or benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life, beyond academia. This may be reflected in patents, intellectual property, influence on government and social policy, contributions of knowledge to the wider society (e.g. collaborations with industry, consultation to government); translation of 6

discoveries and expertise into changes in healthcare locally (initiation of expertise based clinics), nationally (involvement in the preparation and formulation of professional and practice guidelines) and internationally.

Given that different areas of science vary on how easily they are disseminated or translated, no universal expectations are set, but knowledge dissemination and impact, when achieved, will be held in high regard. Good examples can be seen at http://www.kcl.ac.uk/ioppn/about/difference/index.aspx

Excellence in Clinical responsibilities

An active clinical role is seen as an intrinsic and valued aspect of the job of clinical academics. It is a mechanism whereby clinicians contribute to the dissemination and translation of their research and also enhance the success of their studies. Excellence in clinical responsibilities also enables medically qualified academics to obtain NHS ACCEA awards. At the time of promotion, KCL academics can highlight their contributions towards clinical excellence and this further enhances the chance of success of a research-led or education-led application.

4.   Interpreting the Framework in Individual Context

Time devoted to Education The "standard" non-clinical academic can expect to devote roughly 20% of their time to education and about 10% to management, knowledge dissemination and impact activities. 20% of an FTE academic devoted to Education equates of 320 hours credit in the Education Database. These hours provide credit not only for direct teaching, but also related preparation time, time for assessment and feedback, time devoted to pastoral care, project supervision as well as allowance for other education organization and governance activity.

Two areas are as yet not fully resolved as of this cycle [2015] – how to best account for PGR supervision and some elements of Assessment and Feedback. While these elements are being captured in the Education Database this year – the precise hours that are to be allocated to these activities and how they are to be related to the 20%/320 hour figure is unclear. This will be clarified after one full round of the Education Database in 2016.

Allowance for clinical duties of clinical academics. As clinical academics undertake varying amounts of direct clinical activity, account should be taken of the amount of time devoted to clinical duties. There should ordinarily be a *pro rata* reduction in expectations for their contribution to Education. Contributions to the other domains should be broadly equivalent to those of non-clinical staff, albeit with recognition that clinical commitments may impact on some activities.

Principal Investigator and Co-Investigator status. Academics are expected to generate funds for their research by leading teams (as PI) and by supporting others (as formal Co-Investigators, CI). Therefore individuals are expected to lead their own teams and contribute to the work of others. In some areas (for example statisticians, health economists, image analysis experts, bio-informaticians, physicists etc.) the custom and practice is such that individuals are more often CIs than PIs, and thus have smaller groups and smaller grants as PI to sustain them. Regard will be had of this difference. Those individuals who are predominantly CIs will be expected to contribute to a greater range and volume of grants than someone who is predominantly a PI.

Part-time working and agreed leave from work. Some individuals work part-time or have taken leave for health or family considerations. Expectations of such an individual's outputs will be adjusted accordingly. The adjustments should be equitable in the context of the overall performance needs of the Institute and should be agreed prospectively with their Head of Department.

Fellowships and Externally funded salary. Staff are encouraged to apply for Fellowships which support their salary for research or obtain fully salary support on grants. While these academics are also

expected to contribute to educational activities, it is expected that serving the grants takes first priority and education/management expectations will be lesser.

Academic Clinical Lecturer. 'Academic Clinical Lecturer', a form of career-development support provided by NIHR, and HEFCE Senior Lecturer Fellowships are external awards. Awardees of these positions are appointed at the relevant rank within the College and they work within the terms and conditions of their award.

Lecturers on Probation. Lecturers are usually employed on probation, usually for 3 years. This is the period during which they are expected to ramp up their research activity, establish their research team and teaching duties and applying for and acquiring their first joint and independent grants. The guidelines provided in this framework are for an established lecturer, who has completed their probation. For those still on probation, the framework should serve as guidance as to what they should have achieved by the time of their probation review.

Criterion and Promotion. The criterion of achievement provided in the different domains are not the minimal criterion for achieving a given rank. In other words, a Reader seeking promotion to Professor would not be expected to meet the criteria for the rank for Professor. Instead, they would be expected to meets all the elements related to their current rank (Reader) and starting reach some of the criteria listed in the rank above.

5.   Academics with research as their major endeavor

Established Lecturer (past probation)

Research	Education
Publications: • 3 articles, in the last five years, of "internationally excellent" quality (e.g in the top 10%ile of the field) • As first or last author; or a middle author with substantive and critical contribution. • H-Index of 7-12 **Grants and Research Group:** • Sufficient grant income to maintain their own laboratory/desk-based research group with 1-2 regular research workers; and/or formal Co-Inv or Co-PI roles on major grants. • Beginning to obtain salary recovery as formal investigator on research grants as PI or Co-PI **Research Students:** • Supervision of one or more PhD students as secondary supervisor, and moving to primary position later. **Esteem:** • Presenting at international meetings, speaker at national meetings. Reviewing articles for high impact journals. **Future sustainability:** • Clear forward plan for sustaining/enhancing research programme, consistent with the Division's research strategy.	Education contributions equivalent to 20% of time, or 320 hours per Education Database. **Delivery and innovation:** • Contribution to teaching UG/PG modules. • Supervision of undergraduate and/or postgraduate library/laboratory projects. • Favourable student feedback. **Organisation and support:** • Personal tutor to MBBS, BSc and/or MSc students. • Commitment to improving teaching methods and taking on more complex education related roles.
Academic citizenship, management and leadership • Tangible acts of academic citizenship Organisation of departmental/divisional seminars. • Recruit, mentor and manage research staff, within agreed Frameworks and procedures. • Ensure adherence to College and externally agreed Frameworks and procedures e.g. research concordat. • These roles may be within the King's Health Partners setting.	**Knowledge Dissemination and Impact** Actively engaged in Knowledge Dissemination and beginning to consider impact of ones work beyond academia.

Senior Lecturer

Research	Education
Research **Publications:** • 4 articles in the last five years, of "internationally excellent" quality (e.g in the top 10%ile of the field) • As first or last author; or a middle author with substantive and critical contribution. • H-index 12-20 **Grants:** • ==Sufficient grant income to maintain their own laboratory/desk-based research group with 2-3 regular research workers.== • Obtaining about 10-15% salary recovery on research grants (as PI and CI) **Students:** • ==Primary supervision of of 1-2 PhD students, and additional secondary supervision.== **Esteem:** • Speaking at international meetings, and invited speaker, and organizing symposia at national meetings. Reviewing grants for agencies and articles for high impact journals and. **Future sustainability:** • Clear forward plan for sustaining/enhancing research programme, consistent with the Division's research strategy.	**Education** Education contributions equivalent to 20% of time, or 320 hours per Education database **Delivery and innovation:** • Contribution to teaching UG/PG modules. • Supervision of undergraduate and/or postgraduate library/laboratory projects. • Favourable student feedback. • **Organisation and support:** • Personal tutor to MBBS, BSc and/or MSc students. • Contribute to BSC/MSc module organisation, module coordinator, programme leader. • Contribution to critical review, audit and other quality assurance processes. • Engagement in broader educational issues, for example, external examining, conference attendance etc.
Academic citizenship, management and leadership • Tangible acts of academic citizenship Organisation of departmental/divisional seminars. Member of Division/ Department committees and boards. • Recruit, mentor and manage high quality research staff, within agreed Frameworks and procedures. • Ensure adherence to College and externally agreed Frameworks and procedures e.g. research concordat. • For some staff these roles may be within the King's Health Partners setting.	**Knowledge Dissemination and Impact** Actively engaged in Knowledge Dissemination and working on impact of ones work beyond academia.

Reader

Research	Education
Papers: • 4 articles in the last five years, of "internationally excellent" quality (e.g in the top 10%ile of the field) • As first or last author; or a middle author with substantive and critical contribution. • H-index 20 and above **Grants:** • Sufficient grant income to maintain their own laboratory/desk-based research group with 3-4 regular research workers. • Obtaining about 15-20% salary recovery on research grants (as PI and CI) **Students:** • Primary supervision of 2-3 PhD students, with additional secondary supervision. **Esteem:** • Invited to speak at international meetings, organizing symposia and invited speaker and oragniser of national meetings. Reviewing articles for high impact journals, grants for agencies, and serving on professional and scientific committees and Editorial Boards. Future sustainability • Clear forward plan for sustaining/enhancing research programme, consistent with the Division's research strategy.	Education contributions equivalent to 20% of time, or 320 hours per Education database **Delivery and innovation:** • Contribution to teaching and learning including new innovative methods. • Supervision of undergraduate and/or postgraduate library/laboratory projects. • Favourable student feedback. **Organisation and support:** • Personal tutor to MBBS, BSc and/or MSc students. • Contribute to BSC/MSc module, module coordinator, programme leader. • Contribution to critical review, audit and other quality assurance processes. • Engagement in broader educational issues, for example, external examining, conference attendance etc. As academics graduate to senior ranks the balance of educational contribution may shift from delivery to leadership and governance.
Academic citizenship, management and leadership • Tangible acts of academic citizenship • Member and Chair of Division/ Department committees and boards. • Represent the Division at College /KHP meetings and on external meetings/groups • Recruit, mentor and manage high quality research staff, within agreed Frameworks and procedures. • Ensure adherence to College and externally agreed Frameworks and procedures e.g. research concordat. For some staff these roles may be within the King's Health Partners setting.	**Knowledge Dissemination and Impact** Actively engaged in Knowledge Dissemination and achieving impact of ones work beyond academia.

Professor

Research	Education
Publications: ==4-6 articles in the last five years, of "internationally excellent" quality (e.g in the top 10%ile of the field)== • As first or last author; or a middle author with substantive and critical contribution.. • H-Index 25 and above **Grants:** • Sufficient grant income to maintain their own laboratory/desk-based ==research group with 4 or more regular research workers.== • Obtaining 25% or greater salary recovery on research grants (as PI and CI) **Students:** • ==Primary supervision of three or more PhD students,== with additional secondary supervision. **Esteem:** • Routinely invited to speak at international meetings, organizing symposia and invited speaker. Chair and oragniser of national meetings. Reviewing articles for high impact journals; chairing and serving on professional and scientific grant committees and Editorial Boards. **Strategy/delivery:** • Clear forward plan for sustaining/enhancing research programme, consistent with the Division's research strategy.	**Education** Education contributions equivalent to 20% of time, or 320 hours per Education database **Delivery and innovation:** • Contribution to teaching and learning including new innovative methods. • Supervision of undergraduate and/or postgraduate library/laboratory projects. • Favourable student feedback. **Organisation and support:** • Personal tutor to MBBS, BSc and/or MSc students. • Contribute to BSC/MSc module, module coordinator, programme leader. • Contribution to critical review, audit and other quality assurance processes. • Engagement in broader educational issues, for example, external examining, conference attendance etc. As academics graduate to senior ranks the balance of educational contribution may shift from delivery to leadership and governance.
Academic citizenship, management and leadership • Tangible acts of academic citizenship • Chair or Member of Division/ Department committees and boards. • Represent the Division at College /KHP meetings and on external meetings/groups • Recruit, mentor and manage high quality research staff, within agreed Frameworks and procedures. • Ensure adherence to College and externally agreed Frameworks and procedures e.g. research concordat. • For some staff these roles may be within the King's Health Partners setting.	**Knowledge Dissemination and Impact** Actively engaged in Knowledge Dissemination with established impact of ones work beyond academia.

3.2 Academics with Education as their major endeavour

A small number of colleagues at IoPPN will make education their major endeavour (Education-led career path) and this will be the major area of their effort allocation, annual evaluation and their pathway to promotion. The Education-led academics will continue to be involved in research, their research output expectations will be adjusted in accordance with their dominant role in Education. Given the nature of their commitments it may be acceptable that education-led colleagues may not have sufficient 3* or 4* outputs to be submitted for REF.

The indicators that will be used to assess the progress for these individuals have been outlined by the College and are available at https://internal.kcl.ac.uk/hr/promotions/Appendix-2-Education--Supplementary-progression-and-promotion-criteria.pdf.

Individuals following this pathway will need to make a prospective application to the Dean of Education, supported by the Head of Department and Division to be so considered. Once this pathway is confirmed, a bespoke plan for the future development and support for such colleagues will be developed so that they can achieve promotion via the Education-led pathway.

Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience

Academic Performance Framework

Frequently Asked Questions

Why has the Framework been produced?
The Framework is a means of drawing together and clearly articulating the key areas of activity and expectations of an academic, and to provide a clearer reference for recruitment, annual Performance Development Reviews and promotion.

Is the IoPPN the only area rolling this out?
No, all Health Faculties have similar frameworks and all of them are refreshing them.

How does this fit in with PDR?
The Framework is intended to be used as a key reference point when evaluating performance and setting objectives during PDR discussions. The timeline and process is outline in Section 2 of this document.

If I meet all the criteria for a rank – is promotion automatic?
Promotions at King's College London are dealt with a separate process. If a candidate clearly meets all the elements related to a rank and is beginning to reach some of the criteria listed in the rank above, they should begin discussions with their Head of Department about promotion.

What happens if I exceed all or most of the indicators in the Framework?
Identification of exceptional performance in all or many of the domains should lead to appropriate recognition and reward, which may include support for applications for promotion or salary increases, dependent on the current grade of the member of staff. Performance development reviewers, after consultation with the staff member, should highlight such areas for review by the Head of Department, who can advise on the appropriate course for reward and recognition.

What happens if I do not meet many of the indicators in the Framework?
For indicators that are not being met, staff and their performance development reviewer must assess whether there is reasonable justification for this, given the individuals current role and the balance of their workload (see page 1 of this document). If this is an acceptable variation, this should be so documented and endorsed by the Head of Department. Where there is no reasonable justification, performance development reviewers, after consultation with the staff member, should make recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the nature of support required. The provision of this support and its effectiveness shuld be reviewed at subsequent PDR meetings. Support recommendations may include, for example, peer review of research grant applications, attendance at writing or grant proposal workshops, teaching/education training etc. Failure to meet indicators in the framework will not lead to formal disciplinary procedures. However, persistent

15

failure, despite the provision of additional support, may result in formal performance management procedures, in line with current procedures.

I was not told of these criteria so clearly before otherwise I would have made different decisions.
The Institute has always had a tri-partite (research, teaching and contribution to the Institute) expectation from its academic staff. The previous APF at the Institute and the BMS covered the same domains and standards of achievement – though the previous documents were less clear with respect to educational contributions and also about the importance of overheads and salary recovery for the sustainability of the Institute. The framework is being introduced to provide greater clarity and metrics and to bring individual performance in alignment with institutional objectives. If on reading this framework you would like to reconsider some of your current work distribution, please discuss it in the context of your Performance Development Review and, if appropriate, with your Head of Department.

I think I am doing a lot of things that do not directly relate to the criteria laid out here – what should I do?
The purpose of such a framework is to provide clarity of expectations. Speak to your Performance Development Reviewer first. It may be that what you are doing is indeed valuable and just needs to be recognised and measured appropriately. Conversely, it may be that some activities could be adjusted or dropped.