University of Management and Technology

UMT Annual Research Assessment Framework 2026-27

Policy Name	UMT Annual Research Assessment Framework 2026-27
Policy Version	N-2026/10
File No	OPD/ORIC/01/Rev/30-Sep-2026
Next Scheduled Review	2 Years
Effective Date	Oct 1, 2026
Approved By	Executive Committee
Amendment Authority	Executive Committee
Administered By	ORIC
Policy Custodian	Office of Planning Development
E-Approval ID	7280
Distribution	Office of the Chairman and President Office of Rector DG All Concerned Offices

ACTION	NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE
Initiated by	Dr. M Sohail Afzal	STRATPLAN PILLAR 3- INITIATIVE 7	15-4-2026
Revised & reviewed by	Dr. Sammia Shahid	PROVOST	30-4-2026
Reviewed by	Adeel Ahmed Khan	OPD	7-5-2026
Reviewed by	Imran Zahid	OPD	7-5-2026
Reviewed by	Shahzad Khan	OCP	27-8-2026
Reviewed by	Ahmed Abdullah	DG	30-9-2026
Approved by	Executive Committee	OCP	30-9-2026

Table of Contents

1 Objective....3
2 Scope....3
3 Alignment and Rationale for Revision....3
4 General Assessment Principles....3
5 Annual Research Assessment - PhD Faculty (100 Marks)....4
6 Adjusted Annual Research Assessment - Lecturer / Non-PhD Faculty (100 Marks)....6
7 School-Category Adjustment and Link to FISCA Targets....7
8 Performance Rating....8
9 Evidence and Verification Requirements....8
10 Governance and Annual Process....8
11 Safeguards Against Double Counting....8
12 Implementation Note....9

(Individual Faculty Scorecard aligned with HEC ORIC Scorecard, FISCA and StratPlan 2035 - Pillar 3)

1 Objective

To establish a transparent, quality-driven and auditable annual research assessment framework for UMT faculty that translates institutional research priorities into measurable individual performance indicators. The framework emphasizes research quality, external funding, collaboration, citations and visibility, innovation, industry engagement, societal impact, supervision and research leadership while ensuring fair adjustment for Lecturer/non-PhD faculty.

2 Scope

This framework applies to full-time UMT faculty across Schools/Institutes. The primary scorecard is designed for PhD faculty. A separately adjusted 100-mark scorecard applies to Lecturer/non-PhD faculty so that they are not disadvantaged for indicators such as PhD supervision or serving as Principal Investigator where eligibility or opportunity is limited.

3 Alignment and Rationale for Revision

The revised framework addresses the principal gaps identified in the existing assessment model and aligns individual faculty assessment with the institutional ORIC/FISCA/StratPlan performance architecture.

a. Maintains a 100-mark capped structure; no section or activity can inflate the final score beyond its approved weight.

b. Separates proposal submission from grant success so both research effort and competitive funding outcomes are visible.

c. Adds research links/joint projects, international co-authorship, industry/government-funded work, licensing/commercialization, policy/civic impact and research revenue-related contributions.

d. Avoids treating every ORIC school-level KPI as a compulsory individual KPI; faculty are assessed on attributable contribution while Deans retain aggregate school targets.

e. Uses qualification-adjusted expectations for Lecturer/non-PhD faculty and permits discipline-appropriate equivalents in innovation, creative practice, policy and societal impact.

f. Reduces double counting through activity-stage rules, annual evidence requirements and section caps.

4 General Assessment Principles

a. Assessment period: 1 July to 30 June (or the officially notified annual evaluation cycle).

b. Only outputs with verifiable UMT affiliation and occurring within the assessment period are normally claimable, unless a continuing externally funded project is specifically scored for the active project year.

c. A single output may contribute to more than one strategic dimension only where the dimensions are genuinely distinct (e.g., a Q1 paper may score under publication quality and separately under international co-authorship). The same milestone cannot be claimed twice within the same section.

d. For publications, quartile shall be verified through WoS JCR primarily and Scopus/SJR secondarily where JCR is unavailable, subject to the approved UMT publication policy.

e. For multi-author publications, authorship eligibility/credit shall follow the approved UMT Research Reward/Publication policy. The research assessment score measures performance and does not determine financial reward.

f. All scores are subject to section caps. Surplus output may be recorded as “above target” but cannot exceed 100 marks, except where the University separately approves a bonus mechanism.

g. Evidence shall be verified through OTR/ORIC or the designated research portal. Unsupported claims receive zero marks.

h. Discipline-specific equivalence may be approved by RGC/competent authority for fields where patents, laboratory grants or journal quartiles are not the dominant research mode.

5 Annual Research Assessment - PhD Faculty (100 Marks)

Section	Assessment Area	Maximum Marks	Strategic Purpose
I	Research Publications & Quality	35	High-quality peer-reviewed output and citation impact
II	External Funding & Research Projects	20	Competitive proposals, awarded grants and funded research
III	Collaboration, Internationalization & Visibility	15	International co-authorship, joint projects, research links and scholarly visibility
IV	Innovation, Industry & Societal Impact	15	IP, commercialization, consultancy/industry linkage, policy and community impact
V	Supervision, Research Leadership & Citizenship	15	Research supervision, recognition, mentoring, integrity and capacity building

5.1 Section I - Research Publications & Quality (Maximum 35)

Publication scoring is quality weighted. The section cap prevents a single publication category from dominating the entire annual assessment.

Indicator	Evidence / Level	Marks	Cap / Rule
Peer-reviewed journal publication	Q1	30 per eligible paper	One eligible Q1 paper earns the full publication component of 30 marks
	Q2	20 per eligible paper	
	Q3	15 per eligible paper	
	Q4	10 per eligible paper	
Research citation impact	Average Verified FWCI/normalized impact >= 1.50	5	Citation component capped at 5
	Average Verified FWCI/normalized impact 1.00-1.49	3	
Discipline-equivalent scholarly output	Scopus recognized scholarly book, book chapter or approved creative output	Up to 8	Used where relevant; total Section I remains capped at 35
	Scopus Indexed Book	8 per eligible book	
	Non-Scopus Book	4 per eligible book	
	Scopus Book Chapter	4 per eligible book chapter	
	Non-Scopus Chapter	2 per eligible book chapter	

5.2 Section II - External Funding & Research Projects (Maximum 20)

Indicator	Level	Marks	Maximum
Competitive proposal submitted	PI: eligible national/international/industry proposal	3 per proposal	6
	Co-PI / substantive named investigator	1 per proposal	

Indicator	Level	Marks	Maximum
Awarded external research grant/project (PI or formally named Co-PI)	< PKR 1 million	5	14
	PKR 1-4.99 million	7	
	PKR 5 million or above	14	
Strategic premium	International or industry-funded award with UMT as contracting/host institution	+2	Award component remains capped at 14

Note: Proposal submission and award are separate performance stages. A submitted proposal scores 3 marks for the PI and 1 mark for a formally named Co-PI. For an awarded grant or project, the PI and formally named Co-PI receive equal marks according to grant value, subject to verification of a substantive role. Section II remains capped at 20 marks.

5.3 Section III - Collaboration, Internationalization & Visibility (Maximum 15)

Indicator	Marks	Maximum	Verification
Internationally co-authored Q1/Q2 publication	4 each	8	Publication with at least one substantive international institutional co-author
Active joint research project / research link producing verifiable output	2 each	3	Joint proposal, dataset, project, funded activity or formally documented research output other than paper publication
National, international Conference, keynote/plenary speaker, visiting scholar/research visit,	3 each	6	Official invitation/appointment and evidence of participation

5.4 Section IV - Innovation, Industry & Societal Impact (Maximum 15)

Faculty may score from the indicators relevant to their discipline. For the same IP asset, only the highest new milestone achieved during the assessment year shall normally be scored.

Indicator	Qualifying Outcome	Marks	Rule
Innovation / IP	Invention disclosure accepted by UMT	3 each	
	Patent/design/copyright filed	5 each	
	Patent/IP granted	8 each	
	License signed / commercialization / startup or spin-off based on UMT research	10	Same asset: highest new stage only
Industry / consultancy	Documented industry/government funded consultancy or contract research	8	Scale by value and role; verified revenue to UMT required
	≥ Rs. 5 million	8 each	
	Rs. 3–4.99 million	6 each	
	Rs. 1–2.99 million	3 each	
Case study/Policy / societal impact	Policy brief formally submitted to or used by government/recognized body; Scopus/HEC-recognized case study; or art exhibition	4 each	
	Completed community/civic/SDG research project with documented beneficiaries/outcome	3 each	
Research product / creative output	Validated prototype or research/creative product	6 each	Subject to ORIC/RGC-approved equivalence

5.5 Section V - Supervision, Research Leadership & Citizenship (Maximum 15)

Indicator	Marks	Maximum	Condition
Completed research supervision	PhD completion: 8; MS/MPhil completion: 4; BS research project: 2	8	Formal supervisor/co-supervisor credit; pro-rate co-supervision where applicable
Academic recognition & leadership	Editor/associate editor, major research award, journal peer paper review, invited research leadership role: 2 each	4	Recognized scholarly body/journal/event
Research capacity building / mentoring	Grant-writing/research training/ delivered or documented mentoring contribution: 2 each	2	UMT or recognized external activity
Research compliance & profiles	Timely verified research data; ORCID/Scopus/WoS/Google Scholar profile maintained; ethics/compliance requirements met	1	Mandatory evidence

Opportunity-adjustment rule: Where no postgraduate supervision has been formally allocated to a faculty member, up to 5 marks from the supervision component may be earned through additional verified research leadership, mentoring, funded project management or capacity-building contributions. This prevents structural disadvantage while retaining the 15-mark section cap.

6 Adjusted Annual Research Assessment - Lecturer / Non-PhD Faculty (100 Marks)

Lecturer/non-PhD faculty are evaluated on research development, contribution and progression rather than on PhD-level responsibilities that may not be available to them. The scorecard retains alignment with institutional priorities but redistributes weight away from PhD supervision and PI-level expectations.

Section	Assessment Area	Maximum Marks
I	Research Publications & Scholarly Output	40
II	Research Development & Funded-Project Participation	5
III	Collaboration, Internationalization & Visibility	15
IV	Innovation, Industry & Societal Impact	15
V	Student Research, Research Engagement & Capacity Building	15
VI	Research Integrity, Profiles & Professional Development	10

6.1 Detailed Lecturer / Non-PhD Scorecard

Area	Indicator	Marks	Section Cap
I. Publications & Scholarly Output	Q1 = 40; Q2 = 40; Q3 = 30; Q4 = 20 per eligible publication	As stated	40
	Recognized case study, book chapter or approved creative/professional output	As stated in section 5.1	
	Verified citation or impact improvement	Up to 8	
	Verified average FWCI/normalized impact >= 1.50	8	
	Verified average FWCI/normalized impact 1.00-1.49	5	
II. Research Development & Funded Projects	Awarded external research project as formally named PI or Co-PI	5	5
	Competitive proposal submitted as PI / Co-PI	3 / 1	
	Approved grant-writing, research methods or competitive research training	3 each	

Area	Indicator	Marks	Section Cap
III. Collaboration & Visibility	International co-authored Q1/Q2 publication	4 each	15
	Joint research activity/research link with verifiable output	3 each	
	Conference research presentation / invited scholarly participation	4 each	
IV. Innovation, Industry & Societal Impact	Policy, case study, community service or SDG project contribution	5 each	15
V. Student Research & Engagement	MS co-supervision, BS project, internship or COOP research supervision	2 each	15
	Research seminar, colloquium or research group with documented output	1 each	
	Research event/workshop organization or mentoring support	2 each	
VI. Integrity, Profiles & Development	Verified ORCID, Scopus/WoS and Google Scholar profiles; timely portal data	4	10
	Research ethics/integrity compliance and required training; annual research development plan or progress toward higher qualification	3 + 3	

Bonus Structure (Aligned with Incentive Policy, allocated if maximum marks in relevant category are achieved and extra work available)

Category	Max Bonus
Q1 Publication	capped at 5
International Patent	capped at 5
Funded Project ≥ Rs. 5M	capped at 5
Industry Solution funded by industry	capped at 5

Max Bonus = 10. Bonus marks shall be reported separately and shall not increase the final assessment score beyond 100.

7 School-Category Adjustment and Link to FISCA Targets

The individual scorecard does not replace School-level targets. Deans shall continue to be accountable for aggregate FISCA/ORIC/StratPlan outcomes. Individual expectations should be calibrated to the research intensity of the School while maintaining the same 100-mark scoring framework.

School Category	Institutional Publication Reference	Individual Interpretation	Additional Emphasis
A - High Research Intensity	Minimum 2 Scopus-indexed publications per PhD faculty; strong Q1 share	PhD faculty expected to demonstrate consistent annual publication plus grant/collaboration activity	External funding, international co-authorship, IP/industry outcomes
B - Medium Research Intensity	School average target equivalent to 1.5 Scopus publications per PhD faculty	Individual target set through annual plan; school aggregate must meet approved target	Quality publications, grants, research links and impact
C - Emerging Research Schools	Minimum 1 Scopus-indexed publication per PhD faculty	Emphasis on building a sustainable pipeline and research capability	Research development, collaborations, first grants and discipline-appropriate outputs

8 Performance Rating

Annual Score	Performance Rating	Interpretation
85-100	Exceptional	Substantially exceeds annual research expectations and demonstrates strategic impact
70-84	Very Good	Exceeds core expectations with strong quality and/or impact
55-69	Good / Meets Expectations	Meets reasonable annual research expectations
40-54	Improvement Required	Partial achievement; research improvement plan required
Below 40	Unsatisfactory	Material shortfall; formal research performance support/action required

A faculty member may not be rated "Exceptional" solely on the basis of one activity category. Normally, evidence of performance in at least three major sections is required for an Exceptional rating.

9 Evidence and Verification Requirements

a. Publications: DOI/indexing record, quartile verification and UMT affiliation.

b. Citations/impact: verified Scopus/WoS or approved bibliometric source snapshot for the assessment period.

c. Proposals and grants: submission acknowledgement, proposal/award letter, PI/Co-PI role, amount and UMT institutional routing/contract record.

d. Research links/joint projects: documented collaboration plus an actual research output/activity; MoU signature alone is not sufficient for full credit.

e. IP/commercialization: OIC/ORIC/competent office verification of disclosure, filing, grant, license or commercialization stage.

f. Consultancy/industry work: approved UMT agreement and verified institutional revenue/receivable where applicable.

g. Policy/societal impact: submission/adoption letter, partner confirmation, project report or other verifiable evidence of use/benefit.

h. Supervision/leadership: official student record, completion notification, editorial/award/invitation letter or approved institutional record.

10 Governance and Annual Process

a. At the start of the assessment year, each faculty member shall agree an annual research plan with the CoD/Dean consistent with School category and faculty qualification/role.

b. Faculty shall update research outputs on the designated portal throughout the year; OTR/ORIC shall verify claims using approved evidence.

c. Quarterly School reviews should track proposal submissions/approvals, funding, industry projects, research links, joint projects, publications/Q1 share, international co-authorship, IP, commercialization, policy/community outcomes and consultancy/revenue contributions.

d. At year-end, the verified individual score shall be reviewed by the CoD/Dean and finalized through the notified University performance assessment mechanism.

e. Any exceptional discipline-equivalence or disputed evidence shall be referred to RGC/competent authority for documented decision.

f. The framework should be reviewed annually against changes in HEC ORIC Scorecard, FISCA and StratPlan targets.

11 Safeguards Against Double Counting

a. One publication receives one publication-quality score in Section I; authorship roles are not stacked.

b. For the same patent/IP asset, only the highest new milestone achieved during the year is counted in Section IV unless a separately monetized licensing/commercialization outcome occurs and is verified.

c. The same grant may score for proposal submission and later award because these are different performance stages, but repeat annual award points are not allowed unless the project-year scoring rule is explicitly invoked by University policy.

d. A research link/MoU is scored only when accompanied by a verifiable research activity/output; signing an MoU alone does not establish research performance.

e. Consultancy/industry revenue and funded research must be classified consistently by OTR/Finance to avoid counting the same contract twice under separate headings.

12 Implementation Note

For institutional reporting, individual faculty scores should be aggregated with School-level ORIC/FISCA KPIs rather than used as a substitute for them. The Dean remains accountable for School targets such as proposal success rate, external research income, research links, licensing negotiations/licenses, consultancy revenue, civic/policy engagement, international co-authorship and other approved Pillar 3 targets.



