

PBRF SRG Consultation Paper #6 - Developing Evidence Portfolios – operational guidance for the Research Output component

The information below is a summary of the Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF) Sector Reference Group's (SRG's) sixth consultation paper on operational guidance for the Research Output component. Where the organisation is not identified in the comment, the TEC has not attributed those comments to any organisation. Each line of commentary denotes a separate response from an organisation or individual.

Number	Organisation name
1	Auckland University of Technology
2	Auckland University of Technology (School of Art and Design)
3	Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology
4	Department of Music, University of Otago
5	Eastern Institute of Technology
6	Massey University
7	Otago Polytechnic
8	Tertiary Education Union Te Hautū Kahurangi o Aotearoa
9	University of Auckland
10	University of Canterbury
11	University of Otago
12	University of Waikato
13	Victoria University of Wellington

A. Definition of Research

Do you support the proposed changes to the Definition of Research?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	72.7%	8
No	27.3%	3

Comments

The proposed changes to the Definition of Research appear to address the concerns raised regarding applied, commercial or creative research. The only minor change that could be suggested would be to remove the words “national and international” from the second sentence of the first paragraph as they do not seem necessary.

Yes, although continuing to note the meaning of ‘independent investigation’ may be useful to make clear this does not preclude collaborative work.

The University of Waikato supports the SRGs proposal to widen the definition of research to address concerns raised by researchers whose outputs are of a more applied, commercial or creative nature.

The revised definition of research proposed by the SRG is a good first start but may benefit from additional work. Specifically, the footnote accompanying the word ‘independent’ in the original definition of research used in the previous three PBRF rounds, should also be included in the revised definition, i.e. include the sentence ‘The term ‘independent’ here should not be construed to exclude collaborative work.’

The University of Waikato opposes any changes that would allow Panels to develop their own definition of Research.

We support many of the proposed changes to the Definition of Research and for purposes of clarification suggest the following:

- Include the previously asterisked term ‘independent’ (in the 2012 PBRF Guidelines) to clarify that this is not meant to mean research only by individuals.
- That paragraph two of the definition, which covers how the findings might be made available, is moved to after the current paragraph three which continues to define research. This means the first two paragraphs are concerned with the definition of research, followed by how the research findings are displayed or relayed, and then onto what is not included in the definition.
- The REF definition of Scholarly activity i.e. “Scholarship for the REF is defined as the creation, development and maintenance of the intellectual infrastructure of subjects and disciplines, in forms such as dictionaries, scholarly editions, catalogues and contributions to major research databases” was seen to be helpful, and would be a useful adjunct to the primary definition and to expand on the term ‘scholarly’.

We suggest adding the following wording: ‘synthesis and analysis of previous research to the extent that it is new and creative’.

Whilst most changes to the definition of research are supported, we strongly disagree with the inclusion of the reference to 'other stakeholders' in reference to scrutiny and assessment. The use of the terminology 'stakeholders' allows assessment and judgement of a work by those that are not necessarily knowledgeable in a specific field and therefore cannot adequately assess the research. We recommend the sentence concludes with '...experts within the field.'

There was also concern raised at the inclusion of specific examples of avenues of dissemination which may lead a reviewer to discount other means of dissemination if not specifically referenced within the definition.

NZQA has just adopted PBRF current definition so the definitions would differ again.

Using the term "independent" alongside "original" " original, independent..." may be interpreted as excluding research which is done for development because that is likely to be funded by an entity which will benefit directly from development and therefore not be independent.

It appears the purpose of the change in definition is to be explicit about industry and applied research but the phrase "normally publically available" returns to the traditional output of a published paper. The importance is surely that the output has a robust quality assurance process.

The terms "industry and commerce" in UK definition, are broader than "national and international businesses" and more in keeping with government's emphasis on doing research which supports NZ economy.

The need for an output to be open for rigorous assessment by stakeholders, as well as experts in the field, would exclude some findings which aren't open to stakeholder assessment because of the nature of the research. Experts would assess quality, stakeholders would assess impact.

Findings being open to "rigorous assessment" would exclude all oral presentations (including conferences) as it's not possible to undertake rigorous assessment of an oral presentation, yet "oral conference presentation" is included as a Research Output category. In the UK definition, presentation is linked to an "assessable" output, which would be done by a review for a performance, or a curator for an exhibition.

The definition would read better if "cultural innovation or aesthetic refinement" were in paragraph 3.

Yes, the new Definition of Research is supported. It is particularly useful for non-conventional Humanities research, such as performances, creative outputs and will be helpful in being able to "differentiate creative professional practice from research" as noted by the Creative and Performing Arts (CPA) panel. This concern has also been raised by academics within the 'creative and performing arts' field at Otago.

We noted that the statement has been removed about collaborative work (to address the 'independent investigation'). We would suggest that this is reinstated.

We also note that the word routine needs to be repeated in the exclusion section like this:

.. This includes but is not limited to: routine testing; routine data-collection and analysis; preparation for teaching...

It is unfair for the national authority to change the definition of research and parameters halfway through the prescribed period for a research round. Hence, we ask that the following changes be made to ensure that creative outputs with a research knowledge or innovation outcome are included, as well as creative outputs that meet the criteria of artistic excellence. To ensure that all these outputs are eligible and accommodated within the PBRF round we ask that two categories for creative outputs be identified:

1. Creative Research/Innovation Outputs (outputs that contribute to new or original knowledge or innovation in and/or beyond the field - this would include all forms of Practice or Performance as Research (PaR) and/or outcomes that represent significant innovations in practice or conventions).

2. Creative Excellence Outputs (outputs that represent artistic excellence - these outputs were included and were integral to the previous PBRF rounds and are judged by peer review, peer recognition through prizes, awards, honours etc. and by the stature of venue and promoter).

The University of Auckland does not support the proposed changes to the Definition of Research.

The current definition has been well-understood and used by the sector for over a decade, with minor amendments . Given this success, it should not be changed drastically without substantial cause. Significant change runs the risk of problematic unforeseen consequences such as conflicting interpretations by different interests.

The issues raised by the SRG as to why the definition should change – low volume and quality of submissions with an applied research element, and differentiation of research from professional practice in areas like the creative and performing arts – are better addressed through non-definitional responses such as panel-specific guidelines, and amending the list of research output types, if necessary. Slight amendments to the current (2012) definition could be acceptable.

In particular, the University disagrees with:

1.The addition of the sentence: "It includes work of direct relevance to the specific needs of national and international businesses and communities, iwi, government and society."

Rationale: This does not define research; it is a subset rather than expansion of the first sentence, only offering some examples of context – which could lead some to mistakenly believe that consulting work is considered to be research.

2.The deletion of the following sentences: "[Research] typically involves enquiry of an experimental or critical nature driven by hypotheses or intellectual positions capable of rigorous assessment by experts in a given discipline. It is an independent*, creative, cumulative and often long-term activity conducted by people with specialist knowledge about the theories, methods and information concerning their field of enquiry."

Rationale: These criteria are open and inclusive; activity which does not meet them is unlikely to be research, and it is difficult to see why they have been deleted. Their deletion would weaken the PBRF definition considerably, and would likely make it even more difficult for panellists in the creative and performing arts to differentiate between research and professional practice.

3.Changing "Its findings must be open to scrutiny and formal evaluation by others in the field, and this may be achieved through publication or public presentation" to "Research findings are normally publicly available and must be open to scrutiny and rigorous assessment by experts within the field and other stakeholders. Public availability may be achieved through various forms of appropriate dissemination including, but not limited to publication, manufacture, construction, confidential reports or public presentation."

Rationale: Public availability does not define research. Types of research outputs are covered by the "list of research output types".

4.Including "analysis" (as in the phrase "data-collection and analysis") on the list of activities excluded from the definition of research.

Rationale: what is referred to simply as "analysis" usually is research. Note that the REF definition strictly qualifies the type of analysis which it excludes (in bold here): "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 is unnecessary for the PBRF definition to duplicate this, and extremely misleading to have "analysis" without further definition on the list of excluded activities.

The University would accept the addition of "that lead to new or substantially improved insights" to the sentence "In some disciplines, the investigation and its results may be embodied in the form of artistic works, performances and or designs." However, the addition seems unnecessary, as it merely repeats the ideas of a more meaningful phrase which is already in the definition: "cultural innovation or aesthetic refinement."

The largest amendment to date was an addition between 2003 and 2006 to the end of the first sentence: "For the purposes of the PBRF, research is original investigation undertaken in order to contribute to knowledge and understanding", namely "and, in the case of some disciplines, cultural innovation or aesthetic refinement".

We suggest re-ordering and adding to the second sentence, first paragraph as follows:

“It includes work of direct relevance to the specific needs of society, the environment, government, communities, iwi/hapū, and national and international businesses.”

In the second paragraph, second sentence we suggest rewording as follows:

“Public availability may be achieved through various forms of appropriate dissemination including, but not limited to publication, manufacture, construction, confidential reports, public presentation, or artistic performance or exhibition.”

In the third paragraph, first sentence we suggest adding the following:

“In some disciplines, the investigation...lead to new or substantially improved insights, or contribute to a body of work/genre.”

Additional comments

The first suggested reordering means that greater emphasis is placed on those things that are greater than each of us, i.e. society and the environment, rather than giving business/industry this position. A small but significant rephrasing of the paragraph in our view.

In this section, by ‘communities’ is the TEC referring to the community and voluntary sector or communities more broadly, or both?

In the second paragraph, we question whether it can be claimed that confidential reports meet the criteria of being publicly available. Certainly an academic may publish or develop work as a result of such a report, but the report by its very nature is not available to the public.

We also felt it was important to include artistic performance or exhibition, given the concerns that academics in these fields have had about appropriate acknowledgement of their research.

Our suggested addition in the third paragraph, first sentence acknowledges that artistic performance or exhibition may also simply be about contributing to the field.

We are uncomfortable with the second sentence that states “It includes work of direct relevance to the specific needs of national and international businesses and communities, iwi, government and society”. We prefer the wording of the UK REF which simply states “...[research is defined as a process of investigation leading to new insights], effectively shared.” This could be adapted to read something like this “The work is effectively shared with appropriate groups including communities, iwi, government and businesses.”

Do you agree that the peer review panels should specifically consider the definition of research and develop any specific advice in relation to their subject areas as part of the panel specific guidelines?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	9
No	0.0%	0

Comments

The peer review panels should consider whether any specific advice about the definition of research in relation to their subject areas needs to be developed. Any specific advice must be informed by a range of perspectives, including applied, commercial and creative research perspectives. As such, the initial cohort of panellists (charged with developing panel specific guidelines) must include representatives of both different subject areas and also different experiences.

The University of Waikato opposes any changes that would allow Panels to develop their own definition of Research.

We strongly support that recommendation that each of the panels should be asked to expand on, and specify the definition of research for the disciplines they cover in the panel specific guidelines. This is of particular relevance to the CPA panel and the newer disciplines. This is an important consideration that sub-disciplines within some PBRF subject areas are explicitly encouraged or acknowledged as being research, are included in the discipline and there are examples provided to help give guidance and remove ambiguity (and anxiety). Examples include:

Communications, journalism and media studies - does it include investigative journalism when there is a substantive research component?

Design – does it include commissioned research i.e. the creation of a prototype, or an experimental clothing range?

We would hope for consultation with the sector if the Panel decided to make changes to the current proposed definition or would wish to validate its’ views before finalising their specific guidelines.

We support the proposal for guidance and specific advice in relation to the definition of research as relevant to a subject area in the panel specific guidelines.

The more clarity the better the EP and the easier it is to assess whether an EP should be submitted.

Information on applied research could also be given in Panel Guidelines.

The University agrees that peer review panels should develop specific advice on the application of the definition of research to their disciplines as part of the panel specific guidelines. Where appropriate this should be based on the advice of the previous round’s relevant panel, so that panels are not having to ‘reinvent the wheel’.

B. Eligibility of patents as Research Outputs

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Option 1: Maintain the status quo and allow only granted patents as eligible research outputs.	46.2%	6

Option 2: Allow both granted patents (as Quality Assured research outputs) and patent applications (as non-Quality Assured research outputs) as eligible outputs for the 2018 Quality Evaluation, with a granted patent not being allowed for any subsequent Quality Evaluation exercises by the researcher if the application has been submitted (this is the SRG's preferred option).	53.8%	7
---	-------	---

Comments

Option 2 will require consistent application in successive PBRF rounds (with an associated auditing workload) and may also give rise to new behaviours: people may apply for more patents with no real intent to follow the process through to its conclusion. In light of these considerations, Option 1 (maintaining the status quo) is preferred.

The University of Waikato supports Option 1 i.e. only allow granted patents as eligible research outputs.

The University considers Option 2 i.e. also allowing patent applications as eligible research outputs, to be problematic. Theoretically one patent author could decide to use the patent application in a PBRF round which means they would not be allowed to use the granted application in a following round. A patent co-author might have chosen to wait for the granted patent before including it in their evidence portfolio. This could result in a single PBRF round where a patent is allowed in one portfolio, but not in another and would introduce additional monitoring requirements to ensure there was no double dipping. The University of Waikato would not support adding additional administrative costs to PBRF rounds.

The University of Waikato recommends a reference be included in the Panel Specific Guidelines that outlines the need for researchers to demonstrate the application of a patent, to provide evidence of its impact/value and contribution to research.

We support the SRG preference, of allowing patent applications, if in the public domain, to be eligible for inclusion in an evidence portfolio assuming it meets the other eligibility criteria (e.g. is research and is in assessment the period). Patent applications should be classed as not being quality assured and should not be available for any subsequent PBRF assessments.

We support including published patent applications as eligible items within an evidence portfolio with the proviso that the following granted patent is not eligible for inclusion in subsequent rounds. It is recommended that guidance regarding the articulation of the application of the intellectual property as research is clear in the guidelines or relevant panel specific guidelines.

Option 1 as it would become difficult to track “applied” and “granted” patents over 2 assessment periods. Application for a patent could be in “Contribution to research”.

Preference for Option 1 – to maintain the status quo and only allow granted patents as eligible research outputs. In addition to this it needs to be clarified as to which one of the ‘patent family’ will be recorded, i.e. a patent may be granted many times, each in a different country but it is only for one actual output/invention. Therefore, there is only one ‘output’ but multiple patents granted within this same ‘family’. Need to specify clearly that only one patent can be recorded within the patent family otherwise it will be ‘double-dipping’.

The ambiguous language and inconsistency in the 2012 guidelines and other panel documents added to confusion about how to treat patents in the previous PBRF round. Further, the University of Auckland received legal advice during the appeals process for the 2012 PBRF round that the 2012 patent guidelines were not meaningful from a legal perspective. Clarity is required to ensure that valid research outputs and, importantly, those of a commercial nature are eligible, and that all researchers and panel members are correctly advised in good time of what is and is not eligible.

We strongly recommend that the wording for all guidance on this matter is:

1. reviewed by a patent lawyer in order to align with legal terminology and patent application/granting timelines
2. reviewed for clarity and to ensure that all likely possibilities are taken into account.

For example, what is the “same” patent? What if a patent based on the same research is processed in a different jurisdiction? What if closely related patents are published in one jurisdiction and granted in another over different timeframes?

The wording in paragraph 30 of the consultation document is clearer than the Option 2 wording above. We suggest a summary such as: “if a patent application has been submitted to a previous PBRF round, the granted patent is not eligible for the current or any subsequent PBRF round.”

See below for a discussion on determining the timing eligibility for a patent.

C. Determining eligibility of research outputs

Do you support maintaining the existing principle of research output eligibility (inclusion or exclusion of a research output concerns the date when the final version was first made available in the public domain)?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	91.7%	11
No	8.3%	1

Comments

The existing principle of research output eligibility seems clear and logical, and should be maintained.

We support the existing principle of research output eligibility being based on the date the item was first made available in the public domain.

Yes, we support maintaining the existing principle of research output eligibility and guidance provided.

We do not support the existing principle of research output eligibility. The University maintains that using publication/imprint date to determine the date of eligibility would save the sector from unreasonable compliance and high cost, as per the PBRF design principles.

The determination by TEC during the 2012 PBRF round that research output eligibility would be determined by the date of first public availability and not publication date imposed high compliance costs and complex queries, with the audit report noting almost 300 errors for this reason. This is strong evidence that the existing principles and guidance did not serve the sector well.

The argument for retaining this approach in the 2012 round was the need for consistency with previous rounds. However, in 2003 and 2006 the discrepancy between publication date and date of first availability (usually via a website) was minimal, as on-line pre-publication was uncommon. As was clear from the 2012 round, this is now a significant problem.

The more sensible publication/imprint date test should be ushered in for both the start and end of the current round. The lack of consistency with previous rounds could simply be accepted. There are no real consequences in terms of the purpose of the PBRF, the principles, or the fairness to all researchers and TEOs taking part. It is extremely unlikely that any research outputs would be ineligible for both the previous and the current round, as the publication date is virtually always the same as or after the date of first dissemination. Researchers should be advised that any research output that was assessed in the 2012 round cannot be put forward a second time in 2018.

We support the existing principle – the fundamental principle should be that an output is only counted once.

Do you recommend any changes to the proposed guidance?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	58.3%	7
No	41.7%	5

It may be useful to include a point stating that an output's digital object identifier should not be considered as evidence of publication date (as given in paragraph 38 and used as clarification in the 2012 round).

The term 'final version' in the policy statement could be mistaken to mean the final article version with mast/pagination, not the early online form. However, when taken in conjunction with the examples, the intent should be clear.

Waikato found the examples of eligible and ineligible items listed under Clause 40, Section 'Date of imprint outside the assessment period' helpful. The University of Waikato suggests the SRG add a specific comment in this section to reinforce the idea a research output may only be claimed in one PBRF round.

The University of Waikato would appreciate further clarification on Clause 40, Policy Section, first paragraph, second line, 'final version'. What is the 'final version'. For example is the final version of a journal article the version with the volume and issue numbers (which could be produced the year following the online version), or the final content version, or the first time it was publicly disseminated?

The consultation paper indicates some 300 outputs were excluded on the basis of failing the date test, suggesting it has been misunderstood, or poorly managed, by some TEOs. In discussions on this topic it was noted that the term used in the consultation paper "final version" was ambiguous – as in what is the 'final version' that determined eligibility for determination of publication date. We suggest clarifying the term 'version' for the purposes of item date eligibility. A suggestion is 'first publicly available version of the item'. In this instance the 'item' is restricted to a single type, and is not intended to include early versions of a manuscript that may have been partially exposed to a conference audience.

Agree with "first available". Needs to be really clear as this was where most errors were identified.

Clarification needed on what it means by 'final' version, e.g., is an advanced online publication without final proofing/formatting considered 'final' or does it need to have complete formatting/proofing and volume details/page numbers attributed? We could suggest a wording change from 'final' version to 'first published version' or include a technical definition that it was 'first available online or in the public domain'.

If staff did not claim an output for the 2006-11 round which first appeared online in late 2011 but in print in 2012 it should be allowed as an eligible output in the 2012-17 round.

D. Accepted Manuscript provision

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Option 1: Maintain the Accepted Manuscript provision but clarify that the provision only relates to the submission of evidence for an eligible NRO, and that Accepted Manuscripts are not eligible NROs in their own right (this is the SRG's preferred option).	75.0%	9
Option 2: Remove the Accepted Manuscript provision to reduce ambiguity of the NRO requirements.	25.0%	3

Comments

Due to the confusion surrounding the inclusion of Accepted Manuscripts in 2012, the University of Waikato recommends removing the Accepted Manuscript provision in the 2018 PBRF round.

The University of Waikato also recommends the TEC consider a blanket copyright agreement with Copyright Licensing New Zealand (similar to the cover arranged in both the UK and Australia), that would cover both the panel members' and the TEOs' use of copyright material during the 2018 PBRF round.

We support option 1, maintaining the accepted manuscript provision. We advise that misunderstanding of this provision may have come from the terminology used. The consultation paper uses the term 'evidence' in relation to the accepted manuscript provision when we believe the intent is for the accepted manuscript to be used for the purposes of assessment by the panel member (i.e. providing the full text of the item) and to mitigate against potential copyright issues, rather than as evidence for verification of the item. The accepted manuscript is not the published version and so is not suitable for verification nor is it eligible as being a research output in its own right.

The consultation paper explains the intent of the 'accepted manuscript provision' more clearly than the 2012 PBRF Guidelines where on page 57 of the 2012 Guidelines under the section The Meaning of the Assessment Period, it states: "If the final version of a Nominated Research Output is not available, a staff member will be able to submit an Accepted Manuscript (defined by NISO standard RP-8-2008) as a Nominated Research Output" – it does not go on to say it is for the purposes of assessment by the peer review panel only. This may be where some of the confusion has occurred.

The accepted manuscript provision was one mechanism to help TEOs address the fraught issue of breach of copyright due to the massive copying and storing of outputs. The TEC addressed copyright breach for itself by seeking an agreement with Copyright Licensing New Zealand, but failed to do the same for TEOs who were left with the potential risk of copyright breach.

We strongly recommend to the SRG that the request the TEC negotiates an umbrella agreement with Copyright Licensing New Zealand for all participants of the PBRF assessment.

We support option 1, but people discussing this paper found that this section could have been clearer and we would suggest simpler, clearer wording in the final version of the Guidelines

Agree with Option 2 so that there is no ambiguity over eligibility date.

Para 43. The TEOs would like the TEC to seek umbrella coverage of copyright protection for all participants pertaining only to the period during the panel assessment phase.

Option 1 wording is ambiguous and needs clarification.

Of these options, the University of Auckland prefers Option 2. There is no need to use Accepted Manuscripts as proxies for copyright purposes, as is made clear from the consultation document paragraphs 43 and 44.

Additional comments

It is unclear why publically disseminated accepted manuscripts are not allowed to be counted as research outputs in their own right. If the assessment period is decided by date of first dissemination, and the research output is publically available as an accepted manuscript (via an Institutional Repository or personal blog, for example) before it is available on the publisher's website, the date of accepted manuscript availability should count as date of first dissemination of the research output, because that is what it is.

To say publically-available accepted manuscripts are ineligible appears to contradict the basic date-of-dissemination principle governing the inclusion/exclusion of research outputs and highlights the ambiguity of the date of first public availability versus imprint dates as it relates to online accepted manuscripts. This potential issue is increasing, as more TEOs encourage their researchers to lodge their accepted manuscripts in their institutional repositories as soon as possible, and increasing numbers of publishers are allowing such manuscripts to be made publically available.

We support option 1 – again the principle is that an output should only be counted once, and there is overall consistency in these processes.

E. Research Output types

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Option 1: Consolidating the list of output types to 16 types as identified in Appendix 3 of the consultation paper (this is the SRG's preferred option).	90.9%	10
Option 2: Maintain the status quo.	9.1%	1

Comments

Consolidating the list of output types to 16 is highly desirable, but definitions should be provided within the guidelines for output types where there may be confusion (e.g. original creative work).

We suggest the following changes:

- Rename 'Original Creative Work' as 'Creative Work' – the 'original' is unnecessary as all being original is part of the definition of research.
- Need to clarify where creative writing should be categorised. Presumably these should go under 'Creative Work' rather than 'Authored Book' as the emphasis is on the creative nature of the work. This would also avoid issues of creative writing published in forms other than a book. Creative writing examples could be included in the examples e.g. novels, poetry, plays.
- Full conference paper should be included in the new type 'Conference Contribution – Other', not 'Conference Contribution – Published Paper'. Full conference papers are not necessarily published.
- Rename 'Discussion or Working Paper' as 'Discussion/Working Paper'.
- Rename 'Edited Book or Special Edition' as 'Edited Book/Special Edition'.
- Rename 'Scholarly Publications' as 'Scholarly Edition/Literary Translation'. The current name is too generic and could include all published research forms.
- Condense the two thesis types into one type called 'Thesis: Masters/PhD'.

The University of Waikato supports the SRGs proposal to reduce the number of research output types within a PBRF evidence portfolio. As there will only be 4 NROs and 12 OROs in a PBRF portfolio, there may be room to reduce the number of PBRF research category types even further which would reduce the number of category headings in a PBRF portfolio. Should the TEC wish to reduce the number of category types further and should this not hinder PBRF Panel members in their assessment of an evidence portfolio, the category types could theoretically be reduced to:

- Papers and Articles
- Books
- Creative Works and Designs
- Patents and Commissioned Research

We have attached a document showing the subcategories falling under each of the four main category types (refer Columns 1 & 2).

Appendix 3:

The University of Waikato has specific feedback in relation to Appendix 3 of the consultation paper on 'Original Creative Work': The University suggests removing the word 'Original' from the category name as by definition all research must be original and singling out creative works in this manner is inconsistent with how other category types are labelled.

'Thesis – Masters' and 'Thesis – PhD': As the thesis type is already identified as part of the bibliographic reference, an option could be to amalgamate these two category types.

'Edited Books or Special Edition': The University of Waikato seeks clarification from the SRG in relation to this research output category type. Is it the TEC's intention to limit the editing activity for journals to just editing that involves Special Editions of journals?

The University of Waikato is particularly interested in the category type definitions referenced by the SRG in Clause 50. Our University would find these definitions useful.

We support option 1, the consolidation of the list of output types. However we suggest some minor changes for consistency and based on feedback from various parties. The changes are indicated in the table below but are:

1. Change 'Original Creative Work' to 'Creative Work'.
2. Remove 'Conference Contribution – Full Conference Paper' from the Published Proceedings type and placed with the consolidated 'Conference Contribution – Other'.
3. Put a forward slash "/" in place of "or" to shorten the label.
4. Change 'Scholarly Publications' to 'Scholarly Editions / Literary Translations'. Feedback suggests the label 'Scholarly publication' could be widely interpreted.
5. Collapse PhD and Masters Theses into one type, this being consistent with other consolidated types. Differentiation being identified in the bibliographic data.

See appendix for more detail.

We recommend that there be some definition of what comprises each type, for example what qualifies as a 'Special Edition'? This being consistent with the desire to standardise information.

We prefer option 1.

There is one type of research output which could be further considered: web resources. These are sometimes collections of tools available online which don't fit into a single category, although the overall output is a single 'hub' of information. An example would be the lost Cases Project (<http://www.victoria.ac.nz/law/nzlostcases/>). Sometimes this type of work involves publications, designing software solutions, databases, new methodologies – but the real value of the work is in the totality of the web resource. Perhaps 'web resource' could be an additional type.

Whilst consolidation of the research output category types is supported, the reduction to the 16 types proposed in the consultation paper is not. We support the consolidation of items relating to published works and conference contributions; however strongly oppose the combining of creative works into a single category type. The ability to differentiate across the types was crucial for researchers within the creative disciplines and is of importance to both the researchers and assessors to provide clear, unambiguous guidance and assurance of inclusivity.

Provide explicit definitions of the Research Output as Australia does, to provide clarity to staff compiling their EP e.g. the difference between full conference paper and published conference paper. Also clarify quality assurance process especially for conference contributions. The easier it is for staff to understand the criteria the less work for everyone.

Preferences/Proposal for modified output types are outlined below.

Key points in addition to table (see appendix) below:

- Creative/non-conventional outputs should not be merged into one 'Original Creative Work' as it would be very difficult for panel members to differentiate one work type from another.
- No need for a separate 'Confidential Report' category – confidential outputs are not a completely different output type/medium but are rather an 'attribute' of an output, be it a report, government submission, etc.
- Suggest adding a new proposed type. 'Creative Literary Work' (see example below):

Additional comments

'Original Creative Work' should become 'Creative Work' if a single category is created for all creative output types.

Scholarly Publications is a confusing term, better to have 'Scholarly Edition/Literary Translation' if a separate category is created for these works.

Replace other "or" with a "/". Collapse Theses into one category 'Thesis Masters/PhD' and the citation to expand on the type – so consistent with other aggregated types.

The University of Auckland accepts Option 1, with additional definition, and some amendments:

1. "Scholarly edition" and "translation" should not be amalgamated into "Scholarly Publications" but should remain separate (as they are different things).
2. It is unclear what 'special edition' means. It should be further defined (and if similar to "scholarly edition", the two could be amalgamated).
3. The "Other" category could also include 'internet publications' and 'published research data sets' as potential sub-categories.

We would suggest retaining the current descriptions within the 16 types to ensure that it is clear what is counted within each category – or include these in an appendix.

F. Quality Assurance

Do you support the recommendation that the peer review panels include specific guidance on the Quality Assurance standard expected (that is consistent with the definition) and detail acceptable formal Quality Assurance processes for non-standard research outputs as part of the panel-specific guidelines?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	12
No	0.0%	0

Comments

The peer review panels should develop any necessary specific guidance on the Quality Assurance standard expected. However, as noted previously, any specific advice must be informed by a range of perspectives, including applied, commercial and creative research perspectives. As such, the initial cohort of panellists (charged with developing panel specific guidelines) must include representatives of both different subject areas and also different experiences.

Yes. The current definition is so broad it becomes meaningless. Further, some disciplines already set their own standards for what counts as quality assured means (which is usually more rigorous than the PBRF guidelines).

The purpose of the quality assurance feature is to “provide the peer review panel with some assurance about quality” of the item. At present the definition of quality assurance is broad and seemingly designed to accommodate all disciplines. In some disciplines double-blind peer reviewed would be considered the standard for ‘quality assured’ for some output types, but this is not a universal standard. We support the recommendation that the peer review panels specify the standards of what qualifies as ‘quality assured’ for their particular disciplines.

We support the proposal to include greater guidance on the quality assurance expectations in panel specific guidelines.

Do you agree that additional examples of Quality Assurance processes for non-standard research outputs be within the 2018 Guidelines?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	10
No	0.0%	0

Comments

Additional examples of Quality Assurance processes are very useful to indicate the breadth of approaches.

We agree that additional examples of processes that will give assurance to the peer review panel that the item is of a particular quality should be provided. If this is not provided we would question the value of the quality assurance label.

We support the inclusion of additional examples of the expected quality assurance processes for non-standard research outputs, however request that the sector is consulted in the formation of these examples.

Briefly but best to have the examples as a compulsory section in the Panel Guidelines. This means the Panel Guidelines need to be published promptly. Some Panel Guidelines were too generic to be useful.

Do you recommend any examples or changes to the proposed information on formal Quality Evaluation processes?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	66.7%	8
No	33.3%	4

The fourth example given in the proposed text (“A final report for commissioned research”) does not appear to fit well with the other points. However, in light of the inclusion of the final example (“review processes employed by users of commission or funded research”), the fourth example appears to be redundant and as such could be removed.

It would be useful for panels to explain the standard of evidence that might expect to support the claim of the item being quality assured. For example, is the journal listed in Ulrich’s global series directory as a refereed journal? Or is review of the conference abstract sufficient assurance that the full conference paper is quality assured?

We appreciate the additional guidance on definition of QA particularly in relation to applied work. The seven new bullet points in paragraph 57 p13 are a welcome addition – bullet point 6 ('review processes undertaken by major galleries, museums and broadcasters') caters well for many artistic works and performances.

We are unsure how broadly we could interpret the final bullet point ('review processes employed by users of commissioned or funded research'), as this is the only one which seems to accommodate practice-based research in Architecture and Design.

1. Does this bullet point include review processes such as resource consent, public consultation, local body committee approval processes etc. or the very many forms of review and QA that a manufactured product goes through before it actually reaches production - such as standards certification, market testing etc. While design awards, patents or conference papers written about the creative output are obvious forms of QA for manufactured products or buildings, there are also these many other forms of QA that are equally valid but not acknowledged. To the point that in many cases a building actually being built or a manufactured product actually reaching production is also a form of QA in itself, as long as the research component is clearly identified.

2. Does QA in this category take into account the body or company who commissioned the work as a form of QA – e.g. a commission from Apple or the London City Council is a QA statement in itself in the same way point six acknowledges the status of a Gallery.

If so, then this is a good step forward – if not, we recommend that this be considered. This could be by amending the final bullet point to read 'Review processes employed by users of commissioned or funded research including corporate clients and local bodies'.

We note the inclusion of the review process undertaken by 'major' galleries, museums or broadcasters but would like specific examples included with regard to 'dealer' galleries or the use of an independent review panel prior to publication that is not part of the usual publication process (i.e. establishing an expert review panel independent of the process for submission of the output to the publishing body).

Further clarification is needed on what 'review processes' are and what is considered a 'major' museum, gallery or broadcaster in reference to creative outputs. For example, is a street performance at a major international festival considered Quality Assured where the performer is well recognised and 'accepted to perform' by the festival organisers but the particular work performed has not been reviewed specifically? Also note that the site of performance may not be a conventional venue (eg. street art) or backed (and therefore 'reviewed') by a major museum, gallery or broadcaster but could be considered an important contribution for that particular field and have a very strong research component.

The description of Quality Assurance at the top of page 13 (para. 1 end of sentence line 2) should be amended to "artistic merit, innovation or contribution to knowledge."

The formal quality-assurance processes proposed on page 13 will also need to be amended to accommodate the different types of creative outputs ie. Output as aesthetic excellence and performance as quality research.

We recommend some amendments to the proposed examples:

1. 'Final report for commissioned research' is not a review nor any other type of quality assurance, and should be deleted.

2. 'Selection of conference papers/abstracts' should be added.

3. The 'review processes' examples - Māori or Pacific, GLAM sector and users of commissioned research – need more detailed examples (suggested addition link in red): "Review processes specific to Māori or Pacific research processes and/or methodologies such as...." These could be provided by panel members, so as to be panel-specific.

We would suggest adding a clarifying statement along the lines of: "Formal quality assurance processes vary between different discipline areas. They may include commonly understood processes such as peer reviewing for books or journals, but may also include input from experts outside of the tertiary education sector. The process itself may involve written, oral or other forms of review." With the section then followed by the examples of different types of review.

Other comments relating to Quality Assurance

As noted above, the definition is so broad that its usefulness is questionable.

The University of Waikato supports the SRG's proposal to include panel specific guidance on the Quality Assurance standard expected for non-standard research outputs. However as our University has already collected 3 ½ years of publication data and already categorized the quality assurance status of this data using the TEC's existing guidelines, we would not support major changes to the quality assurance definition.

Waikato would however support PBRF Panels providing further clarification on quality assurance processes for creative arts, Māori, Pacific and applied research.

The University of Waikato would find it helpful if an additional 'quality assurance evidence' field was added to 'The Forms of Evidence Required For Requested Research Outputs' table in the PBRF Guidelines.

There was a general agreement that the Panels should provide much more detail in the 'Panel Specific Guidelines' on things such as expectations of research, QA processes etc.

If the quality assurance for a research output is non-standard then the researcher should be required to provide detail on that quality assurance process, rather than just noting that it is "non-standard".

G. "Other Comments" field

Do you support renaming the "Other Comments" section to "Platform of Research - Contextual Summary" and the proposed descriptor for the section of the EP?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	13
No	0.0%	0

Comments

Wider contextualisation of an applicant's platform of research would be useful for the panellists but further guidance on what can or can't be included in this section may assist consistency of response. The proposed descriptor appears to allow latitude for applicants to include anything that they view as "context", which may include extra outputs etc. One option may be to provide a list of inclusions (or exclusions if that is more appropriate) together with two or three exemplars of summaries.

The University of Waikato supports the SRG's proposal to rename the 'Other Comments' field 'Platform of Research – Contextual Summary'

We strongly support the renaming of the 'Other Comments' section to "Platform of Research - Contextual Summary" and are comfortable with the descriptor for the section. We also recommend the character limit for the Platform of Research field remain at the 2012 limit of 2048 characters (approximately 200 words).

Yes, it makes the purpose of the field much clearer.

We support the proposal to rename the other comments section and the guidance provided to researchers for completion.

Yes. The title "other comments" is misleading as it is extremely important in setting the context.

Yes. Our TEO has referred to this section as the "Platform of Research" in 2006 & 2012 rounds.

It would be useful if more guidance were given to researchers about what response is expected in this section, and under what circumstances. Ideally, this guidance would be panel-specific, and could also include the wording in paragraph 58 of the consultation document: to provide "relevant information on the nature, quantity, and quality of research outputs that demonstrates research quality during the assessment period" as well as "to provide the wider context of individual research".

If this change assists with panels understanding what a researcher does, we are supportive of this proposed change.

H. Presentation of Other Research Outputs

Presenting OROs by type

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Option 1: Maintain the status quo.	33.3%	4
Option 2: Require OROs to be clustered by type but ordered in accordance with the staff member's preference (this is the SRG's preferred option).	66.7%	8

Comments

Option 2 seems like a good compromise that will allow staff members some degree of control of the presentation of their Other Research Outputs, while enforcing some degree of consistency of presentation for the panellists.

The University of Waikato also supports Option 2, i.e. OROs must be clustered by type. However Waikato would like both the order within each category and the order each category type appears within the portfolio, to be decided by the researcher.

We support the SRG's preferred option 2. This is understood to be requiring staff to group items by type (e.g. all books together all journal papers together). However the order of types is not fixed (e.g. can put all books first, or all journal papers first, at the staff member's discretion) and that the ordering within types is also at the staff member's discretion (e.g. can order chronologically or by title or by any other order). To clarify, we support only the clustering of types, ordering within and between types to be at the discretion of the individual staff member.

We have no strong preference either way

We support the proposal to have OROs clustered by type as long as the order of that type is at the researchers discretion.

Option 1 - the submitter should order ORO to contextualise the quality and impact of the research. Clustering by type may put less important work first which could affect the way the portfolio is assessed.

Option 2. It is acknowledged that this option will not allow staff to rank outputs by importance however it would allow panel members to easily identify output types while still maintaining the ability for staff to still rank their outputs within categories.

There is no obvious advantage to either the researcher or the panel member to group the OROs by type. As the number of OROs has decreased, panellists no longer have to navigate through a large number of entries, so the issue being addressed by a standard order is diminished. On the other hand, researchers may wish to order their OROs by theme, or in chronological order, if different ORO types lead on from one another, and it would be useful to offer them that choice.

We support option 2 – we believe it is important to allow the researcher to specify their preferred outputs.

ORO Description field

Do you agree that only bibliographic information, including that relevant to creative research types (advised in the panel-specific guidelines) be allowed in the ORO Description field?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	91.7%	11
No	8.3%	1

Comments

Yes, only bibliographic information should be allowed in the ORO Description field. Providing two or three exemplars of this (either within the overall guidelines, or within the panel specific advice) may provide greater clarity for staff members and their TEOs.

Yes. This will become increasingly important if the proposed new output type 'Original Creative Work' is adopted – this field will be needed to further classify the output.

Waikato supports the SRG's proposal that only bibliographic information, including that relevant to creative research types, be allowed in the ORO description field.

We strongly support that only bibliographic information, and any other specific fields that must be specified in the General PBRF Guidelines be allowed in the ORO description field. We are aware that some TEOs put additional comments against some OROs in previous assessments, we disagree with this approach as it is inconsistent with the desire to reduce the effort to compile an evidence portfolio (i.e. providing comments against all outputs, not just the NROs), was not sought in the PBRF Guidelines, and unfairly and inconsistently presented evidence portfolio material to the assessment panels (i.e. some portfolios had comments others did not).

The recommendation to the range of fields specified in the General PBRF Guidelines is for reasons of standardisation of information. It is not technically possible to have extra bibliographic fields for one particular panel (e.g. CPA for various output types) and not have those fields available for other assessment panels for the same output type. It is expected the output type of 'Creative Works' may require specific fields to help fully describe the work, for example Medium and Size/number of pieces are typical existing fields but the SRG may also wish to suggest an additional bibliographic field such as "Description".

In general we support the inclusion of only bibliographic information in the ORO description field, provided that the ability for creative research types to fully describe their outputs as specified in the panel specific guidelines is allowed.

Need to make it very clear and be audited so no-one has an unfair advantage by using additional text to describe their work.

We prefer that an ORO description field be allowable for creative research output types only.

It is possible that some outputs may fall into both categories and identifying these as both should be an option. In any instance, it is essential that space be allocated in the commentary section of both the OROs and NROs sections for the academic to provide a statement indicating the nature of the output. This is modelled on the UK and Australian systems (see page 3 of the attached document from the Queensland University of Technology) where it details what is required in what they refer to as the 'Research Statement'. Having this space available for information beyond bibliographic detail allows the academic to explain the output's research or aesthetic significance. This is particularly important for Creative Research/Innovation Outputs because it will not be immediately obvious to the viewer how the work contributes to knowledge - this is why Performance as Research works are accompanied by exegetical writings. This space is also vital for those claiming a Creative Excellence Output if it is to be judged by anything other than venue. This means we definitely do not support the proposal to reduce ORO commentary to only include bibliographic details (p. 14)

Yes – in order to streamline the process for researchers, TEOs and panellists alike, the University agrees with this.

I. Standardisation of information and evidence**Do you agree with the recommendations that:**

- greater standardisation of information and evidence be introduced for the 2018 Quality Evaluation; and
- the rules regarding the information and evidence submitted in the Research Output are tightened to ensure that electronic links only go to the actual research, open sites (where applicable) and the files are of sufficient quality to be appropriately assessed.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	76.9%	10
No	0.0%	0
Possibly	23.1%	3

Comments

These recommendations appear sensible – they may result in a slight increase in the burden on staff members and their TEOs but will help consistency of submissions and reduce negative impacts from poor submissions.

The University of Waikato supports the SRG's proposal to introduce greater standardisation of information and evidence requirements for the 2018 Quality Evaluation round and the recommendation that electronic links for NROs only link to open sites (where applicable).

The University of Waikato would be interested in understanding whether adding a re-typed version of a poor quality document would be an acceptable practice for supporting NRO evidence.

We support the recommendations to standardise information and evidence and that the instructions and specifications for submission of material for assessment and/or verification of items is improved.

We support the recommendation that greater clarity and guidance is provided to researchers and TEOs as to the level of information and evidence required for the provision of NRO information. We also support the requirement for the links provided to take the user directly to the actual research output rather than intermediary websites or portals, however clear guidance needs to be provided to the consequences of not providing the links directly to the output. Will a copy of the output then be requested by the TEC or will the output be discounted?

The submitter and their TEO should check that web links are all active and if not, a screen shot file provides the necessary evidence.

We disagree with the proposal to ensure all electronic links go to the actual research as it is impossible to ensure that all websites are active. Websites are frequently overridden or only temporarily active. At times, site pathways are also changed so there could be no guarantee that the link will go directly to the actual research. However for audit purposes, to ensure that all output information is valid, evidence of the actual source must be held by the TEO, eg. a screenshot of the web link where the information was sourced as proof of its availability and validity at the time it was recorded/presented, but the web link in the output citation itself may go to the organisation/conference homepage.

It is the responsibility of the TEO to ensure that the NRO output provided is textually or audibly clear and in its full form. These are needed when a direct electronic link is not satisfactory or available.

Recommendation 1: It is difficult to see how this would be achieved. More information is required before the University can offer an opinion on this.

Recommendation 2: The University agrees with this - as long as not everything needs to be submitted electronically. Electronic submission should not be mandatory. For example, books and creative works should not need to be digitised (in some cases, this would be impossible).

If these proposed changes assist with the efficiency of the Quality Evaluation process and reduce demands on staff of TEIs, panels, and TEC staff, then we are supportive of these changes.

J. Any other matters

In their Consultation Paper #6, the SRG has requested feedback in four arenas that seem pertinent to Art & Design researchers:

(i) With respect to an expanded definition of research to better accommodate research in applied, commercial and creative fields. PBRF definition is contrasted with that from the UK's REF and Australia's ERA assessments (Par 25)

(ii) Feedback is requested on having Panels consider the definition of research in their subject areas for panel-specific guidelines (Par 26)

(iii) Feedback is requested on a recommendation to reduce the research output types from 31 to 16. This impacts particularly on available research types for creative works research (art and design) as well as categories for conference outputs. The SRF has two options only for feedback recommendations: Option 1—reduce to the prescribed 16; Option 2—maintain status quo (Par 49-51)

(iv) There is a recommendation that for better defining Quality Assurance processes definitions for current QA processes will be sought from major galleries, museums and broadcasters (Par 57)

i) Expanded definition

The expanded definition is adequate in providing a clear statement on outcomes as artistic works, performances and or designs. In comparison to the UK REF definition and the Australian ERA definition, it is longer though in my opinion more conservative. The REF definition seems expansive on acknowledging research as inventing and generating (it does not mention 'creative' works per se. The ERA definition is short, though mentions creative or creation 3 times in its 4 lines. We might question whether a more inclusive definition results in a longer one or a simpler and more expansive one.

Art and Design Staff in the fashion and product design would like to ensure that commissioned research (ie the creation of a prototype) or a commission by commercial partner (ie an experimental clothing range for a commercial company) could also be considered as original research. The activity of curation, where an original concept is developed through a catalogue essay and exhibition of work on a research topic, should be recognised as a creative output (and where it is beyond routine standard practice of a gallery). See also REF category for curated or produced substantial public exhibitions and events.

ii) Panels providing expert-definitions of research

This may well be useful in having discipline specific experts addressing research fields in art and design. However, timing is crucial, as we would want to be well informed on how a CPA panel might nuance definitions well before December 2017 as well as ensuring we are able to minimise cross-panel assessments brought about by panel specific definitions of research relevancy. The A+D staff would welcome the opportunity to have input into expert definitions of research given our distinctive and highly variant modes of practice-led research within the school.

iii) Reduction of the number of Research Output Types

I am not necessarily comfortable with the either/or option presented by the SRG. Reducing the number of output types, particularly in light of the quite small number offered by REF and ERA, seems appropriate. However, PBRF reduces all art and design output types to a single Original Creative Work. This is by far the most significant reduction for any research field. If we look at the REF output types (7 in all) and ERA's 9 output types, we see something interesting (see footnote 19). REF: They do not use the word 'creative' for any output, yet for the 7 output types art or design works might be encompassed in one of 5 different types: physical artefact; exhibitions and performances; other documents; digital artefacts (including web content); and other. The other 2 types are books (or parts of books); journal articles and conferences. ERA is equally interesting with its 9 types that include separate categories for: original creative works; live performances of creative works; recorded/rendered creative works; curated or produced substantial public exhibitions and events. Thus, although REF and ERA have substantially fewer types than PBRF's 31 original and 16 intended, they yet find it important to distinguish between output types that encompass creative works (REF) or nominate creative works types (ERA) in nuanced ways, while collapsing traditional output types that PBRF wants to continue to differentiate. Perhaps we can ask for a third Option that addresses provision for differentiations of original creative works where warranted and further reducing category types for more traditional outputs.

Footnote1 I find the REF and ERO categories for creative work as complex as the 2012 PBRF categories and I would support the reduction to a single label, rather than the third option of fewer, but more than one label. The category for digital artefact seems particularly fraught as just about anything could become a digital artefact in 2015.

The A+D staff generally welcome a reduction of the number of categories for creative research outputs. The main reasons for this are:

1. A single label of 'creative work' could address the difficulty of locating interdisciplinary research outputs [design or exhibition or performance etc] that fall between or blend multiple categories.
2. The multiple categories are difficult for emerging researchers who have trouble placing their work.
3. Contemporary visual art, performative spatial design practices or multi-media fashion events often falls between performance and other categories so this move to a single label is particularly supported by these departments.

• Note 1: The label 'original creative work' has been questioned by A+D staff who deal in multiples modes of prototyping and also by performers who might be re-performing an historical composition, and in the case of curation. The term 'creative work' is offered as an alternative.

Note 2: We suggest that the 'creative work' label should be accompanied by easily visible key descriptive words and a short sentence to describe the research output.

• Note on para 64. If the term 'original creative work' is adopted to encompass all creative activity we propose that keywords could also be used in the ORO description field. A formatted reference only might be too limited to show the scope of the creative output. The rationale for this is that the PBRF panel will still be able to garner an immediate impression of a researcher's key fields of practice.

• Performative spatial design practices

iv) Better definition of QA provided by leading galleries, museums and broadcasters

Again, this may be positive in helping to define quality assurance processes in non-traditional research milieus. However, it is necessary to be careful in how the notion of "major" is acted on, as QA processes may vary widely, with some possibly becoming a benchmarking that is inappropriate to many research arenas that do not particularly engage with "major" galleries or museums. More pressing would be seeking definitions of quality assurance from an industrial design sector that help to give guidance to design-led research practices.

Please also note that there was some concern amongst artists that creative research exhibited in dealer galleries were not necessarily considered 'Quality Assured' under the 2012 PBRF. Venues such as Two Rooms gallery or Gow Langsford in Auckland are subject to rigorous processes of selection for the exhibiting artists and are high profile venues for reviewers and audience attendance.

Better definitions of quality assurance from an industrial design sector that help to give guidance to design-led research practices is of importance. Industrial design staff often comment that quality assurance of the product may be its commercial success and relevance to consumers. That a commercial product is the result of research that is beyond 'business as usual' could be attested by organisations such as DINZ.

Recognition of external funding for design development is another area to be considered where prototypes are research outputs.

Given the trend towards open access publishing, the SRG should consider introducing a policy statement requiring the deposit of the finalised/peer reviewed manuscripts of journal articles and published conference papers with an ISSN in open access institutional or subject repositories upon acceptance for publication. The UK REF has adopted a similar statement for outputs from 2016: <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/year/2014/201407>. The SRG may want to consider this for adoption after the 2018 assessment.

a)We request that specific and clear descriptions are given for each output type and these descriptions should include:

- Details of inclusions
- Details of exclusions
- Examples of both inclusions and exclusions
- A comprehensive outline of evidence requirements for each category

b)We would like more clarity on the wording found in footnote 4(b) (pg.4).

"Research outputs equivalent to a) above" - what does this mean in terms of N&E staff who have not completed a PhD?

Research Publication Reporting Categories

Waikato Management School
Te Raupapa



	1. REFEREED/ PUBLISHED RESEARCH	2. OTHER SCHOLARLY OUTPUTS	3. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES
PAPERS and ARTICLES	Refereed Journal Articles Refereed Conf. Proceedings Refereed Conf. Papers Research Book Chapters	Non-refereed Journal Articles Other Contributions to Journal Conference Papers Conference Abstracts Conference Posters Conference Oral Presentations Book Chapters Book Reviews Working Papers Doctoral Thesis Research Masters Thesis	Journal Editor Editorial Board Member Executive Role on Professional Organisations Invited Presentations to Academic, Business or Government organisations Research Appointments Prizes Awards/Honours Research Event Convenor Principle Investigator on External Research Contract Named Researcher on External Research Contract Refereeing for Journals, Books, or Conferences Award Panel Membership Appointment Panel
BOOKS	Authored Research Books	Other Authored Books Edited Books Edited Journal Special Issues Edited Conf. Proceedings	
CREATIVE WORKS and DESIGNS	Major Original Creative Works Refereed Designs	Other Creative Works Other Designs Software & Film/Videos	
PATENTS and COMMISSIONED RESEARCH	Granted Patents	Commissioned Research Reports Confidential Reports	

ERA Non-Traditional Outputs

This is the print-friendly version of the following page:
<http://www.research.qut.edu.au/data/pubcollections/qut/nontradoutputs.jsp>
[\[Return to original version\]](#)

The Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) initiative gives HEPs the opportunity to submit research outputs which lie outside the traditional HERDC categories.

More information about ERA can be found on the [ERA at QUT](#) page.

Non-Traditional Research Outputs

The Non-Traditional Research Output categories span the range of creative works, live performances, exhibitions, recordings and reports. For further information about the categories please click on the link below.

- [Original Creative Works](#)
- [Live Performance of Creative Works](#)
- [Recorded/Rendered Creative Works](#)
- [Curated or Produced Substantial Public Exhibitions and Events](#)
- [Research Reports for an External Body \(new for ERA 2015\)](#)

Research Component: All non-traditional research outputs must have a research component present in the work. If the work does not contain this research component it should be submitted to the QUT Scholarly Collection.

Research Statement: Where non-traditional research outputs are nominated for peer review in ERA, a statement identifying the research component of each research output must be provided.

QUT ePrints: All non-traditional research outputs must be entered on QUT ePrints

ORIGINAL CREATIVE WORKS

The Original Creative Works category is an ERA category designed to capture research outputs where the researcher is the creator of the work itself

2D and 3D creative works (paintings, photographs, sculptures, ceramics, etc.) | Maps & designs | Architectural designs | Novels, reviews, poems or other textual pieces

The exhibition of an original creative work can be used to demonstrate that the work has been made publicly available, but each instance of such a research output can only be claimed once. Exhibited creative works can be submitted as either:

- a single item exhibited as an individual creative work (equal to one research output); or
- a portfolio of works exhibited as a cohesive/thematic collection of the work of a single creator (also equal to one research output).

NP-A1 Visual Art Work	A research output such as fine arts and crafts work, diagram, map, photographic image, sculpture or installation.
NP-A2 Design/Architectural Work	Realised, constructed, fabricated or unrealised building and design projects. 'Unrealised' projects must have an output that provides evidence of the research involved.
NP-A3 Textual Work	Written creative work that is not eligible to be submitted as a book or journal article, such as a novel or art review. Scholarly editions, scholarly translations, exhibition catalogues, catalogue entries, notated musical work and published scores may be submitted in this sub-category.
NP-A4 Other	Other original creative works that are not Live Performances of Creative Works, Recorded/Rendered Creative Works, Curated or Produced Substantial Public Exhibitions and Events, and Research Reports for an External Body.

LIVE PERFORMANCE OF CREATIVE WORKS

The Live Performance of Creative Works category is an ERA category designed to capture research outputs where the Performance itself is the creative work:

Musical performances | Plays and theatrical works | Dance | Performance Based Inter-Media

Documentation of this creative work may be in the form of a recording of the performance, reviews, performance programs or other material that the institution considers useful to the peer review process.

NP-B1 Music	New work or a demonstrably new or innovative interpretation or production of an existing work.
NP-B2 Play	New theatrical work or a demonstrably new or innovative interpretation or production of an existing work
NP-B3 Dance	New dance work or a demonstrably new or innovative interpretation or production of an existing work.
NP-B4 Other	New work or a demonstrably new or innovative interpretation or production of an existing work.

RECORDED/RENDERED CREATIVE WORKS

The Recorded/Rendered Creative Works category is an ERA category designed to capture research outputs where the research component is contained within the recording/rendering (rather than the performance itself).

Sound Production | Recording Techniques | Experimental Inter-Arts | Performance created for the recorded medium

Simple documentations of live performances of creative works without a research component are not eligible to be submitted as this research output type, but may be submitted as supporting material for a Live Performance of Creative Works.

NP-C1 Audio/Visual Recording	Research outputs presented in an audio-visual format, such as films, documentaries or audio-visual presentations.
NP-C2 Performance	Performances (in music, dance, theatre, etc.) that have been created specifically for a recorded medium.
NP-C3 Inter-Arts	Recorded/rendered creative works, often experimental, produced in association with other researchers in other disciplinary fields.
NP-C4 Digital Creative Works	Digital creative works, including creative 3D models, digital outputs of architectural and design projects, computer programs, games and visual artworks.
NP-C5 Website/Web Exhibition	These are eligible as recorded/rendered creative works if the eligible researcher is the creator of the creative works featured in the website. Curated web based exhibitions of the creative work of others must be submitted as Curated or Produced Substantial Public Exhibitions and Events
NP-C6 Other	Other recorded/rendered creative works not listed above.

CURATED OR PRODUCED SUBSTANTIAL PUBLIC EXHIBITIONS AND EVENTS

The Curated or Produced Substantial Public Exhibitions and Events research output type is specifically aimed at research outputs produced by curators rather than artists.

Internet Based Exhibitions | Gallery exhibitions | Festivals | Large-Scale Events

Note: Exhibition catalogues written by curators should be submitted as Original Creative Works

Where a curator is an eligible researcher, the curator may claim exhibitions, festivals and other events as research outputs. Artists may claim exhibitions as their original creative works under the Original Creative Works research output type, where the exhibition of the creative works is used as evidence that those works have been made publicly available.

Multiple exhibitions/events **cannot be counted as multiple research outputs** where the repeated exhibitions/events do not introduce a new research component to the work. For example, a touring exhibition can only be counted once.

Multiple exhibitions/events **may be counted as multiple research outputs** where each subsequent exhibition/event introduces a new research component to the work that builds upon the initial research component of the original exhibition/event.

Recurring exhibitions and events may be submitted. For example, the Biennale of Sydney is a recurring event with each occurrence being unique rather than a repeat of the previous occurrence.

NP-D1 Web-based exhibition	The curation and/or production of an internet website presenting a collection of creative works where the internet is the medium of the exhibited works.
NP-D2 Exhibition/Event	The curation and/or production of a collection of creative works exhibited together for the first time, in that particular arrangement, in a recognised gallery, museum or event. This should be accompanied by a well researched publication that includes the time and location of the exhibition.
NP-D3 Festival	The curation of a festival bringing together innovative work or existing works in an innovative format or through a theme that provides new

NP-D3 Festival	Works in an innovative format or through a medium that provides new perspectives and/or experiences.
NP-D4 Other	Curated or substantial public exhibitions and events that do not fit into the above output types.

RESEARCH REPORTS FOR AN EXTERNAL BODY

A Research Report for an External Body is a written research output commissioned or solicited by an external body such as a government department or private company. To be eligible to be submitted, a research report must meet the definition of research.

The following examples are **ineligible** for submission under this subcategory (in some cases, these items may be eligible as part of a portfolio)

- submissions to public inquiries and consultations, including government or parliamentary inquiries
- policy blogs or online commentaries/articles
- briefing notes or reports initiated by the researcher (as opposed to an external body)

Research reports that contain sensitive, confidential or classified material must only be submitted as per the requirements in for Sensitivity-Confidential or Sensitive Research Outputs.

NP-E1 Public Sector	A research report that has been undertaken for an Australian, state, territory, local, foreign or international government body or organisation.
NP-E2 Industry	A research report that has been undertaken for a company, industry organisation, industry peak body, or an employer/employee association.
NP-E3 Not for Profit	A research report that has been undertaken for a body or organisation operating in the not-for-profit sector.
NP-E4 Other	A research report undertaken for an organisation not covered by the above sub-categories.

Research Statement

For non-traditional research outputs which are nominated for ERA peer review, a statement identifying the research component of the output. The statement must be no more than 2000 characters (around 250 words) and address the following categories:

1. **Research Background** | Field | Context | Research Question
2. **Research Contribution** | Innovation | New Knowledge
3. **Research Significance** | Evidence of Excellence

The following is an example of an acceptable visual arts research statement:

Research Background

Current international developments in painting have identified the need to establish complex forms for representing identity in terms of facial expression. While this research recognises the significance of facial expression, it has overlooked the unstable nature of identity itself.

Research Contribution

The paintings *Multiple Perspectives* by Y address the question of the unstable nature of identity as expressed in painterly terms through a study in unstable facial phenomenon using the philosophical concept of 'becoming'. In doing so it arrives at a new benchmark for the discipline in understanding visual identity, namely that identity is not bound to stable facial phenomena but, like other forms of meaning, is constantly undergoing change.

Research Significance

The significance of this research is that it overcomes barriers for visually understanding the complex nature of identity and its expressive painterly possibilities. Its value is attested to by the following indicators: selection of the painting for inclusion in the international exhibition Documenta, Kassel, Germany; its inclusion as a case study in the renowned Courtauld Institute, University of London, *Issues in Contemporary Art* graduate seminar series; its being the subject of a chapter in the book *Identity Reframed* published by Thames and Hudson and authored by the renowned art historian Z; its forming part of a competitively funded ARC project.

Research Evaluation Committee (REC) members and ERA peer reviewers will evaluate non-traditional research outputs selected for ERA peer review in the context of the research component as identified in the research statement.

(Source: Appendix C Draft ERA 2015 Guidelines)

QUT ePrints

The single point of submission for research outputs both traditional and non-traditional outputs is QUT ePrints.

Stage 1: A research output is deposited in ePrints and processed by the QUT ePrints team

Stage 2: The Office of Research will carry out verification checks, including those for the government submissions and then the output will appear in a researcher's profile in RAD.

For more information on how to add outputs to QUT ePrints contact eprints@qut.edu.au

For further information see

- [ERA at QUT](#)
- [Publications Collection Types](#)

Please contact the Office of Research (researchdata@qut.edu.au) if you have any questions or require any further information.

Copyright © QUT. All rights reserved.
Queensland University of Technology
CRICOS No. 00213J
Last modified 20-Aug-2014

installation, performance art, live art, new media arts, painting, drawing, ceramics, jewellery and metalwork, glass, carving, tukutuku, raranga, tattoo, fibre arts and illustration. Also includes exhibition curation and art history, theory and pedagogy relevant to the practice and tertiary level teaching of visual art and craft.

Cross-Referrals

It is expected that most cross-referrals to this panel will come from the following panels: Education; Engineering, Technology and Architecture; Humanities and Law; Māori Knowledge & Development; and Social Sciences and Other Social/Cultural Sciences.

The membership of peer review panels is designed to enable panels to assess the quality of research in most areas, including those which have a professional or applied outcome. It is recognised, however, that a small number of staff members will have research outputs that require expert advice from outside the scope of the panel membership and/or that may need to be considered by one of the two Expert Advisory Groups.

Expectations for standard of evidence to be supplied

It is expected that most research outputs submitted to the Creative and Performing Arts Panel will be quality-assured. Where it is not self evident, the quality-assurance process for the Nominated Research Output (NRO) should be described in the "Description" field.

Examples of quality-assurance processes include:

- exhibitions in or acquisition by national or international institutions
- inclusion in national or international festivals, biennales, etc.
- publication in credible literary journals or by credible publishers
- broadcast on national or international television or radio
- performances with or by a major professional ensemble
- concerts promoted within an established professional series
- CDs on recognised labels
- patents
- exhibition in a recognised dealer gallery
- commission by a recognised institution
- commercialisation of a design
- recognized awards and prizes.

Examples of non-quality-assured research outputs

might include:

- Web design on the internet
- Presentation in alternative fora
- Documented ephemera
- Concerts in series that contain a high proportion of amateur groups
- Concerts presented by, or exhibitions within the staff member's own institution.

Any of these, however, might qualify as quality assured if the conditions described above for quality assurance are met and documented.

It is essential that, where an NRO is submitted as quality-assured, the basis of that claim is clearly indicated.

Quality assurance relates to the character of the output. Any output which does not go through a formal quality assurance process by those expert in the field prior to public dissemination is a non-quality assured output in terms of PBRF. Reviews, on the whole, are evidence of peer esteem rather than quality assurance.

Staff members completing EPs may wish to provide evidence of a journal's quality assurance processes.

Elaboration of the definition of Research

Original creative work is in and of itself considered to be research and fulfils the criteria of the PBRF Definition of Research where it results in the generation of new knowledge, an enriched sense of the possibilities of the art form, or communicates in a meaningful and profound way through an artistic medium. (For the PBRF Definition of Research in the general Guidelines, see Chapter 1 Section D: What Counts as Research?)

It is the excellence of the creative output itself which is relevant to PBRF. Documented links to orthodox academic research, where relevant in some way to the character of a particular NRO, may be useful but they are not always necessary and are of secondary importance.

Work in the creative and performing arts is regarded as research (rather than as exemplary practice) where it has an aesthetic or exploratory rationale and value (rather than relating to routine professional demands).

Industry commissions will be considered as long as they meet the PBRF Definition of Research.

Types of research output

Any research output appropriate to and recognised by the particular discipline will be considered. Clearly, the Creative and Performing Arts Panel