

## Stakeholder Feedback March 2016

## PBRF SRG Consultation Paper #10 - Review of the technical specifications for the 2018 Quality Evaluation information technology system

The information below is a summary of the Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF) Sector Reference Group's (SRG's) tenth consultation paper on the review of the technical specifications for the 2018 Quality Evaluation information technology system.

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	Lincoln University
2	Eastern Institute of Technology
3	Victoria University of Wellington
4	University of Otago
5	University of Waikato
6	Auckland University of Technology
7	CPIT
8	Massey University
9	University of Canterbury
10	University of Auckland
11	Individual
12	Otago Polytechnic

## A. Evidence Portfolio schema

## 1. Do you support the changes to the structure of EPs to be submitted to the 2018 Quality Evaluation?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	83.3%	10
No	16.7%	2

## Comments

Pg 12.  
 Element Name: BirthDate "The Date of Birth must not be the NSI system default"  
 The University of Waikato strongly opposes this change.  
 Some staff elect not to provide this personal data. In these instances the NSI default date is appropriate.  
 Introducing this as a requirement would incur additional work  
 •initially in obtaining the information from those staff who have chosen not to provide it  
 •and then changing our current processes to ensure the data is collected from all future staff.

Pg 13.  
 Element Name: Title, MinLen:1  
 As this is an optional field Waikato asks whether the MinLen should be zero rather than 1

Pg 13.  
 Element Name: MiddleName, MinLen:1  
 Should the MinLen be zero to accommodate staff with no middle name?

Pg 32  
 URI Details  
 Symplectic's 2018 PBRF software will need to accommodate the requirements set out in the schema definition document, and also in this particular area

Page 37  
 ORO Bibliographic details/Description - MaxLen: 1000  
 Waikato's maximum APA reference character length is close to the 1000 limit. Waikato would prefer the maximum character length be extended to 1200 or 1500.

In general yes, except for the following:

a) We do not support the inclusion of researcher identification details (e.g. TEO, name, title, age)

being included in the portfolio when viewed by the peer review panel. We have a strong view that the portfolios, in principle, should be presented in the most anonymous manner possible to minimise the possibility of bias, realising of course that the researchers name is listed throughout the portfolio. We believe the review should aspire to the highest possible review standards and that a 'blind review' is close to the review gold standard. It's unclear why the staff member's name and demographic details was ever provided to panellists, if this is to continue it should be explained why this information is relevant to the review.

b) The schema does not make reference to the electronic provision of outputs (e.g. link to pdfs) required for NROs. We assume they are included in the NRO subset.

In the 2012 PBRF round it was not clear what the Special Circumstances referred to outside of the Canterbury Earthquake. It is still unclear what the Extra-ordinary circumstances may include.

The objectives of the Contextual Summary are not clear. Most of the score is for research Outputs and those are the NROs. Each of the NROs has a qualifying statement that should suffice. Panel members should be selected on their ability to "cut to the chase" not paraphrase contextual summaries for enlightenment.

## 2. Do you support the rounding of data elements (e.g. 2048 rounded to 2000, 1024 rounded to 1000, 255 rounded to 250)?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	58.3%	7
Yes (conditional)	16.7%	2
No	25.0%	3

### Comments

At Victoria, we think this is fine, but understand that other universities prefer keeping 2048 or rounding up to 2050, which would also be fine.

We do not support the change. Many systems are already coded and using the existing character counts. The benefit to the assessment is minor and will provide little value if changed but will cause problems for many staff that have already maxed the limit in current developed systems.

Leave it the same - the less that changes the better.

Massey supports the reduction of all the descriptors except reducing the Contextual narrative. Our view is this element is important and in our view should increase to 2,500 characters.

No, we don't agree with the reduction in the commentary fields, it would be usual to round anything at half or above to be rounded up, therefore these should be round up rather than rounded down. (E.g. 2048 to 2050; 1024 to 1020)

The reduction from 2048 to 2000 is significant.

### Other Comments

We strongly support the change of wording from 'Special Circumstances' to 'Extra-ordinary Circumstances'. However, clear guidelines are still required to be provided advice around what is acceptable and what would not be considered as appropriate. We support the change from 'Other Comments' to 'Platform of Research - Contextual Summary'; however it could still be reduced to just Platform of Research'.

## 3. Do you agree that default date of birth (as used in the NSI) cannot be used and will result in a validation error for the EP?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	50.0%	6
No	50.0%	6

### Comments

We think there needs to be some means by which an EP can be submitted in cases where:

a) We don't know the date of birth, and

b) The date of birth in the NSI is incorrect.

It would be convenient if Universities were able to provide the date of birth to update the NSI if it is known.

No. Despite the fact that this would 'clean' the NSI data, it is the staff that are often employed from an overseas institution that that are not always captured easily. We would not like to see the proxy date result in a fail to validate.

The majority of University of Waikato staff voluntarily provide their date of birth. Some staff elect not to and Waikato would oppose removing the option to use the NSI default birth date. As mentioned earlier, introducing this as a requirement would incur additional work

- initially in obtaining the information from those staff who have chosen not to provide it
- and then changing our current processes to ensure the data is collected from all future staff

No. We strongly disagree with this proposal.

The default date of birth if used in the NSI should be a valid date of birth. The issue being addressed by this proposal is related to the methods the TEC used to verify staff identity for personal information requests and is unrelated to the quality assessment itself. We suggest the TEC simply use an alternative method to identify individuals for such requests.

We also propose the TEC specify a suitable default date of birth that is either NSI compatible or one that will not invalidate the EP for instances where TEO staff have not provided their date of birth.

The SRG offer no solution in this proposal for instances where staff choose not make their date of birth available. TEOs would have to provide false birth dates and enter false birth dates into the NSI system to ensure the EP and census file validates in the TEC system.

In summary we find the proposal impracticable and poorly considered, creating more work for TEOs to solve a problem created by the TEC.

No - researchers should not be compelled to provide their date of birth.

The birthdate should be as it appears in the NSI, default or otherwise.

#### 4. Do you accept the change for middle name to be entered into one element?

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

#### Comments

I expect that "National Student Number " will be the key identification information and "name" is for correspondence. What will happen if middle names are truncated by character limit?

#### 5. Do you support reducing the character limit of the Field of Research Description element to 500?

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

#### 6. Do you agree with the proposed structure for the MaoriResearch and PacificResearch elements?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	75.0%	9
No Response	8.3%	1
No	16.7%	2

#### Comments

No, as we do not agree with cross-referrals to either of these panels.

We would like the SRG to take note that his requirement adds complexity to the evidence portfolio schema.

a) There is an assumption that there is a standard naming convention for component items (e.g. NRO1, NRO2 etc.), this is not the case at our TEO where every item had a unique number so that the research object evidence can be tagged to the particular output - related numbers. Consequently, we would be citing a unique ID number (e.g. 112566487) as a reference in the 2018 portfolio and this is unlikely to be particularly helpful to reviewers.

b) Alternatively, where the naming convention is NRO1, NRO2 etc., if a researcher re-orders their outputs they must then ensure their reference component number/s is also revised.

The method utilised in the 2012 assessment was a simple 'flag' against particular components, this seems a simpler mechanism than that proposed and addresses both of the potential issues outlined above.

I do not understand why this is included.

#### Other Comments

Allowing staff to include detail supporting their decision to cross-refer the EP to the Maori or Pacific panel, and allowing them to identify the specific components requiring special consideration, helps cross-referral assessors better target their cross-referral assessment.

#5 Given the purpose of this field, 500 characters should be more than sufficient.

#6 The commentary and referenced items will assist Chairs to assess the validity of the cross referral.

**7. Do you support the addition of explicit information to identify the link or physical location of the main research object?**

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

**Comments**

We continue to have copyright concerns for Lincoln University research material being held on a 'non-secure publicly available web location' for the 2018 round. Our preferred method for storing NRO material is in our D-Space closed collection area which can be accessed by panel members with a generalised Lincoln University login and password. The only other option is to upload most of our NRO material in the TEC file Store which will be a considerable administration burden on our current Library staffing levels.

We support this proposal. However we suggest that if the research object evidence is available from the TEO (hardcopy or DVD etc.) either in addition to a URI link or instead of a URI link, then a default message is listed, e.g. "the evidence of this output is available upon request to the TEC secretariat", that directs panel members to contact the TEC rather than the TEO directly as has happened in the past.

**8. Do you agree with the renaming of MyContribution to IndividualContribution?**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	75.0%	9
No	25.0%	3

**Comments**

We believe this label will do nothing to address the issue raised and so should not be changed. We suggest guidance be provided with percentage contributions discouraged. Some journals now require the contribution of each co-author to be described, we suggest the format provided by leading journals inform development of material. Within our TEO we have developed detailed material and would be happy to advise on this material if requested.

Leave it the same - the less that changes the better

No, I'm not sure how this will help to address the identified issue.

**9. Do you have suggestions for guidelines for describing individual contribution?**

Suggest that researchers do not make a percentage statement about their contribution. It has become an extra administration requirement to check all NRO statements for contribution 'percentage' statements against other LU authors using the same research output.

We suggest you follow international authorship guidelines and ask for confirmation of the following:

Authorship of a publication is warranted if a person makes a significant contribution to a work in at least one of the following ways:

- conception and design of research;
- analysis and interpretation of data;
- drafting the publication or revising it for substantive intellectual content.

None of the following is sufficient on its own to justify attribution of authorship:

- participation solely in the acquisition of funding;
- routine collection of data;
- general supervision or oversight of a research group or individual.

Authors of a publication must be able to take public responsibility for at least that part of the work that falls within their area of expertise, or - as is the convention in some disciplines - the entire paper.

- All authors must approve the final version of the publication.

Authorship requirements also apply to collaborating staff from other institutions or companies.

Some kind of guidance about whether percentage contribution or qualitative account of contribution is preferred would be useful. Also exemplars would be helpful.

Waikato recommends panels collectively address this question so that information panels require to assess an NRO, is provided by the researcher.

Some journals now require the contribution of each co-author to be described, e.g. PLOS ONE or Nature Group. We suggest the format provided by leading journals inform development of material. Within our TEO we have developed detailed material and would be happy to advise on this material if requested.

Suggested sources for developing guidance on author contribution include:

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors

<http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html>

Nature Group

<http://www.nature.com/authors/policies/authorship.html>

An example from the Journal of Biological Chemistry: (<http://www.jbc.org/site/misc/ifora.xhtml#contributions>)

Author contributions

Statement describing each author's contributions to the manuscript. Authorship credit should be based on the following:

Acquisition of funding, collection of data, or general supervision of the research group alone does not constitute authorship. Corporate authorship is not accepted.

substantial contributions to conception and design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data;

drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content;

final approval of the version to be published

Review the Authorship criteria section of the JBC Editorial Guidelines.

Identify each author by his or her initials, as in these examples:

Example 1: PFG conceived and coordinated the study and wrote the paper. AKR and JRG designed,

performed and analyzed the experiments shown in Figures 2 and 4. NFJ designed, performed and analyzed the experiments shown in Figure 3. THP provided technical assistance and contributed to the preparation of the figures. All authors reviewed the results and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Example 2: MAF and GFG designed the study and wrote the paper. GFG purified and crystallized AnsT protein and determined its X-ray structure. NFJ characterized AnsT enzyme activity in vitro. THP designed and constructed vectors for expression of mutant proteins and analyzed the mutant phenotypes in bacteria. All authors analyzed the results and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Few areas have single authors and the order of authors is not always indicative of level of contribution, especially in teams which publish together extensively. Therefore it is important that individual contributions are described accurately. Have both a % contribution and ask for specific description.

These guidelines need be clearer. Specific examples would be most useful.

No - other than ensuring there are clear guidelines that direct researchers to explain what work they did in the production of the output (as opposed to other co-authors).

Regarding point 31 of the paper - is the issue when percentages were used because only a percentage and no explanation of the contribution was provided? Or was it that the percentages supplied by co-authors did not tally?

Individual contribution should not be given as a percentage but described as an activity; What part of the research was contributed by the individual? What was the individual responsible for?

Collaborators often declare this on publication of research anyway. For example: "S.T.G., B.B.-L. and D.E.A. designed the experiment. S.D.P. and D.E.A. assembled input data, and B.B.-L. and S.D.P. wrote code, ran the model, and analysed output data. B.B.-L. administered the experiment and wrote the manuscript" could be changed for BB-L's EP to "I designed the experiment with two co-authors, wrote code, ran the model and analysed output data with one co-author, and administered the experiment and wrote the manuscript alone".

Outlining the contributions of other authors gives context. The assessor of the NRO can then judge how important that activity was to the NRO.

Perhaps this could be a series of tick boxes to make the information easier to assimilate.

For simplicity it is proposed that the default be that the main evidence of the research output is uploaded to TEC and ask for explicit information if it is not.

**10. Do you agree that Prezi files can be accessed via a URI link to a public access website, but not via a file exported to a .EXE file)?**

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

**11. Do you support the proposal for TEOs to upload large video files to Youtube, Vimeo or Ustream and provide URIs plus the physical location of a DVD that can be requested if**

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

**Comments**

In general yes, although again, it may pose an issue with any confidential files. Provision of a DVD if needed should address this however.

However some staff may feel more comfortable if it was stored on a private YouTube account that can have the link shared to view or hear the work.

Waikato would support this proposal if it was optional, but not if it was mandatory. There are concerns copying a copyright DVD to Youtube

No, we completely reject this proposal.

Some of the work staff produce is strictly bound by copyright, this proposal suggests staff and TEOs potentially have to breach copyright and provide free public access to material that is restricted, as well as generating further work for TEOs. We expect this proposal would be actively discourage staff from listing items provisioned on DVDs for commercial circulation. Consequently this proposal is contrary to the principles of the PBRF design.

Instead, we suggest the proposal be one of the options for how video files could made available to panel members.

**12. Do you agree that panellists expecting to access large video files will be required to have high quality internet access and the latest versions of Quicktime, VLC, and/or**

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

**13. Do you have any other feedback regarding the changes to the EP schema, the EP template and/or the XSD file?**

No

No

No

No

Symplectic's 2018 PBRF software will need to accommodate the requirements set out in the schema definition document. Waikato understands the TEC are working closely with Symplectic on this matter.

It is unclear why the EP schema requires TEOs to list if the EP contains confidential outputs and then if the confidential output is available for review - with the option of 'no' being unavailable. This issue is already covered in the Guidelines that all outputs listed in the EP as NROs must have the full item evidence available for review and if OROs then sufficient evidence for verification. These two confidential fields seem redundant for that reason.

No

No

When populating the 'output source' field, we appreciate the ability to opt for either an HTML table or a reference citation. Having two options is useful.

Short and concise is best.

#### Other Comments

We have noticed that the Staff Data file and portfolio no longer have a 'gender' question but this has not been mentioned in the consultation paper material.

A suggestion for the collection of 2018 statistical data. Could data be collected for the 2018 round include the number of 'Open Access' journal articles selected for the Research Component of the portfolio.

There should be reminders that the URI need to be current for the period of the assessment.

#### B. Staff data file specification

**1. Do you agree that default date of birth (as used in the NSI) cannot be used and will result in rejection of the Staff Data file?**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	50.0%	6
No	50.0%	6

#### Comments

We think this needs further thought, there could be practical difficulties for Universities in cases where the date of birth is unknown, or incorrect in the NSI. There needs to be some way of submitting portfolios in this case

The University of Waikato does not support the SRG's proposal to reject a TEO's Staff Data file if a default date of birth was used. The majority of University of Waikato staff voluntarily provide their date of birth. A small section elect not to and the NSI default birth date accommodates this scenario. Please refer to earlier comments in this feedback document.

No, strongly disagree with this proposal. A default date of birth must be provided for cases where staff have not provided a birth date.

No - researchers should not be compelled to provide their date of birth.

This should be the same as the NSI, whether it is the default or otherwise

## 2. Do you accept the renaming of the Date of First Academic appointment to Date of First Research Appointment?

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

### Comments

No. How might this be applied for academics in the creative arts areas who, for example, were appointed to their first academic position within the round and previously only worked as a professional artist? Their 'Date of First Academic Appointment' is then identical to their 'Date of First Research Appointment'. The problem is with the word 'appointment', in that a professional artist will most often not have been 'appointed'. This does not clarify at all the in-principle decision made by TEC in 2012, that academics who had been professional artists but were currently in their first academic position with research responsibilities could not be classified as New & Emerging. We accept that this will work well for academics who have previously been employed in, for example, an industry with specific research components in their contract, or for academics who have moved from a non-research role into a role requiring research.

No, disagree with this proposal. There appears to be confusion over the criterion for determining staff as 'New and Emerging'. The date that is required is the date of the staff member's first appointment that would be PBRF eligible (i.e. 12 months contract, 0.2 FTE or more etc.) and where the role includes the requirement for substantive research or degree level teaching. The 'Date of First Research Appointment' is not appropriate as it may not be a PBRF eligible position, focuses on research and excludes degree level teaching. If the SRG are proposing a new and significant change to the New and Emerging researcher criteria we strongly suggest a brief consultation paper on the matter.

In a polytechnic staff may change from level 4 or below teaching, to degree level teaching, so Date of Academic Appointment doesn't necessarily mean they will be doing research. However, staff may also be gaining a higher qualification such as a Masters or PhD while teaching on a degree. It would be clearer to explain it is the date of appointment to a role where research is expected.

Changing the field name will have little impact. However clearer guidelines on how to interpret the requirements will be most useful.

The SRG has confirmed that new and emerging status will be based on the date when the researcher is first research active, as measured by the production of non-supervised research outputs. Given this, it would be appropriate to remove 'Appointment' as employment/appointment is no longer relevant. 'Date of First Research Output' or 'Research Active Date' may be better alternatives.

No, the University does not accept this particular renaming. Neither of these names is specific enough to avoid confusion. People acting in good faith could apply these names differently, leading to inconsistency. Evidence of the significance of such dates is also often hard to come by. Instead, the University strongly recommends that the Date of First Academic Appointment is changed to Date of First PBRF-Eligible Appointment. This brings the test for new and emerging researchers into line with other staff eligibility tests.

Yes if it only refers to the NE category.

This should be re-worded to say either Date of first academic appointment teaching on a degree or being required to undertake research.

## 3. Do you know of any situation where the date of Employment Contract Change could be required? (This has been removed but could be added back if any reason for retaining it)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	50.0%	6
No	50.0%	6

No, especially now we are only collecting data for staff submitting a portfolio.

Would this not be useful in determining if academic staff had had a recent contract change which removed their eligibility to participate in the PBRF? Was this not a loophole in the definition of staff eligibility in the 2012 round which resulted in significant game playing by some TEOs?

No but if others see a reason for keeping it, we are happy to keep it as a non-mandatory field

No

This could potentially cover scenarios where a general staff member becomes an academic staff member and/or meets PBRF eligibility criteria

No.

A field is required that specifies the date the staff member appointed to their 'first PBRF eligible position' (worldwide) and this field would address this (date of contract change) and the previous issue of 'first research appointment'.

Staff may move through different positions in an institution and some programmes develop into degree courses and staff won't be specifically have a "Research Appointment". Not all staff teaching on a degree are required to do research and it may be that staff move from that category to one where they are required to undertake research e.g. part time, casual or contract employment.

No

No, given the change in the new and emerging guidelines, a change in employment contract is no longer relevant. The date of a change in activity/the production of research outputs for the first time will be sufficient.

Yes. Anyone moving from a PBRF ineligible position to their first PBRF eligible position within the same TEO will need a date of Employment Contract Change to their First PBRF-Eligible Appointment, for the reasons given above.

It might be useful for FTE changes that occur within the reporting period.

Yes, where a staff member has been teaching at sub-degree level and then has a change of contract to be required to teach at degree level. This is particularly the case when a School gets their first degree programme. If the wording in 23 was changed to cover this, ie degree teaching and/or research then this would no longer be needed.

**4. Do you support the addition of the new fields to indicate if a researcher has transferred from another TEO during the 12 month period prior to the PBRF Census date, and if so, the TEO they have transferred from?**

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

#### Comments

Yes but would only be beneficial when staff are transferring nationally between TEOs.

Waikato strongly opposes the inclusion of the below data fields. To do so could incur development costs to create the functionality needed and would incur increased administrative costs to collect and maintain the data. Waikato is of the view the TEC's software should be developed to identify this data.

Field Position	Field Title
16	Transfer from another TEO?
17	Transfer from Provider ID
18	Concurrently employed at more than 1 TEO?
19	Previous Provider ID

No, completely disagree with this proposal. TEOs do not always accurately receive this information. The TEC is more than capable of identifying if an NSI number is listed at more than one TEO and as such the proposal is redundant.

This information is not readily available in all cases.

This will require additional work by TEOs to track researchers.

No. TEOs do not always know and certainly do not keep records of all the recent employment history of new employees. Neither do they have the right to compel employees to disclose this information. Populating the new fields is therefore impractical and would be contrary to standard employment law.

It depends on the reason. If it for genuine change of employment then this is probably irrelevant. If it is just to poach researchers for 0.2FTE positions or greater to boost an overall score as has happened in the past it should in fact not be allowed.

Although, what if the previous position was not a PBRF eligible one ?

**5. Do you support the addition of a field to indicate if a researcher is concurrently employed at more than one TEO?**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	58.3%	7
Yes conditional	8.3%	1
No	33.3%	4

#### Comments

Waikato supports the addition of a field to indicate if a researcher is concurrently employed at more than one TEO, but would oppose making the completion of this field mandatory.

No, completely disagree with this proposal. TEOs do not always accurately receive this information. The TEC is more than capable of identifying if a NSI number is listed in more than one TEO and as such the proposal is redundant.

This information is not readily available in all cases.



This will require additional work by TEOs to track researchers.

No. For similar reasons: TEOs do not always know and do not usually keep records of other employers of their employees.

This is essential otherwise "double-dipping" may occur

This is not always known. The TEO census data submitted by the TEOs will provide this.

#### 6. Do you have any other feedback regarding the changes to the Staff Data file specification?

No

No

No

No

The previous system where TEOs flagged staff as eligible and the TEC identified transferred or concurrent staff could be reinstated. This removes the onus from TEOs of tracking researchers. TEOs do not necessarily know where a former researcher has gone, particularly when they leave one TEO and do not directly go to the new TEO.

The SRG in-principle decision on overseas staff defines "staff based in New Zealand" (and therefore PBRF-eligible) as those who:

1. are resident in New Zealand for more than 50% of census year; or

2. are not resident in New Zealand for more than 50% of census year but are employed at 0.5 FTE or higher by the submitting TEO.

While TEOs will know the second group, it will be difficult for the TEOs to determine the country of residence for all part-time staff. How does the SRG propose that this knowledge is discovered? What evidence will be required?

#### C. Please describe and detail any areas or issues relating to the review of the Evidence Portfolio schema and the associated files and/or the Staff Data file specification that require our attention but have not already been included in the consultation paper.

Waikato recommends the working relationship between the TEC and Symplectic be maintained until Symplectic's 2018 PBRF software has been fully developed.

Symplectic's 2018 PBRF software will need to accommodate the requirements set out in the schema definition document.

Field 12, Nominated Academic Unit. This field in the staff data file has no utility as it cannot be compared with like units elsewhere. We believe previous consultation on this matter covered the lack of value of this field. Secondly, the guidance notes for this field suggests a minimum of five staff whereas the 2012 Guidelines required a minimum of seven.

It is proposed that the staff data file no longer collects gender or ethnicity information. Will the TEC not need to track/report on this information in 2018? If not via the staff data file, where will this demographic information be collected?

The schema should include elements for the preferred order and description of Research Contributions.

I think it is really important that staff data files are very carefully screened. Appointing non-teaching "research" staff just prior to the census year who actually don't do anything (except an occasional consultation) but boost the overall value is unethical and should not be allowed. We are supposed to teach as well as carry out research but this is not a consideration for the PBRF. This makes the playing field very unlevel indeed.