



Tertiary Education Commission
Te Amorangi Mātauranga Matua

Performance-Based Research Fund

Health panel-specific guidelines 2012

Quality Evaluation

Introduction

The Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF) 2012 Panels have developed guidelines to assist staff members with the processes of developing and submitting Evidence Portfolios (EPs). These guidelines provide advice on specific areas that relate to the subject area of Health and do not replace or supersede the requirements for EPs that are set out in the *PBRF Quality Evaluation Guidelines 2012*.

The Health panel-specific guidelines must be read in conjunction with the *PBRF Quality Evaluation Guidelines 2012*. In areas where the panel-specific guidelines do not provide additional information, this is because the advice provided in the *PBRF Quality Evaluation Guidelines 2012* applies.

The panel will be primarily interested in assessing the quality of the NROs and the staff member's contribution to them, and can also take into account the quality of the outlets through which the research has been published.

Please note that peer review panels assess EPs without reference to Quality Categories gained by staff members from their participation in the 2003 and/or 2006 Quality Evaluations.

Health panel-specific guidelines

Description of panel coverage

The Health Panel will assess EPs in the subject areas described below. The descriptions should be considered a guide – they are not intended to be exhaustive.

- Audiology
- Dentistry
- Health psychology and mental health
- Nursing
- Nutrition and dietetics
- Occupational therapy
- Optometry and optical sciences
- Pharmacy
- Physiotherapy
- Speech and language therapy
- Sport and exercise science
- Veterinary
- Other health studies

Cross-Referrals

It is expected that most cross-referrals to this panel will come from the following panels: Medicine and Public Health, Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Sciences; and Maori Knowledge and Development.

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

The Health Panel expects that research outputs will normally be peer-reviewed publications in scientific literature describing research studies. While other output types will be considered on their merits by the panel, a staff member should provide an explanation as to why these have been chosen as Nominated Research Outputs (NROs).

Staff members completing EPs may wish to indicate in some way the relative ranking and impact factor a journal may have.

Elaboration of the definition of Research

Publication of case reports without a research component would not normally be considered as meeting the PBRF Definition of Research.

For the general Guidelines, see Chapter 1 Section D: What Counts as Research?

Types of research output

The general Guidelines apply (see Types of Research Output, Chapter 2, Section C).

TEOs should note that all research outputs included in EPs must be consistent with the PBRF Definition of Research, as set out in the general Guidelines, and must be accompanied by evidence as to quality.

Additional advice from expert advisory groups

EPs can be referred to an expert advisory group (EAG) by either a TEO or by the Chair of a peer review panel.

Where an EP has been referred to an EAG and has **at least one** NRO that meets the criteria set out by that EAG, additional advice can be sought. A score and opinion on the EP will be provided back to the peer review panel the EP is assigned to.

The criteria that will determine whether or not the EAGs will accept EPs for consideration will be published on the TEC website.

Indications of the minimum quantity of research output expected to be produced during the assessment period

The general Guidelines apply, see Chapter 2 Section C: Guidelines for Completing the Research Output Component and Chapter 3 Section C: Assessing and Scoring the Three Components of an EP.

Special circumstances

The general Guidelines apply, see Chapter 2, Section F: Dealing with Special Circumstances.

Treatment of non-standard, non-quality-assured and jointly produced research outputs

The Health Panel is aware that it is usual for original research papers to have more than one author; and that different research groups have varying understandings about authorship and order of authorship.

Where there are multiple authors, staff members must ensure that their contribution to the research output is clearly defined in the "My Contribution" section. In cases where co-authors include the same NRO in their EPs, staff members are encouraged to confer about the details of their contributions, to ensure that there is no conflict in the information provided.

The Health Panel would expect contributions to detail, for example, the staff member's contribution to the design, data collection, hypothesis, statistical analyses, and/or interpretation.

Proportions of Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) to be examined¹

It is intended that the Health Panel will examine at least 50% of all NROs in the EPs submitted to it.

¹ "Examined" is defined as either reading an NRO in full, substantially or sufficiently to make an informed assessment, or (for NROs which by their nature cannot be read) an equivalent level of scrutiny.

Use of specialist advisers

The general Guidelines apply, see the topic: Using a Specialist Adviser in Chapter 3 Section B: Allocating EPs to Panel Members and Obtaining Additional Input.

Elaboration of the descriptor and tie-points for the Research Output (RO) component

The general Guidelines apply, see topics: Scoring the RO component and Scoring an EP: Allocating points for research outputs in Chapter 3 Section C: Assessing and Scoring the Three Components of an EP.

Elaboration of the descriptor and tie-points for the Peer Esteem (PE) component

The general Guidelines apply, see topic: Scoring an EP: Allocating points for peer esteem in Chapter 3 Section C: Assessing and Scoring the Three Components of an EP.

Elaboration of the descriptor and tie-points for the Contribution to the Research Environment (CRE) component

The general Guidelines apply, see topic: Scoring an EP: Allocating points for contribution to the research environment in Chapter 3 Section C: Assessing and Scoring the Three Components of an EP.