Appendix to Assessment Framework consultation paper: Relevant information from 2012 Quality Evaluation Guidelines

Guidelines for Selecting a Peer Review Panel

TEOs will nominate a peer review panel

TEOs must nominate a subject area and a peer review panel for each EP. This nomination will either be confirmed or amended by the TEC where necessary, in consultation with panel Chairs, prior to assigning EPs to panel members.

TEOs are also responsible for making sure that the EP states a 'primary field of research' for each EP (see "Primary field of research" below).

Note: For more information on the process used by the TEC for assigning EPs to panels, the safeguards in place in the event of panel transfers, and the process for notifying TEOs, see Chapter 3 Section B: Allocating EPs to Panel Members and Obtaining Additional Input on page **Error! Bookmark not defined.**.

Which panel to nominate?

The nominated peer review panel should be the panel that covers the discipline or subject area best representing the staff member's overall EP.

42 subject areas have been identified across the panels, and staff members will be required to select the subject area for their EP that best matches their primary subject area of research. This may not always be the same as the subject area represented by the staff member's academic department.

The subject area selected for the EP will be the subject area that the quality score will be reported under on a nationally standardised basis.

Research outputs as guide

Typically, the nominated peer review panel should be the one that best matches the research outputs of an EP and, in particular, that EP's Nominated Research Outputs (NROs).

Primary field of research

Staff members will be required to enter a 'primary field of research' in a free-text field in their EP. This is likely to be described at the level of a discipline or sub-discipline (eg. educational psychology, molecular biology).

This primary field of research should reflect **both** the research field of the EP's NROs **and** the balance of the staff member's research activity during the assessment period.

This information will be used to help guide the allocation of an EP for assessment. It will not be used for reporting.

Interdisciplinary research

Interdisciplinary research is any research undertaken by a staff member, or a group of staff members, that spans two or more disciplines or subject areas. It includes any part of the EP, although typically it will be represented in the Research Output component.

Where the research outputs in an EP involve interdisciplinary research that is covered by more than one panel, the TEO should nominate the panel with the subject area that best matches the majority of the research outputs – in particular, the subject area that best matches the NROs selected.

Note: Only one panel may be nominated. However, a staff member (through their TEO) may ask for their EP to be cross-referred to another panel that covers a subject area relevant to their research.

The final decision on whether an EP will or will not be cross-referred lies with the Chair of the nominated peer review panel. All TEO requests for cross-referral will be considered, but a request for cross-referral is not in itself sufficient to guarantee that the cross-referral occurs.

Requests for cross-referral to the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel are an exception to the above, and all such requests will be actioned.

Requests for cross-referral to an expert advisory group are also an exception to the above, and all such requests will be actioned.

2012 Quality Evaluation panels and subject areas

Panel	Subject Areas
Biological Sciences	Agriculture and other applied biological sciences Ecology, evolution and behaviour Molecular, cellular and whole organism biology
Business and Economics	Accounting and finance Economics Management, human resources, industrial relations, international business and other business Marketing and tourism
Creative and Performing Arts	Design Music, literary arts and other arts Theatre and dance, film and television and multimedia Visual arts and crafts
Education	Education
Engineering, Technology and Architecture	Architecture, design, planning, surveying Engineering and technology
Health	Dentistry Nursing Other health studies (including rehabilitation therapies) Pharmacy Sport and exercise science Veterinary studies and large animal science
Humanities and Law	English language and literature Foreign languages and linguistics History, history of art, classics and curatorial studies Law Philosophy Religious studies and theology
Māori Knowledge and Development	Māori knowledge and development
Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology	Computer science, information technology, information sciences Pure and applied mathematics Statistics

Panel	Subject Areas
Medicine and Public Health	Biomedical Clinical medicine Public health
Physical Sciences	Chemistry Earth sciences Physics
Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Sciences	Anthropology and archaeology Communications, journalism and media studies Human geography Political science, international relations and public policy Psychology Sociology, social policy, social work, criminology and gender studies

Subjects that Cross Subject-Area Boundaries

Purpose of this topic

A number of research areas cannot readily be allocated to subject areas and panels – and so the purpose of this topic is to provide guidance on choosing a subject area that best fits the focus of an EP. The research activities covered in this topic are:

- Area Studies (eg. Pacific studies, Asian studies, European studies)
- Audiology
- Biomedical research (including pharmacology)
- Creative writing
- Curatorial studies
- Interior design
- Industrial design and product design
- Design history
- Environmental studies
- Food science and technology
- Librarianship and information management
- Māori education
- Māori health
- Multimedia and other media studies areas
- Tourism studies.

Note: The list above is not intended to be exhaustive.

Area studies (eg. Pacific studies, Asian studies, European studies)

Potential subject areas

- Depends on the underpinning research methodologies utilised in preparing research outputs.

Comment

For example, many staff members who research in area studies will be deploying social science or humanities paradigms, in which case the EP should be submitted to the Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Sciences Panel or the Humanities and Law Panel respectively.

Audiology

Potential subject areas

- Clinical Medicine
- Other Health Studies.

Comment

Audiology generally falls within the Clinical Medicine subject area of the Medicine and Public Health Panel. In cases where the research is primarily about rehabilitation, audiology could fall within Other Health Studies and so the EP could be submitted to the Health Panel.

Biomedical research (including pharmacology)

Potential subject areas

- Biomedical

- Molecular, Cellular and Whole Organism Biology.

Comment

The disciplines of physiology, pathology, immunology, pharmacology, biochemistry, molecular biology, genetics, genomics, cell biology, microbiology, neuroscience, developmental biology, and bioinformatics could fall within both the Biomedical subject area (Medicine and Public Health Panel) and the Molecular, Cellular and Whole Organism Biology subject area (Biological Sciences Panel). Research outputs that are being used primarily in medical science, clinical practice, public health and health interventions should be submitted to the Medicine and Public Health Panel. 'Other' research outputs in those disciplines or subject areas should be submitted to the Biological Sciences Panel.

Creative writing

Potential subject areas

- Music, Literary Arts and Other Arts
- English Language and Literature.

Comment

Creative writing is mostly associated with English and Literature departments. However, research that primarily represents creative writing outputs would fall within the Music, Literary Arts and Other Arts subject area and so should be submitted to the Creative and Performing Arts Panel: this is because the nature of assessment is likely to be closer to other creative and performing arts. Where the research is more closely aligned with humanities research it would fall within the English Language and Literature subject area and so the EP should be submitted to the Humanities and Law Panel.

Curatorial studies

Potential subject areas

- History, History of Art, Classics and Curatorial Studies
- Music, Literary Arts and Other Arts.

Comment

Curatorial studies would primarily fall within the History, History of Art, Classics and Curatorial Studies subject area and so would be submitted to the Humanities and Law Panel. However, in some cases, the nature of the research may be associated more with creative and performing arts research activity: therefore it would fall within the Music, Literary Arts and Other Arts subject area and the EP would be submitted to the Creative and Performing Arts Panel.

Interior design

Potential subject areas

- Design
- Architecture, Design, Planning, Surveying.

Comment

Research that is focused on interior design may fall within the Design subject area (Creative and Performing Arts Panel) or the Architecture, Design, Planning, Surveying subject area (Engineering, Technology and Architecture Panel). This depends on the research focus, and on whether it is closer in approach to architecture or creative design.

Industrial design and product design

Potential subject areas

- Design
- Architecture, Design, Planning, Surveying.

Comment

Research that is focused on industrial design and product design may fall within the Design subject area (Creative and Performing Arts Panel) or the Architecture, Design, Planning, Surveying subject area (Engineering, Technology and Architecture Panel). This depends on the research focus, and whether it is closer in approach to architecture/engineering or creative design.

Design history

Potential subject areas

- Design
- Architecture, Design, Planning, Surveying
- History, History of Art, Classics and Curatorial Studies.

Comment

Research into design history could feasibly be seen by three panels (Creative and Performing Arts Panel; Engineering, Technology and Architecture Panel; and Humanities and Law Panel). For example if the primary focus of the research involves historical analysis, it would fall within the History, History of Art, Classics and Curatorial Studies subject area and so the EP would be submitted to the Humanities and Law Panel. If the research outputs extend to other aspects of design, then see "Interior design" and "Industrial design and product design" immediately above.

Environmental studies

Potential subject areas

- Ecology, Evolution and Behaviour
- Chemistry
- Physics
- Public Health.

Comment

Research focused on environmental studies falls within a number of subject areas. The most appropriate subject area will reflect the underpinning disciplinary base of the research.

Food science and technology

Potential subject areas

- Engineering and Technology
- Chemistry
- Agriculture and Other Applied Biological Sciences.

Comment

Food science and technology research falls within a number of subject areas. Food science would fall within the subject area that best reflects the underlying science – that is, either the Chemistry subject area (Physical Sciences Panel) or the Agriculture and Other Applied Biological Sciences subject area (Biological Sciences Panel). Food technology would generally fall within the Engineering and Technology subject area, and so would be submitted to the Engineering, Technology and Architecture Panel.

Librarianship and information management

Potential subject areas

- Computer Science, Information Technology, Information Sciences
- History, History of Art, Classics and Curatorial Studies.

Comment

Librarianship and information management primarily falls within the Computer Science, Information Technology and Information Sciences subject area and so an EP with this research focus should be submitted to the Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology Panel. A staff member may, however, feel that the focus of their research is primarily from a humanities perspective and in this case the EP would be more appropriately submitted to the Humanities and Law Panel (within the History, History of Art, Classics and Curatorial Studies subject area).

Māori education

Potential subject areas

- Education
- Māori Knowledge and Development.

Comment

Research focused on Māori education (including kaupapa Māori education and mātauranga Māori education) would generally fall within the Education subject area and so the EP would be submitted to the Education Panel. If the research outputs fundamentally influence Māori culture or development, however, they would fall within the Māori Knowledge and Development subject area and so the EP would be submitted to the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel.

Māori health

Potential subject areas

- Public Health
- Māori Knowledge and Development.

Comment

Research focused on Māori health (including hauora) would generally fall within the Public Health subject area and so the EP would be submitted to the Medicine and Public Health Panel. If the research outputs fundamentally influence Māori culture or development, however, they would fall within the Māori Knowledge and Development subject area and so the EP would be submitted to the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel.

Multimedia and other media studies

Potential subject areas

- Theatre and Dance, Film and Television and Multimedia
- English Language and Literature.

Comment

Research expressed by way of media products (eg. multimedia production) would generally fall within the Theatre and Dance, Film and Television and Multimedia subject area (Creative and Performing Arts Panel). Research that represents commentary on or analysis of media products would be likely to fall within the English Language and Literature subject area (Humanities and Law Panel).

Tourism studies

Potential subject areas

- Marketing and Tourism
- Other subject areas as applicable.

Comment

Research into tourism will generally fall within the Marketing and Tourism subject area (Business and Economics Panel); but where the research focus is primarily in another discipline (eg. history of tourism, or ecological tourism), the research could fall within another subject area and so the EP would be submitted to the panel

responsible for that subject area.

The Panel Assessment Process

Allocation of EPs

Panel Chairs will assign EPs to two panel members for pre-meeting assessment and scoring. Panel Chairs will designate one of these two panel members as lead for that EP.

The panel Chair will also, if necessary, determine whether the EP will be cross-referred to another peer review panel or an expert advisory group or whether additional input from a specialist advisor will be sought.

In allocating EPs to panel members, the Chair will have regard to:

The expertise of the panel members in the subject areas in which the staff member is being assessed

Any declared conflict of interest (see this chapter Section G: Guidelines for Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality on page 141)

Achieving a balance of workload across panel members.

Pre-meeting assessment and scoring: responsibilities

Panel members will work within the established policies, guidelines and procedures for the PBRF and within the specific guidelines for their particular panel. The panel-specific guidelines will be prepared once the panels have been appointed in 2011.

Panel members' responsibilities in assessing the EPs assigned to them are to:

- Follow the assessment process outlined later in this chapter (see Section C: Assessing and Scoring the Three Components of an EP on page 116)
- Confirm they have no conflicts of interest that prevent them from assessing the EPs assigned to them
- Review all the material in the EPs assigned to them
- Review or request any of the Nominated Research Outputs (NROs), as required
- If necessary, assist the panel Chair to identify if specialist advice or expert advice or cross-referral is required
- Determine and record preparatory component scores for each EP, using the PBRF assessment policies, the descriptors and tie-points for each component, and the panel-specific guidelines – and taking into account any advice from the moderators
- Complete all documentation required for this part of the assessment process
- Maintain confidentiality in relation to all material in, and discussions relating to, the EPs reviewed.

Lead panel member

One of the panel members responsible for an EP's pre-meeting assessment and scoring will be designated the 'lead' panel member. The lead panel member will:

Co-ordinate the discussion with the other assigned panel members during the detailed assessment and provision of an initial score

If necessary, consider preparatory scores and/or comments provided as a result of additional input

Record any discussion points with other panel members and/or additional assessors (where the EP has been referred to specialist advisers, expert advisory groups or cross-referred to another panel)

Lead any discussion on that EP at the panel meeting.

The steps in the assessment process

The process of assessing an EP starts with preparatory scores and ends with a Final Quality Category. The steps in this process are:

- *Preparatory* scores for each of the three components, provided by assigned panel members, and possibly also cross-referred panel members, expert advisory group members and/or specialist advisors
- A *Preliminary* score for each of the three components, provided by the two primary panel members
- An *Indicative* Quality Category based on the *preliminary* component scores
- *Calibrated panel* scores for each of the three components based on the calibration of the preceding sets of scores
- A *Calibrated Panel* Quality Category based on these calibrated component scores
- A *Holistic* Quality Category based on a holistic judgement of each EP
- A *Final* Quality Category.

More detail on each of these steps follows.

Determining *preparatory* scores

The first stage of the assessment results in the generation and recording of a set of *preparatory* scores for each of the three components of an EP.

In this first stage, each panel member will assign two sets of component scores. These are:

Preparatory–NoSpecial component scores

Preparatory–Special component scores.

Assigning *Preparatory–NoSpecial* scores

Where panel members assign component scores to each of the three components of the EP and do **not** take into account any special circumstances, this will generate *Preparatory–NoSpecial* scores.

Assigning *Preparatory–Special* scores

Where panel members assign component scores to each of the three components of the EP and **do** take into account any special circumstances, this will generate *Preparatory-Special* scores.

The panel member must confirm they have considered special circumstances if any were included in the EP.

If there is a change to the component scores as a result of consideration of special circumstances, the panellist must record as a comment, the rationale for the scores they have provided.

Determining *preparatory* scores where cross-referral has occurred

It may be decided by the panel Chair that the Evidence Portfolio (EP) should be referred to a specialist adviser and/or cross-referred to another panel (see this chapter Section B: Allocating EPs to Panel Members and Obtaining Additional Input, especially from page **Error! Bookmark not defined.** onwards).

Additionally, a TEO or a panel Chair may have directed that an EP be cross-referred to one of the expert advisory groups.

Cross-referral to peer review panel

If the EP involves a cross-referral to a peer review panel then this stage of the assessment will also result in the generation and recording of a set of *preparatory* scores for each of its three components.

Each cross-referral panel member must assign and record two sets of component scores, and a comment if appropriate. These are:

- *Preparatory–NoSpecial component scores*
- *Preparatory–Special* component scores.

The cross-referral panel member must confirm they have considered special circumstances if any were included in the EP.

If there is a change to a component scores as a result of considering special circumstances, the panel member must record the rationale for the scores they have provided.

Cross-referral to an expert advisory group

If the EP involves a cross-referral to an expert advisory group, then this stage of the assessment will result in the generation and recording of an overall *preparatory* score for the EP and a comment.

Cross-referral to a specialist advisor

If the EP involves specialist advice then this stage of the assessment will result in recording a *preparatory* comment.

Determining *preliminary* scores

The two primary panel members assigned to work together on the pre-meeting assessment and scoring will determine and record one set of component scores. These scores are known as the:

Preliminary component scores.

These preliminary scores will be based on a calibration of all the *preparatory* scores - including those from the primary panel members, cross-referral panels, expert advisory groups and specialist advisors.

If there is a change to the *preliminary* component scores as a result of calibration of the *preparatory* scores, the lead primary panel member must record the rationale for the scores they have provided.

The Moderators will give guidance to panels on the weightings for special circumstances from analysis within and between panels based on the *preparatory* scores.

Deriving *Indicative* Quality Categories

When a set of *Preliminary* component scores are recorded the TEC's PBRF system will derive an:

Indicative Quality Category.

Note: The TEC's PBRF system will provide for the award of "C(NE)" and "R(NE)" Quality Categories for new and emerging researchers at this and subsequent stages in the assessment. See this chapter Section E: Assessing New and Emerging Researchers on page **Error! Bookmark not defined.** for more information on the assessment criteria for new and emerging researchers.

Determining *calibrated panel* component scores

At the full panel meetings, discussion (including the use of exemplar EPs to calibrate the various component scores) will lead to an agreement on and recording of the following scores:

Calibrated Panel component scores.

Deriving *Calibrated Panel* Quality Categories

When a set of *Calibrated Panel* component scores are recorded the TEC's PBRF system will derive a:

Calibrated Panel Quality Category.

Determining *Holistic* Quality Categories

This *Calibrated Panel* Quality Category for each EP will then be reviewed by the full panel, as part of the holistic assessment process.

- The purpose of the holistic assessment is to ascertain which of the available Quality Categories is most appropriate for an EP, taking all relevant factors into consideration. It is expected that in the majority of EPs the Calibrated Panel Quality Category would become the final score, and the holistic phase would be primarily for exceptions. In forming their holistic judgement about the Quality Category to be assigned to an EP, the panel will take the following information into account:

- The Quality Categories arising out of each of the stages of the assessment process

- The scoring of the Research Output (RO), Peer Esteem (PE) and Contribution to Research Environment (CRE) components at each of the stages of the assessment process

- Notes indicating uncommon factors about the EP (eg. in relation to quantity and/or quality issues)

- Whether special circumstances have been appropriately applied and, if so, whether the circumstances in question are sufficient to affect which Quality Category should be assigned to the EP

- Whether the EP is eligible for the assignment of a “C(NE) or “R(NE)”

- The fact that the eight-step scoring system does not facilitate the use of fractional scores

- The potential for the PE and CRE component scores to be influenced by the placement in EPs of particular types of information

- The additional rules applying to the assignment of a “C” Quality Category (see “Additional rules” on page 15)

- Whether the evidence in the PE component is congruent with the judgements made about the appropriate score for the RO component

- The Quality Category descriptors

- The fact that there is no requirement for the component scores and Quality Category to be in agreement if the holistic assessment of an EP produces a different result.

The full panel will then determine and record:

Holistic Quality Categories.

Assigning *Final* Quality Categories

Following the determination of *Holistic* Quality Categories, panels will assign and record:

Final Quality Category.

A *Final* Quality Category of R or R(NE) for PBRF-eligible staff members who did not submit an EP, will be derived at this stage.

Defensible decisions

In deciding on the assignment of a Quality Category to an EP, panels will need to ensure that their decisions are defensible.

The Scoring System for panels

The points scale

The first stage in the assessment of EPs is based on allocating points for each of the three components of the EP. The points scale used has the following characteristics:

The scale has a range from 0 – 7

'7' is the highest point on the scale and '0' is the lowest

A score of '0' would reflect that no evidence has been provided in the EP for that component

Only **whole** scores can be allocated (eg. scores of 4.5 or 3.25 will not be allowed).

Descriptors and tie-points

The descriptors and tie-points for each of the three components are used to assist with the scoring.

The descriptors provide an introduction to the component being assessed.

The tie-points encapsulate the standard expected for that score.

Role of the tie-points

The tie-points at 2, 4 and 6 are used to distinguish between different descriptions of quality for each of the components.

The Weighting System

The status of the weighting system

The weighting system is **not** intended as a mechanical or absolute method for determining Quality Categories. The various weightings may be overridden as part of the holistic assessment of EPs.

The weighting scale

A weighted score will be calculated by the TEC's PBRF system for each component of each EP.

The same weightings will be used for all EPs, to ensure maximum comparability in judgements across panels.

- These weightings are set out in the following table.

Component	Weighting
Research Output (RO)	70
Peer Esteem (PE)	15
Contribution to the Research Environment (CRE)	15

Treatment of new and emerging researchers

Panels will take into account whether an individual is a new and emerging researcher.

For the award of the "C(NE)" Quality Category, specific assessment criteria exist for new and emerging researchers. (See this chapter Section E: Assessing New and Emerging Researchers on page **Error! Bookmark not defined.**.)

The weightings of 70 and 15 and 15 (set out in the table immediately above) apply when a new and emerging researcher's EP is being considered for the assignment of an "A" or "B" Quality Category.

Additional Rules

Where Quality Categories are being determined or assigned, the following additional rules should be applied to the RO component score:

- A score of at least 2 on RO will be required for the award of a "C" Quality Category
- An EP will not meet the minimum requirements for a component score of 2 if the only NRO in the EP is a Masters or Doctoral thesis.

Note: While these are necessary conditions, they do not imply that an RO score of 2 would automatically give a Quality Category of "C".

Calculating the weighted score

The score for each component is multiplied by the weighting for that component. The weighted total for each Evidence Portfolio (EP) will be calculated automatically by the TEC's PBRF system.
The maximum weighted score available is 700. This would require each component of an individual's EP to receive a score of 7.

Example of calculation

This table below provides an example of how a total weighted score is calculated.

EP Component	Raw Score (0 – 7)	Weighting (%)	Weighted Score
RO	4	70	280
PE	6	15	90
CRE	5	15	75
Total Weighted Score			**445**

Total weighted score provides initial

The purpose of the total weighted score is to provide an initial placement of each EP into one of the six available Quality Categories.

This initial placement does not necessarily determine the Final Quality Category that will be assigned to an EP. The Final Quality Category is a decision of the panel based on its calibration of panel members' results, its

placement into a Quality Category

holistic judgement of the EP, and the Quality Category awarded to the researcher's prior EP in 2003 or 2006 (if any).

Relationship of total weighted score and Indicative Quality Category

The table below shows the Quality Categories associated with the range of weighted scores for all PBRF-eligible staff members **except** new and emerging researchers.

Total weighted score	Quality Category
600 – 700	A
400 – 599	B
200 – 399	C
Less than 200	R

PBRF Scoring / Quality Category Guide

Combined PE & CRE Score	RO Score 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0	0	70	140	210	280	350	420	490
1	15	85	155	225	295	365	435	505
2	30	100	170	240	310	380	450	520
3	45	115	185	255	325	395	465	535
4	60	130	200	270	340	410	480	550
5	75	145	215	285	355	425	495	565
6	90	160	230	300	370	440	510	580
7	105	175	245	315	385	455	525	595
8	120	190	260	330	400	470	540	610
9	135	205	275	345	415	485	555	625
10	150	220	290	360	430	500	570	640
11	165	235	305	375	445	515	585	655
12	180	250	320	390	460	530	600	670
13	195	265	335	405	475	545	615	685
14	210	280	350	420	490	560	630	700
Quality Category	R		C		B		A	

Relationship of total weighted score and Indicative Quality Category for new and emerging researchers

This table shows the Quality Categories associated with the range of weighted scores for new and emerging researchers.

Note that, because new and emerging researchers are not required to supply PE and CRE components, a new and emerging researcher awarded a Raw Score of 2 for their RO component, will have their Weighted Score automatically rounded up from 140 to 200.

Specific assessment criteria exist for the award of "C(NE)" for new and emerging researchers and apply at the holistic assessment phase. See also this chapter Section E: Assessing New and Emerging Researchers on page **Error! Bookmark not defined.** for information on this.

Total weighted score	Quality Category
600 – 700	A
400 – 599	B
200 – 399	C(NE)
Less than 200	R(NE)

PBRF Scoring / Quality Category Guide (New and Emerging only)

Combined PE & CRE Score	RO Score 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0	0	70	200	210	280	350	420	490
1	15	85	200	225	295	365	435	505
2	30	100	200	240	310	380	450	520
3	45	115	200	255	325	395	465	535
4	60	130	200	270	340	410	480	550
5	75	145	215	285	355	425	495	565
6	90	160	230	300	370	440	510	580
7	105	175	245	315	385	455	525	595
8	120	190	260	330	400	470	540	610
9	135	205	275	345	415	485	555	625
10	150	220	290	360	430	500	570	640
11	165	235	305	375	445	515	585	655
12	180	250	320	390	460	530	600	670
13	195	265	335	405	475	545	615	685
14	210	280	350	420	490	560	630	700
Quality Category	R(NE)		C(NE)		B		A	

What do the Quality Categories Mean?

Important considerations

While the following descriptors provide a useful reference point, they are 'generalised' in approach. In determining or assigning Quality Categories, panels are expected to take account of other factors including (but not limited to) special circumstances, the specific assessment criteria for new and emerging researchers, and the overall principle of holistic assessment of Evidence Portfolios (EPs).

Quality Category descriptors

Quality Category "A": For an EP to be assigned an "A" it would normally be expected that the staff member has, during the assessment period in question, produced research outputs of a world-class standard, established a high level of peer recognition and esteem within the relevant subject area of their research, and made a significant contribution to the New Zealand and/or international research environments.

Quality Category "B": For an EP to be assigned a "B" it would normally be expected that the staff member has, during the assessment period in question, produced research outputs of a high quality, acquired recognition by peers for their research at least at a national level, and made a contribution to the research environment beyond their institution and/or a significant contribution within their institution.

Quality Category "C": For an EP to be assigned a "C" it would normally be expected that the staff member has, during the assessment period in question, produced a reasonable quantity of quality-assured research outputs, acquired some peer recognition for their research, and made a contribution to the research environment within their institution. *This Quality Category is available for the EPs of all PBRF-eligible staff members **except** new and emerging researchers.*

Quality Category "C(NE)": For an EP to be assigned a "C(NE)" a new or emerging researcher would normally be expected, during the assessment period in question, to have produced a reasonable platform of research, as evidenced by having:

either

a) completed their doctorate or equivalent qualification and produced at least two quality-assured research outputs

or

b) produced research outputs equivalent to a doctorate and at least two quality-assured research outputs. *This Quality Category is available for the EPs of new and emerging researchers only.*

Quality Category "R": An EP will be assigned an "R" when it does not demonstrate the quality standard required for a "C" Quality Category or higher. *This Quality Category is available for the EPs of all PBRF-eligible staff members **except** new and emerging researchers.*

Quality Category "R(NE)": An EP will be assigned an "R(NE)" when it does not demonstrate the quality standard required for a "C(NE)" Quality Category or higher. *This Quality Category is available for the EPs of new and emerging researchers only.*

Allocating EPs to Panels and Panel Members

Allocating an EP

Although the TEO has nominated a panel for each EP, the TEC (through the panel Chairs and Principal Moderator) will make the final decision on the allocation of EPs.

Transferring an EP to another panel

Participating TEOs will have selected a panel, subject area and provided a primary field of research for each EP submitted to the TEC. These selections will be checked against the PBRF Guidelines for panel selection and finalised for the panel Chairs' approval.

The transfer of an EP might be required for several reasons including, but not restricted to, the following:

- The primary subject area of research falls within the coverage of another panel
- Conflict of interest exists within the primary panel
- Relevant subject-area expertise may reside in a different panel.

On the advice of panel Chairs, the TEC will transfer an EP to another panel. The panel secretariat will be responsible for recording the reason for the transfer. The new panel is responsible for assessing and reporting on the EP.

Where an EP has been transferred, the EP will be cross-referred to the original panel for additional input. Where the original panel is unable to provide additional input (eg. owing to a lack of expertise or a conflict of interest), specialist advice will be sought.

Notification of TEOs

The TEO will be notified if an EP is transferred to another panel. This will take place at the end of the assessment process, as part of the reporting of results. The notification will include reasons why the transfer took place.

Obtaining Additional Input

Who makes decisions about additional input?

Decisions about whether or not additional input will be sought are made by panel Chairs.

TEO requests for additional input will be taken into account when decisions about additional input are made, but a TEO request for additional input is not in itself sufficient to guarantee that additional input will be sought.

There are two exceptions to this.

- The first is when a TEO has requested additional input from an expert advisory group. All TEO requests for additional input from an expert advisory group will result in such additional input being sought.
- The second is when a TEO has requested that an EP be cross-referred to the Māori Knowledge and Development (MKD) panel. All TEO requests for cross-referral to the MKD panel will result in such cross-referral occurring.

When is additional input needed?

Additional input may be needed when:

- The members of a panel cannot provide all the expertise necessary to fully review an EP that has been correctly assigned to it (ie. the panel is the best one to undertake the assessment but it needs assistance in doing so)
- The EP has been transferred from the panel it was initially allocated to, and so additional advice from the original panel is required (see "Transferring an EP to another panel" above)
- A staff member (through their TEO) has requested that another panel participates in the assessment of their EP.

Cross-Referrals to another Panel

General principles

The general principle for handling EPs that cross subject areas and panels is that one panel will be allocated the EP. The panel to which the EP is originally allocated will take primary responsibility for assessing it.

Cross-referral

Typically, an EP will be cross-referred to another panel (or other panels) when a significant proportion, but not a majority, of the outputs listed in the Research Output (RO) component falls within the subject areas covered by the other panel(s).

Cross-referral may also be appropriate when one or more Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) fall within the subject areas covered by another panel.

Decisions on cross-referral will be made by the Chair of the panel to which the EP was originally allocated.

Guidelines for Special Input Requirements: Māori Research

Māori Knowledge and Development Panel

The Māori Knowledge and Development Panel will normally assess all EPs that contain kaupapa Māori or Māori-centred research.

This means that the panel will consider all EPs where there is evidence of research based on Māori world-views (both traditional and contemporary) and Māori methods of research.

Researchers (through their TEO) will have an opportunity to indicate on their EP if they would like the EP cross-referred to the Māori Knowledge and Development (MKD) panel. If such an indication is made, the cross-referral will occur. The MKD panel is the only peer review panel where this is the case.

This mandatory cross-referral is similar to that applying to expert advisory groups, although there is a significant difference in that the MKD panel is a peer review panel and the expert advisory groups are not peer review panels.

Use of Māori specialist advisers

In addition to the above requirement regarding cross-referral to the MKD panel, panel Chairs will also have the opportunity to decide whether input from a Māori specialist adviser is required for an EP that has been allocated to their panel. A Māori specialist adviser may be required when the EP contains:

- Research involving Māori

AND/OR

- Research that is specifically relevant to Māori.

Descriptions of these two kinds of research are given immediately below.

Research involving Māori

Research involving Māori is research where:

- One or more NROs address an issue of importance for Māori and show evidence of involvement with Māori

OR

- The NROs are of such a nature that they are able to contribute to the understanding of issues affecting Māori.

Research specifically relevant to Māori

Research specifically relevant to Māori is research where:

- One or more of the NROs are specifically relevant to Māori

OR

- Research impact or uptake may provide an opportunity to increase the understanding of issues affecting Māori.

Role of Māori specialist advisers

The role of Māori specialist advisers is to provide panels with advice on the quality of research outputs dealing with matters relevant to Māori.

General Guidelines for Assessing an EP

The three key components

An EP is assessed on each of its three components:

- Research outputs (RO)
- Peer esteem (PE)
- Contribution to the research environment (CRE).

General assessment principles

The following principles should be used in assessing Evidence Portfolios (EPs):

- The Quality Evaluation is a standards-referenced rather than a norm-referenced assessment regime – so there are no predetermined limits on the proportion of PBRF-eligible staff members who can be assigned to particular Quality Categories
- The standards used are based on the descriptors (with specific tie-points) for each of the three components of the EP
- The process is one of holistic assessment (which is based on **all** the information provided in the full EP, the descriptors and tie-points for each of the three components of the EP, and the descriptors for each Quality Category)
- The assessment is primarily about quality, not quantity
- Only the information contained in the EP, along with any Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) examined by the panel, will be used for assessment purposes
- There are explicit assessment criteria for the assessment of new and emerging researchers for the "C(NE)" Quality Category
- There is provision for the recognition of sustained special circumstances over at least half of the assessment period to affect the quantity of entries in all components of the EP
- In the RO component, research outputs that meet the PBRF Definition of Research (see Chapter 1 Section D: What Counts as Research? on page **Error! Bookmark not defined.**.) are essential; but they are not sufficient in themselves for achieving a funded Quality Category other than in exceptional circumstances
- Particular attention should be given to those EPs that:
  - are on, or close to, the boundaries between Quality Categories *and/or*
  - have a lower quantity in any of the three components because of special circumstances *and/or*
  - have unusual combinations of scores across the three components (eg. 7 for RO but 2 for PE and 2 for CRE).

The 'Quantity' of Research

Quantity in the context of quality

The PBRF is primarily concerned with the quality of research and not the quantity of research output. However, the Quality Category to which an EP is assigned depends upon there being an adequate platform of research and the quantity of research is important in this context.

Platform of research

The research platform is the body of research outputs as described in the (up to) four NROs **and** the (up to) 30 'other' research outputs.

Research output scores are likely to be higher where the platform of research in an EP shows evidence of a greater breadth and/or depth of research activity.

However, there will always be exceptions to this (eg. an EP where the quantity of ROs is relatively low, but which includes one or two outstanding research outputs that have had a major impact on a discipline).

Minimum requirement

At least one NRO is required before an EP can be accepted for assessment by the TEC.

Where an EP contains four or more research outputs, a staff member must submit four of these research outputs as NROs. Staff members should ensure their EP does not contain, for example, two NROs and a number of 'other' research outputs.

Special circumstances

Where there are fewer than four NROs in an EP, **and** where the reason for this falls within the criteria for special circumstances, details should be provided in the Special Circumstances fields of the EP. Each case will be looked at on its merits.

Where a panel concludes there is insufficient reason (in terms of Special Circumstances) for an EP having fewer than four NROs, this may be reflected in the Final Quality Category assigned to the EP.

Questions to consider in assessing quantity

The following table outlines the issues panel members will consider when they assess the RO component and look at the adequacy of quantity.

Question	Factors/Considerations
Does the EP meet the general expectation set for the **quantity** of research outputs?	Any factors outlined in panel-specific guidelines Does the staff member meet the criteria for a new and emerging researcher? Information contained in the Special Circumstances field of the EP The type of research outputs produced (eg. in some subject areas, a book would normally be weighted more than an article) Particular weight should be given to NROs.

Is there an adequate platform of research for that score?	See Scoring an EP: Allocating Points for Research Outputs on page 27 Consider both the NROs and the 'other' research outputs, but give greater weight to the NROs As a general rule, the research platform would be expected to be broader (ie. contain more quality-assured research outputs) if higher scores are allocated, but there could be exceptions to this Special circumstances are not considered in the assessment of quality.
Are there any uncommon factors associated with the research outputs?	Consider both quality and quantity Record these factors for the panel to consider.
Score the research output between 0 and 7	Use the descriptors for the tie-points to guide the scoring Give greater weight to quality factors rather than quantity factors.
Which of the tie-point (ie. scoring) descriptors best reflects the quality of the research output in the EP?	See Scoring an EP: Allocating Points for Research Outputs on page 27.

Concerns about quantity

Where a panel member has concerns about the quantity of research outputs (ie. it fails to meet the expectations), this should be discussed with the other panel members assessing the EP. If all agree that the quantity of research does not meet expectations (taking special circumstances into account where appropriate), then this should be noted.

Panel meeting calibration

In the panel meeting, the panel will calibrate both quality (the scoring according to the tie-point descriptors) and quantity (the factors that determine whether research outputs meet the guidelines, and the appropriate breadth of the research platform at each tie-point).

Assessing the EP's Research Outputs

Critical importance

The RO component is the most important of the assessment components in the Quality Evaluation. This can be seen in its weighting – it accounts for 70% of the overall assessment of the staff member's EP (although the holistic assessment of EPs may override this weighting).

In addition, the RO component can influence the Quality Category assigned to an EP. For example, a staff member whose EP provides only limited evidence of peer esteem or contribution to the research environment may nevertheless have a "C" or "B" Quality Category assigned if their research outputs are of high quality. Conversely a staff member with high evidence of peer esteem or contribution to the research environment, but with no evidence of high-quality research outputs, would be unlikely to have an "A" or "B" Quality Category assigned to their EP.

Note: The assessment criteria for new and emerging researchers are different to that relating to other staff (see this chapter Section E: Assessing New and Emerging Researchers on page **Error! Bookmark not defined.**). New and emerging staff members may be awarded a "C(NE)" Quality Category **without any evidence** of peer esteem or contribution to the research environment.

General principles

The following general principles apply to the assessment of research outputs:

- Each research output must fall within the Definition of Research for the PBRF (see Chapter 1 Section D: What Counts as Research? on page **Error! Bookmark not defined.**).
- Any research output included in the EP, including confidential outputs, must have been produced (ie. published, publicly disseminated, presented, performed, or exhibited) within the assessment period.
- All research outputs must be able to be made available to, and be assessed by, a peer review panel.
- All research activity will be considered on its merits regardless of whether it is concerned with basic, fundamental, strategic, artistic or applied research. The assessment of research activity will treat the outputs of practice-based research fairly, in relation to the outputs of other research.
- All types of research output will be considered on their merits. One type of research is not considered to be of greater quality per se than another, simply because of the nature of the output type (eg. a performance should not be considered of lesser standing than a publication in a journal). The panel-specific guidelines may have further information on the research output types that may be expected as NROs.
- The absence of quality assurance for an output will not automatically be taken to imply low quality.

Establishing Expectations in Scoring the Three Components of the EP

Independent assessment of each component

The three components (Research Output (RO), Peer Esteem (PE), Contribution to Research Environment (CRE)) will be assessed using the descriptors and tie-points for each component (see the next four topics in this Section, on pages 26 to 31) as well as the guidelines provided by the panel(s) to which the EP has been assigned or cross-referred.

Special circumstances

Special circumstances will be considered prior to the panels meeting and then revisited as part of the panel determination of Quality Categories.

New and emerging researchers

The assessment process provides specific assessment criteria for new and emerging researchers (see Assessing New and Emerging Researchers on page 33).

Allocating scores

Each of the EP's three components will be scored separately, using the 0 – 7 points scale shown in the following table.

Score	Significance
7	Maximum
6	Tie-point
5	
4	Tie-point
3	
2	Tie-point
1	Minimal evidence
0	No evidence supplied

Scoring the RO Component

World class

The use of 'world-class' in relation to the RO component is not intended to suggest that those research outputs should relate to international themes or cross-national comparisons, or that they should be the focus of international interest, nor does world-class imply research outputs generated by international collaborations. World-class denotes a standard, not a type or focus of research.

Research outputs that deal with topics or themes of primarily local, regional or national focus or interest can be of world-class standard. For example, research concerning Māori or Pacific topics or themes may rank with the best research of its type conducted anywhere in the world.

The scope of world-class characteristics, as indicated in the tie-point descriptors in the next three topics, may overlap. It should be noted that the characteristics are not ranked in any particular order, that other characteristics may also denote world-class research outputs, and that the characteristics are not cumulative.

Scoring an EP: Allocating Points for Research Outputs

Points Scale The following table provides a detailed description of the outputs to be assessed when assigning a score to the RO component of the EP.

Note: Scores of 6, 4 and 2 are tie-points; the descriptions alongside them are the tie-point descriptors.

COMPONENT	• RESEARCH OUTPUT (RO)
Descriptor	This component is concerned with the production of quality research outputs. As part of the evidence in this component, staff members will present up to four NROs (ie. their best research outputs). All NROs presented in the EP must be peer-reviewable (ie. they can be reviewed by the panel or assessor if required). Research outputs are any form of assessable output embodying the findings of research and generated out of research activities, and include: • printed academic work • published and unpublished work • work published in non-print media • other forms of outputs such as patents, materials, products, performances, and exhibits. All outputs submitted in the RO component must meet the PBRF Definition of Research. They therefore exclude activities related to professional practice, scientific and technical information services and artistic work that do not embody the results of investigation. The EP may include research primarily concerned with methodological, theoretical and analytic issues (basic or strategic research), and/or applied research primarily directed to and impacting on practices, technologies or policies. This includes processes (as in industrial processes, medical procedures, etc) with an assessment of impact, eg. company profit, reduction in length of operation time, improved survival, improved social outcomes, environmental impact, etc. The absence of peer review will not of itself be taken to imply low quality. Evidence of research outputs having been reviewed through peers is one measure of quality. However, other quality-assurance processes, including referees and commissioning processes (but not limited to these examples) shall also be given regard. There is potential for overlap between the RO and PE components. Assessors need to ensure that they adequately differentiate between pre-publication/production review as it relates to the quality-assurance process for the RO component and post-publication/production review that may be presented as part of the PE component. Most of the assessment time should be spent on the RO component. ***continues on following page***

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="6">Scores</td><td>7</td><td rowspan="2">The EP would be expected to demonstrate leadership and accomplishment in research exemplified by a platform of world-class research that includes highly original work which ranks with the best of its kind.

In doing so, the EP would likely be characterised by, for example, outputs that represent intellectual or creative advances, or contributions to the formation of new paradigms, or generation of novel conceptual or theoretical analysis and/or theories or important new findings with wider implications. In doing so it could indicate research that is exemplary in its field and/or at the leading edge and/or highly innovative. It would be expected to demonstrate intellectual rigour, imaginative insight or methodological skill or to form a primary point of reference to be disseminated widely. A significant proportion of research outputs should be presented through the most appropriate and best channels. The research outputs would be likely to result in substantial impact or uptake. Such impacts could also include: product development, uptake and dissemination; or significant changes in professional, policy, organisational, artistic, or research practices.</td></tr>
<tr><td>6</td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td rowspan="2">The EP demonstrates a platform of significant research output that has generated substantial new ideas, interpretations or critical findings and that makes a valuable contribution to existing paradigms and practices. The research outputs generate new information or ideas and are well researched and technically sound. The EP typically includes research outputs that are presented in reputable channels considered as being at least at a middle level of excellence. The research is likely to contribute to further research activities and to have demonstrable impacts reflected in developments that may include: product development, uptake and dissemination; or changes in professional, organisational, policy, artistic, or research practices.</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td rowspan="2">The EP demonstrates a platform of research activity (or developing research activity) and output that is based on a sound/justifiable methodology, and that makes a contribution to research within the discipline and/or to applied knowledge. This could be demonstrated by the production of research outputs that have been subject to quality-assurance processes.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2"></td><td>1</td><td>Minimal evidence of research activity. The research outputs are assessed as having limited or no significance/impact, as contributing little or no additional understanding or insight in the discipline/field, and/or as lacking in the appropriate application of theory and/or methods.</td></tr>
<tr><td>0</td><td>No evidence of research activity.</td></tr>
</table>

Scoring an EP: Allocating Points for Peer Esteem

Points Scale The following table provides a detailed description of the outputs to be assessed when assigning a score to the PE component of the EP.

Note: Scores of 6, 4 and 2 are tie-points; the descriptions alongside them are the tie-point descriptors.

<table>
<tr><th>COMPONENT</th><th colspan="2">PEER ESTEEM (PE)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Descriptor</td><td colspan="2">This component is concerned with recognition of the staff member's research by peers. Indicators of peer esteem include:
Research-related fellowships, prizes, awards, invitations to share research knowledge at academic and end-user conferences and events
The ability to attract graduate students or to sponsor students into higher-level research qualifications, positions or opportunities because of the staff member's research reputation
Research-related citations and favourable review. In considering the former, it must be noted that the quantum of citations may be a poor proxy for esteem. Some research work may be cited frequently because it is considered to be an example of poor research. Consequently emphasis should be placed on evidence of positive review and citation
Participation in editorial boards
The ability to attract professional/ business/ manufacturing engagement, awards and scholarships, invited memberships of company boards of directors/ advisory boards, invited engagement with industry focused organisations, eg. NZTE.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Scores</td><td>7</td><td rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>6</td></tr>
<tr><td>The EP would be expected to demonstrate that the staff member has attracted world-class recognition through their research. This could be reflected by some or all of the following: the receipt of prestigious prizes, or fellowships of leading learned societies/academies or prestigious institutions, or special status with professional or academic societies, or editorship, membership of editorial panels or refereeing of top-ranked journals, or awards for research as well as invited attendance, or examination of PhDs, or invited presentations at prestigious academic and industry conferences/events, or directorships, or advisory board membership. An ability to attract overseas/top research students and scholars as well as to mentor their own students into postdoctoral and other fellowships, scholarships and positions in centres of research excellence could be demonstrated in the EP. A consistent record of favourable citations of research should combine with strong evidence of positive research reviews, contribution to knowledge in the discipline (including overseas where relevant), and movement into creative practice.</td><td>5</td></tr>
</table>

	4	The EP shows that the staff member, through their research, is recognised within New Zealand or elsewhere and is esteemed beyond their own institution. The EP demonstrates peer esteem by providing evidence of some or all of the following: the receipt of prizes, membership of a professional society or similar with restricted or elected membership or honours or special status with professional or academic societies, editorship or membership(s) of editorial panels of reputable journals within New Zealand or elsewhere, research fellowships of esteemed institutions, reviewing of journal submissions and book proposals, PhD examination or advisory board memberships or invitations for keynote addresses for conferences/events that are at a middle level of excellence. A consistent record of research citation and positive reviews of specific research outputs and/or overall contribution to research knowledge in a discipline or substantive area of knowledge or practice can be expected. The EP could demonstrate graduate students moving into research scholarships or postdoctoral fellowships or junior lectureships in departments with good research ratings.
	3	The EP demonstrates a developing recognition among peers of the staff member's research contribution and developing rigour in the application of research techniques. This may be evidenced through attracting awards and invitations to present research to informed audiences, within and possibly beyond the applicant's immediate institution, as well as positive reviews and citations, or being asked to referee research outputs. Where the staff member has an involvement primarily in commissioned research outputs, reference to letters of commendation or other evidence of esteem by commissioning agents could be expected.
	2	
	1	Minimal evidence of peer esteem generated through research activities.
	0	No evidence of peer esteem generated through research activities.

Scoring an EP: Allocating Points for Contribution to the Research Environment

Points Scale

The following table provides a detailed description of the outputs to be assessed when assigning a score to the CRE component of the EP.

Note: Scores of 6, 4 and 2 are tie-points; the descriptions alongside them are the tie-point descriptors.

COMPONENT		• CONTRIBUTION TO THE RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT (CRE)
Descriptor		This is concerned with the contribution to the development of research students, to new and emerging researchers and to a vital, high-quality research environment. This component has a number of aspects, including: • Research and disciplinary leadership – including membership of research teams, and contributions to disciplinary development and debate and public understanding of the discipline • Contribution through students and emerging researchers – supporting and mentoring students to achieve postgraduate qualifications and to develop as researchers • Contribution to institutional vitality – supporting the development of research both within and across institutions (eg. hosting visiting researchers). Attracting research funding may be an important contribution to institutional vitality, but the amount of research income in itself will not be taken into account • Contribution to research context and connectivity - including factors such as the ability to engage profession/ business/industry with the academic sector, contribution to profession/business/manufacturing sector, membership of profession/ business/manufacturing bodies, etc.
Scores	7	
	6	The EP would be expected to demonstrate a contribution to New Zealand and/or international research environments (for example, through extensive research networks and/or collaborations) in addition to a strong contribution to the research environment in their organisation(s). The EP may show a history of attracting renowned scholars to the TEO and/or New Zealand. Evidence of research and disciplinary leadership may include some or all of the following: membership(s) of renowned collaborative research teams; membership(s) of research selection panels in New Zealand and elsewhere; research leadership at the highest levels (eg. leading/participating in major research consortia including researchers outside of New Zealand); organising and hosting world-class conferences; the development of research infrastructure, or significant contributions to research-focused conferences or stakeholder engagement or attracting funding. The EP is likely to show a strong and consistent history of successful supervision of students, particularly at PhD level, and could provide evidence of supporting research students to access and produce research outputs that are quality-assured (possibly in combination with academic staff). The EP could demonstrate contributions to developing new research capacity that go beyond student supervision, including among Māori researchers and Pacific researchers. Other contributions to debate in the discipline, both in New Zealand and beyond, and/or public understanding of developments in or implications for the discipline may be expected.
	5	

	4	The EP demonstrates research and disciplinary leadership within the broader discipline in addition to contributing to the individual's own TEO research environment. Research and disciplinary leadership may include some or all of the following: collaborative research across disciplinary boundaries or across organisations and/or membership(s) of research selection panels or leading research consortia within New Zealand; and/or show evidence of attracting researchers and scholars to the TEO, and/or stakeholder engagement and/or research funding; and/or organising and hosting conferences. The EP could show supervision of research activities of students and supporting them to produce research outputs, possibly in conjunction with academic staff. The EP could show a contribution to developing new researchers, including Māori researchers and Pacific researchers, or generating research opportunities (by attracting external funding as a research programme or project leader). Other contributions to debate in the discipline and/or public understanding of developments/implications in the discipline may be expected.
	3	
	2	The EP is likely to show contributions to the research environment primarily within the TEO or locality. Research and disciplinary leadership is likely to be reflected in participating in committees of organisational bodies or discipline-related bodies dealing with research matters. The EP could show contributions within the TEO, such as hosting of visiting researchers, organisation/hosting of conferences/seminars, and/or assisting in attracting research money, or as a named researcher in externally funded research programmes or projects. Other contributions to the discipline may be demonstrated such as successful supervision of Masters and PhD students, including Māori students and Pacific students.
	1	Minimal evidence of contribution to research environment.
	0	No evidence of contribution to research environment.

Selecting NROs for Examination

Number of NROs to be examined

Each peer review panel is expected to examine at least 25% of the NROs listed in the EPs that it is responsible for assessing.

As a rule of thumb, each panel member will review at least 25% of the NROs from the EPs they are assigned. However, the actual proportion reviewed may vary from panel member to panel member.

Panels may examine more than 25% of NROs if they deem this to be appropriate and necessary. (Individual panels' approaches to this will be advised as part of the panel-specific guidelines).

Assessing New and Emerging Researchers

Available Quality Categories

EPs from staff members who meet the criteria for new and emerging researchers may be assigned the following Quality Categories: "A", "B", "C(NE)" and "R(NE)". For these criteria, see New and Emerging Researchers on page **Error! Bookmark not defined.**.

Criteria for "A" and "B" Quality Categories

In order to be eligible for the "A" and "B" Quality Categories, new and emerging researchers must meet the standards that apply to all other staff members.

Criteria for a "C(NE)" Quality Category

In order for a new and emerging researcher to have the potential to secure the new Quality Category "C(NE)", evidence will need to be provided that includes **at least** the following:

a) The successful completion of a Doctoral degree or equivalent during the assessment period for the Quality Evaluation **AND** 'Other' research outputs of an adequate quality and quantity, bearing in mind the time period during which the staff member has been PBRF-eligible (a minimum of two quality-assured research outputs would normally be expected)

OR

b) Research outputs equivalent to a) above.

Doctoral degree or equivalent

In most disciplines, a Doctoral degree is regarded as the appropriate entry-level degree for an academic appointment involving research; in some other disciplines, however, either a Masters degree (in, for example, Creative and Performing Arts) or a professional qualification (such as in Law or Education) may be the customary qualification for a research career. Staff members without a Doctoral degree would normally need to provide evidence of more than the minimum number of research outputs (ie. two).

Importance of PE and CRE components

Evidence of peer esteem or contribution to the research environment are not required in order for a new and emerging researcher's EP to be assigned a "C(NE)" Quality Category. New and emerging researchers will not be disadvantaged when they are being assessed for the "C(NE)" Quality Category if they provide only limited evidence in these components. New and emerging researchers are encouraged to complete these components of their EP, as this may allow the EP to be considered for a higher Quality Category.

Assigning an "R(NE)" Quality Category

The EPs of new and emerging researchers that do not meet the standards set out above will be assigned an "R(NE)" Quality Category.

When are these criteria applied?

These criteria will be applied throughout the assessment process.

The Moderation Process

Four stages

There are four stages in the moderation process. These are described in the following table.

Stage	Event	Description	Timing
1	Initial Moderation Panel meeting	Moderation Panel reviews the scoring data from the pre-panel-meeting assessments to ensure the consistent application of assessment standards across panels.	November 2012
2	Second Moderation Panel meeting	Moderation Panel reviews the Final Quality Categories assigned by panels to ensure consistency across panels.	December 2012
3	Reconvening of panels (where required)	In the event that an inconsistent application of assessment standards is identified, panels may be reconvened to review their assessments.	January 2013
4	Moderation Panel reporting	The Moderation Panel reports to the TEC Board on the moderation process.	February 2013

Initial Moderation Panel Meeting

Purpose

The purpose of the initial Moderation Panel meeting is to create an environment in which the judgements of the panel are based on the consistent application of principles and standards across all the panels, while at the same time not reducing the individual panel judgements to a mechanistic application of the assessment criteria.

Participants

The participants in the meeting are:

- The Principal Moderator and the two Deputy Moderators
- The Chairs of each peer review panel and the Chairs of the two expert advisory groups
- The Moderation Panel Secretariat.

What happens prior to the meeting

Prior to the meeting the Moderation Panel Secretariat will prepare:

- A review of the status of the EPs for each of the panels
- An analysis of the preparatory and preliminary scores generated by panel members, to identify any patterns of average scores or any distribution of Quality Categories that might suggest the potential for, or risk of, systematic bias or error in assessing EPs (these scores will be analysed by panel, subject area, TEO, and academic unit)
- An analysis of the standard deviations, standard errors, and box and whisker diagrams outlining the spread of results at each of the levels
- An analysis of the application of the special circumstances provisions and the assessment of new and emerging researchers
- An analysis of the results of any cross-referrals
- A comparison of the Quality Categories assigned in 2003 and 2006 against the Indicative Quality Categories arising out of the preparatory and preliminary scores assigned by panel members.

What happens at the meeting

The main activities for the initial Moderation Panel meeting are:

- Reviewing the preparatory and preliminary results of the data checking and verification processes conducted by the TEC
- Identifying any patterns or variations in the preparatory and preliminary scores across the panels that might indicate potential bias, error, or the inconsistent application of assessment criteria
- Discussing any particular issues that have emerged for members of the panels that might impact on the consistent application of standards
- Agreeing to consistent approaches to issues that have been identified as being capable of compromising the integrity and consistency of the PBRF standards – for example, the consistent and appropriate treatment of special circumstances, new and emerging researchers, applied and practice-based research, use of specialist advice, handling of confidential outputs, or the approach to the assessment of unusual or uncommon types of research outputs.

Outcomes of the meeting

As a result of the meeting, the Chair of each panel will, with assistance from their secretariat, be in a position to:

- Promote the principles of consistency
- Ensure adherence to agreed procedures and standards
- Identify areas of potential risk
- Communicate to panel members the Moderation Panel's agreed approach to any identified issues.

Information supplied to panels	The Moderation Panel will provide any background information considered necessary to assist panel members in understanding the nature and impact of any issues that have been identified as being capable of compromising the integrity and consistency of the PBRF standards.

Second Moderation Panel Meeting

Purpose	The purpose of the second Moderation Panel meeting is to provide an independent review of the standards that have been applied by panels in the assignment of Quality Categories to EPs.
Participants	The participants in the meeting are: - The Principal Moderator and the two Deputy Moderators - The Chair of each peer review panel and the Chair of the two expert advisory groups The Moderation Panel Secretariat.
What happens prior to the meeting	Prior to the meeting, the Moderation Panel Secretariat will prepare an analysis of the Quality Categories agreed within each panel and across all panels.
What happens at the meeting	The second Moderation Panel meeting will involve an independent review of cross-panel consistency. The Chair of each panel will briefly present their draft panel report, which may include comment on the practices of panel members, the panel process, and any issues that arose during the review process. The Moderation Panel will consider: - Whether there is evidence to suggest that the assessment system has not been applied according to the relevant guidelines - Whether the pattern of Quality Category profiles generated by each panel appears credible and justified. - Where there are possible material inconsistencies and/or an inadequate explanation of recommendations, the Moderation Panel will ask the panel(s) concerned to review the Quality Categories they have assigned to their EPs, and/or provide further explanation of them.

Main areas of focus

It is not expected that there will be uniformity of results or that panels, subject areas, or TEOs will have similar profiles of Quality Categories. Instead, the Moderation Panel will focus on:

- Any 'outlier' results in respect of subject areas, TEOs or panels
- The extent to which panels have departed from, or confirmed, the quality profiles generated from the preparatory and preliminary scores
- A comparison of the 2012 aggregate Quality Categories profile and distribution against the 2003 and 2006 aggregate profile and distribution
- The adequacy of the panels' reporting and explanations of their Quality Category recommendations.

The Moderation Panel will not direct

The Moderation Panel will not direct any panel as to what Final Quality Categories might be assigned. The final decision on Quality Categories is a matter for each panel's judgement.

Reconvening of Panels

Purpose

Where a panel has been required to undertake a review of their recommendations, it may need to be reconvened (by video/teleconference wherever possible). This is to address any material differences or apparent inconsistencies in standards, without having to physically reconvene the panel.

Participants

The participants in any such reconvening are:

- The Chair and members of the panel required to review its recommendations
- The Principal Moderator, the Deputy Moderators and/or a Chair of another panel
- The secretariat for that panel and the Moderation Panel Secretariat.

Before the panel reconvenes

Prior to reconvening, the Moderation Panel will provide direction on the matters to be considered and how these should be addressed.

Following the reconvening

Following any such reconvening, the Chair of the panel will be required to report in writing to the Principal Moderator:

- The reasons for the Moderation Panel's request for the review
- The outcomes of the panel's reconsideration, with explicit listing of any amendments resulting from that review
- A commentary justifying the outcome (ie. any amendment to, or confirmation of, their original recommendations).

This report will be required in time for the Moderation Panel to prepare its own report to the TEC Board, and the information should also be included in the panel's own report to the TEC Board.

Moderation Panel Reporting

Purpose

The purpose of Moderation Panel reporting is to advise the TEC Board on the consistent application of principles and standards within and across panels. This report is intended to provide additional confidence in the recommendations presented to the TEC Board by each of the panels.

Inputs

Inputs to the Moderation Panel's report to the TEC Board include:

- Panel reports to the TEC Board
- Additional reports from the Chairs of panels that were asked to review their recommendations
- Relevant benchmarking information.

Key issues

The key material to be included in the Moderation Panel's report includes:

- The extent to which the Moderation Panel is satisfied that the assessment standards have been applied on a consistent basis
- Brief discussion of the recommendations from each panel, highlighting any issues that the Moderation Panel wishes to comment on and/or provide recommendations on
- Information on the application of assessment standards, particularly on an intertemporal basis, and in relation to the application of the special circumstances provisions and the assessment of new and emerging researchers
- Any areas where refinement of the Quality Evaluation might be required
- A commentary on the overall Quality Evaluation process, highlighting issues that may impact on consistency across some or all panels
- A commentary from the moderators addressing any matters of particular significance.