

The use of Quantitative Indicators in Research Evaluation

Policy on the use of Quantitative Indicators in Research Evaluation			
Version No.	V1.1	Policy Owner	Professor Simon Hodgson
Superseded version	V1.0	Author Role Title	PVC (Research and Innovation)
Approval Date	24 October 2018	Approved by	Academic Board
Effective Date	1 November 2018	Review Date	1 May 2019

The use of Quantitative Indicators in Research Evaluation	Page Number
1. Introduction	3
2. Purpose	3
3. Scope	4
4. Policy Statement	4
5. Roles and Responsibilities	5

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Teesside University signed up to [the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment](#) (DORA) in December (2017) to demonstrate its commitment to the fair evaluation of research performance. It also supports the principles outlined in the [Leiden Manifesto](#) and the [Metric Tide](#) report.
- 1.2 DORA is a set of recommendations for improving the way research is assessed targeted at: research funders, academic institutions, publishers, organisations that provide research data and individuals.
- 1.3 In particular DORA seeks to address the practice of equating the Journal Impact Factor (JIF) of the journal in which an article may appear with the quality of the article, or a researcher's contributions. The JIF was originally a mechanism used by librarians to support the procurement of journals and is not appropriate to evaluate the quality of research articles.
- 1.4 Since the publication of DORA (2013) other frameworks have emerged in relation to the use of quantitative research indicators in the assessment and management of research. These are the Leiden Manifesto (2015) and The Metric Tide Report (2015).
- 1.6 In 2017 The Forum for Responsible Metrics (FFRM) – a partnership between HEFCE (now Research England), Research Councils UK, the Wellcome Trust, Universities UK and JISC - was established to develop a programme of activities to support the responsible use of metrics in higher education institutions and research organisations across the UK. Although the FFRM focuses on the recommendations made in the Metric Tide Report it supports the principles in set out in both Leiden and DORA.
- 1.7 In signing up to the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment Teesside University acknowledges the damaging effects research indicators used in isolation can have on academic careers and pledges to support the responsible use of research indicators.

2. Purpose

This policy sets out Teesside University's position on the use of quantitative research indicators to evaluate research performance, provides guiding principles on the institutional approach to using such indicators and an action plan to embed these principles.

The University has reviewed the recommendations for institutions and researchers set out in DORA, The Leiden Manifesto and The Metric Tide to create the principles set

out in this policy on the use of research indicators in research evaluation. An implementation plan to embed the principles set out in this policy is at appendix 1.

3. Scope

The guidance in this document applies to academic staff, research staff, postgraduate research students and professional staff supporting the evaluation of research activities (DAE, FCM, SLS, HR and RIS).

Using research indicators responsibly will impact on the ways in which staff in Schools and Services capture and use data to evaluate the quality of research for the purposes of recruitment, promotion, appraisal and research assessment exercises.

The guidance sets out to modify behaviours of academic staff, research staff and postgraduate research students using research indicators to evaluate the research quality of themselves and others.

4 Policy Statement

- 4.1 Teesside University recognises the contribution that appropriate quantitative indicators can make to the evaluation of research quality when used alongside qualitative indicators and expert opinion.
- 4.2 The University will support staff using research data (including academic, research and professional staff) to understand the appropriate use and limitations of research indicators.
- 4.3 The University is committed to managing data in an open and transparent way, to improving its research information infrastructure and encouraging its researchers to self-verify their data and obtain an ORCID ID.
- 4.4 When utilising research indicators to inform decisions on recruitment, promotion and assessment the University and its staff will specify the criteria used for selecting those indicators.
- 4.5 Teesside University will work with the sector to explore, develop and share best practice in relation to the responsible use of research indicators and new approaches to evaluating research.
- 4.6 Researchers at Teesside University will be expected to uphold the highest standards of research integrity, including acknowledging the contributions of others and citing original research.

4.7 Researchers at Teesside University will be encouraged to use research indicators responsibly including in their own CVs and personal statements.

5 Roles and responsibilities

5.1 The PVC (Research and Innovation), Deans, Directors and Associate Deans (Research and Innovation) are responsible for disseminating this policy and raising awareness of staff and PGR students through discussion and debate.

5.2 An action plan, managed by the PVC (Research and Innovation), setting out responsibilities and detailing how the principles set out in this policy will be embedded in Schools and Services is included at appendix 1.

Appendix 1: Implementation plan to embed the responsible use of research indicators

	Action	Deadline	Responsibility
Awareness raising and impact monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publish University policy on research evaluation and the use of research indicators 	Nov 2018	PVC (R&I)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicate the research evaluation policy to staff through web pages and University Update, all staff briefings, the Professoriate, research staff training events, research induction and other research fora. 	Dec 2018	PVC (R&I)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicate the research evaluation policy to an external audience through the web site, academic fora, and through professional sector networks (SCONUL, ARMA, CIPD) 	Dec 2018	PVC (R&I)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with the Athena Swan SAT to analyse recruitment and promotions data and monitor any changes in the representativeness of staff within disciplines and at all career levels following changes to recruitment/promotions processes. 	Jun 2019	HR Director
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver researcher development programme on the uses and limitations of research indicators. 	Oct 2018	RIS Director
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embed the responsible use of metrics in the researcher development programmes for publication and research integrity. 	Oct 2018	RIS Director
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embed training on the responsible use of research indicators in researcher evaluation in the research leadership programme. 	Oct 2018	RIS Director
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable staff to access training and resources on the use and management of research data. 	Oct 2019	RIS Director
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver an internal communications campaign to promote ORCID ID 	June 2019	SLS Director
Open and transparent evaluation processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop selection processes for REF outputs combining quantitative (where appropriate) and qualitative data with expert opinion. 	Jun 2019	PVC (R&I)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify the criteria to select REF outputs in the Code of Practice. 	Jun 2019	PVC (R&I)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change recruitment practices including allowing candidates to select and describe the significance of a select number of research outputs, the wider societal impact of their research and their five-year research aspirations and plans. 	July 2019	HR Director
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update the promotions process to specify and justify which quantitative indicators will be used and ensure that these data are available to individual academic staff via the PURE system. 	Dec 2019	HR Director & RIS Director
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide research CV templates that combine five year aspirational plans with selected research outputs via the PURE system. 	Dec 2019	RIS Director
Robust data and systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement PURE and Unit 4 research finance systems 	Jan 2019	Finance Director
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify the research data requirements of the University and agree the use of consistent definitions 	Jan 2019	RIS Director
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build opportunities for researchers to self-verify data in PURE and provide feedback to data owner. 	July 2019	RIS Director