



Tertiary Education Commission
Te Amorangi Mātauranga Matua

Performance-Based Research Fund

Humanities and Law 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 areas of Humanities and Law and do not replace or supersede the requirements for EPs that are set out in the *PBRF Quality Evaluation Guidelines 2012*.

The Humanities and Law 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.

Humanities and Law panel-specific guidelines

Description of panel coverage

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

English language and literature

Foreign languages and linguistics

Foreign languages and linguistics includes foreign languages, literatures and cultures, English for speakers of other languages, translating and interpreting, applied linguistics and linguistics.

History, history of art, classics and curatorial studies

Law

Law includes business and commercial law, constitutional law, administrative law, human rights law, Treaty of Waitangi law, criminal law, family law, international law, environmental law, jurisprudence, legal practice and justice administration.

Philosophy

Religious studies and theology

It should be noted that, in relation to area studies, women's studies, cultural studies, gender studies, media studies, and other multidisciplinary studies, the Humanities and Law Panel will consider EPs that are primarily concerned with research outputs generated out of humanities or law paradigms.

Cross Referrals

It is expected that most cross-referrals will be with the following panels: Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Studies; Māori Knowledge and Development; Mathematical and Information Systems and Technology; and Creative and Performing Arts.

It is recognised that a small number of staff members will have research outputs that require expert advice from outside the scope of the panel membership and/or that may need to be considered by one of the two Expert Advisory Groups.

Expectations for standard of evidence to be supplied

It is expected that, for the majority of disciplines covered by the Humanities and Law Panel, most research outputs submitted will be quality-assured. Quality assurance will include peer-review for journals, referee reports for books and conference papers, and other equivalent quality-assurance processes. If a non-standard quality-assurance process has been used, e.g. in relation to practice-based research outputs (such as a commissioned report) or creative

research outputs (such as a film, video or exhibition), staff members are expected to explain in the Description field precisely how quality has been assured for the NRO.

The Humanities and Law Panel will use the same standard of evidence to assess all types of research output. That is, it will consider the extent to which the research:

- is recognised as being of high quality,
- is original, representing an intellectual advance or a significant contribution to knowledge,
- exhibits intellectual and methodological rigour and coherence,
- demonstrates intellectual and/or disciplinary impact, and/or
- demonstrates impact in the wider community, e.g. through influencing the direction of policy or practice.

The scope of these criteria may overlap. The list does not imply any particular rank order, although overall research quality will be the critical factor.

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

Elaboration of the definition of Research

Where any Nominated Research Output (NRO) results from media production, professional practice or consultancy, the staff member should clearly indicate its research character and content in the "Description" field.

Routine professional practice in law does not fall into the PBRF Definition of Research. It is recognised that analysis derived in the course of professional practice may contribute to or constitute research outputs (e.g. an influential and original opinion or submission).

Routine professional practice in language teaching does not fall within the PBRF Definition of Research. Research-based commentary on language teaching and pedagogy, as well as research-based curricula and products, may fall within the Definition of Research.

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

Types of research output

Research outputs generated by staff members in Humanities and Law are diverse. The most common types of output are likely to be journal articles, books, and book chapters.

Research outputs may also include:

- Bibliographies
- Catalogues
- Exhibitions
- Critical commentaries
- Multimedia presentations
- Reviews, including book reviews that meet the PBRF Definition of Research (see above) and do not fall within its exclusion definitions – but note that book reviews are not articles and should not be presented as such
- Review articles
- Translations, where these contain significant editorial work in the nature of research
- Dictionaries and encyclopaedia articles that meet the PBRF Definition of Research
- Textbooks or loose leaves that meet the PBRF Definition of Research
- Other types of research output such as electronic and web-based publications, film and video, and non-print research outputs.

It is recognised that in law, textbooks can be important forms of research. Where a legal textbook has offered a new paradigm to explain a body of well-known existing case law, this should be made clear in the “Description” field. A new paradigm is distinct from a new exposition of known and established law, and the commentary should specifically address this distinction. Where a new paradigm is claimed in respect of parts only of a legal textbook, those parts should be clearly identified by page or chapter references. Similar specific referencing and commentary is required when the claim is made in respect of a new edition, or the updating or adaptation of an existing text.

NROs that are non-print-based need to be made available to the panel (if requested) in an alternative form that provides adequate documentation for an assessment to be made.

If a book published on the occasion of an exhibition is a major stand-alone publication in its own right with a shelf-life longer than the exhibition, the book may be considered a separate output and be submitted as an authored (or edited) book. If this is the case, the researcher should indicate at the end of the exhibition entry that: ‘This exhibition was complemented by [book title]’. At the end of the authored book/edited volume entry, a phrase such as: ‘This book was published on the occasion of [exhibition title]’ should

be included.

With regard to research outputs for languages, it should be noted that, although language teaching materials would not normally be included in the Definition of Research, some such materials could conform to the research definition where they are original and generated out of research. Where outputs such as language curriculum design, or new or substantially improved teaching materials, devices, products or processes are presented as research outputs, staff members should demonstrate that those materials meet the PBRF Definition of Research.

The following types of research outputs should not be presented as NROs when they appear in substantially the same form as the original:

- Foreign language versions of work originally published in English
- English language versions of work originally published in a foreign language
- Second or later editions of a work.

TEOs should note that all research outputs included in EPs must be consistent with the PBRF Definition of Research, as set out in the *PBRF Quality Evaluation Guidelines 2012*, 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 Pacific Research and the Professional and Applied Research 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 Humanities and Law Panel understands that there may be some variation in the number of research outputs in any given period across disciplines and sub-disciplines, and will look for evidence of consistent engagement and a steady programme of research and publication during the assessment period.

Special circumstances

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

Definitions of Quality Categories

The general Guidelines apply (see Chapter 3, Section A: What do the Quality Categories Mean? and Chapter 3, Section C: Assessing and Scoring the Three Components of an EP).

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

Non-standard research outputs will be assessed using the same criteria as standard research outputs.

Non-quality-assured research outputs

Non-quality-assured research outputs are eligible for inclusion in EPs and will be assessed by the same criteria as quality-assured research outputs (see general Guidelines Chapter 2, Section C: Quality-Assured and Non-Quality-Assured Research Outputs).

Jointly produced research outputs

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.

Proportions of Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) to be examined¹

It is intended that the Humanities and Law Panel will examine at least 50% of NROs in each EP submitted to it.

Use of specialist advisers

Specialist advisers will be used:

- to assist in assessing NROs wholly or partially in a language that is inaccessible to panel members
- to assist in assessing NROs that require specialist knowledge additional to that of panel members.

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

The general Guidelines apply (see general Guidelines, Chapter 3, Section C: Scoring the RO Component and Scoring an EP: Allocating Points for Research Outputs).

Tie-point 6

Research outputs that deal with topics or themes of primarily local, regional or national focus or interest can be of world-class standard if they exhibit the characteristics stated in the generic guidelines. Such works will be of the highest quality in their theoretical

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.

approach and sophistication, in their evidence or material base and use of that evidence or material, in argument, originality and presentation or creativity.

Tie-point 4

The general Guidelines apply (see Chapter 3, Section C: Scoring an EP: Allocating Points for Research Outputs).

Tie-point 2

It would be exceptional to reach this level without quality-assured research outputs.

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

The PE component descriptor

The general Guidelines apply (see Chapter 3, Section C: Scoring an EP: Allocating Points for Peer Esteem).

Tie points

The general Guidelines apply (see Chapter 3, Section C: Scoring an EP: Allocating Points for Peer Esteem).

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

The CRE component descriptor

The Humanities and Law Panel recognises that a number of activities contribute to the research environment in humanities and law, including: translations; significant language teaching materials; academic writing and commentaries on existing works and research; book reviews; reading manuscripts; membership of editorial boards; refereeing and reviewing; assessing research grant applications; external examining of theses; leadership in conference planning; hosting department colloquia; research-related collegial activities.

In addition to the mentoring of students referred to in the general Guidelines (see Chapter 3, Section C: Scoring an EP: Allocating Points for Contribution to the Research Environment) the panel recognises that contribution to the research environment involves the support of honours and honours-equivalent students, particularly in law.

Tie-points

The general Guidelines apply (see Chapter 3, Section C: Scoring an EP: Allocating Points for Contribution to the Research Environment).