

Annex A

Review of research assessment: response form

Please complete and return as a Word attachment to an e-mail, to responses@ra-review.ac.uk. The deadline for responses is 30 September 2003.

Response by (name of person or organisation):.....

Corporate response (representing the views of the group or organisation): Yes/No

Private response (representing the views of one or more individuals): Yes/No

Contact in case of queries:

Name:

Tel:

e-mail:.....

Recommendation 1 (see paragraphs 113-116 of the review)

Any system of research assessment designed to identify the best research must be based upon the judgement of experts who may, if they choose, employ performance indicators to inform their judgement.

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 1? Place a cross beside the appropriate answer:

- Strongly agree ...
- Agree ...
- Neither agree nor disagree ...
- Disagree ...
- Strongly disagree ...

Comments on recommendation 1:

Recommendation 2 (see paragraphs 117-126 of the review)

- a. There should be a six-year cycle.
- b. There should be a light-touch 'mid-point monitoring'. This would be designed only to highlight significant changes in the volume of activity in each unit.
- c. The next assessment process should take place in 2007-8.

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 2? Please indicate your views using the grid below:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Point a					
Point b					
Point c					

Comments on recommendation 2:

Recommendation 3 (see paragraphs 127-133 of the review)

- a. There should be an institution-level assessment of research competences, undertaken approximately two years before the main assessment.
- b. The competences to be assessed should be institutional research strategy, development of researchers, equal opportunities, and dissemination beyond the peer group.
- c. An institution failing its assessment against any one of the competencies would be allowed to enter the next research assessment but would not receive funding on the basis of its performance in that assessment until it had demonstrated a satisfactory performance.

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 3? Please indicate your views using the grid below:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Point a					
Point b					
Point c					

Comments on recommendation 3:

Recommendation 4 (see paragraphs 134-155 of the review)

- a. There should, in principle, be a multi-track assessment enabling the intensiveness of the assessment activity (and potentially the degree of risk) to be proportionate to the likely benefit.
- b. The least research intensive institutions should be considered separately from the remainder of the HE sector.
- c. The form of the assessment of the least research intensive institutions would be a matter for the relevant funding council.
- d. The less competitive work in the remainder of institutions should be assessed by proxy measures against a threshold standard.
- e. The most competitive work should be assessed using an expert review assessment similar to the old Research Assessment Exercise.

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 4? Please indicate your views using the grid below:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Point a					
Point b					
Point c					
Point d					
Point e					

Comments on recommendation 4:

Recommendation 5 (see paragraphs 156-171 of the review)

- a. The output of the Research Quality Assessment should be a 'quality profile' indicating the quantum of 'one star', 'two star' and 'three star' research in each submission. It will not be the role of the assessment to reduce this profile to summary metrics or grades.
- b. As a matter of principle, star ratings would not be given to named individuals, nor would the profile be published if the submission were sufficiently small that individual performance could be inferred from it.
- c. Panels would be given guidelines on expected proportions of three star, two star and one star ratings. These proportions should normally be the same for each unit of assessment. If a panel awarded grades which were more or less generous than anticipated in the guidelines, these grades would have to be confirmed through moderation.¹

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 5? Please indicate your views using the grid below:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Point a					
Point b					
Point c					

Comments on recommendation 5:

¹ This consultation question reflects an edited version of recommendation 5. The recommendation in the review report also states that 'the funding councils should provide institutions with details of the relative value, in funding terms, of one star, two star, and three star research, and of research fundable through the Research Capacity Assessment in advance of the assessment. These ratios might vary between disciplines.' In the event that the review recommendations are accepted, each funding council will develop its own policies for reflecting the assessment results in funding, taking proper account of Sir Gareth's recommendation.

Recommendation 6 (see paragraphs 172-197 of the review)

- a. There should be between 20 and 25 units of assessment panels supported by around 60 sub-panels. Panels and sub-panels should be supported by colleges of assessors with experience of working in designated multidisciplinary ‘thematic’ areas.
- b. Each panel should have a chair and a moderator. The role of the moderator would be to ensure consistency of practice across the sub-panels within the unit of assessment.
- c. Each panel should include a number of non-UK based researchers with experience of the UK research system.
- d. The moderators of adjacent panels should meet in five or six ‘super-panels’ whose role would be to ensure consistency of practice between panels. These ‘super-panels’ should be chaired by senior moderators who would be individuals with extensive experience in research.

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 6? Please indicate your views using the grid below:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Point a					
Point b					
Point c					
Point d					

Comments on recommendation 6:

Recommendation 7 (see paragraphs 198-204 of the review)

- a. The rule that each researcher may only submit up to four items of research output should be abolished. Research Quality Assessment panels should have the freedom to define their own limits on the number and/or size of research outputs associated with each researcher or group.
- b. Research Quality Assessment panels should ensure that their criteria statements enable them to guarantee that practice-based and applicable research are assessed according to criteria which reflect the characteristics of excellence in those types of research in those disciplines.

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 7? Please indicate your views using the grid below:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Point a					
Point b					

Comments on recommendation 7:

Recommendation 8 (see paragraphs 205-213 of the review)

- a. The funding councils should work alongside the subject communities and the research councils to develop discipline-specific performance indicators.
- b. Performance against these indicators should be calculated a year prior to the exercise, and institutions advised of their performance relative to other institutions.
- c. The weight placed upon these indicators as well as their nature should be allowed to vary between panels.

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 8? Please indicate your views using the grid below:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Point a					
Point b					
Point c					

Comments on recommendation 8:

Recommendation 9 (see paragraphs 214-234 of the review)

- a. Where an institution submits to Research Quality Assessment in a sub-unit of assessment all staff in that sub-unit should become ineligible for the Research Capacity Assessment, even if they are not included in the Research Quality Assessment submission.
- b. The funding councils should establish and promote a facility for work to be submitted as the output of a group rather than an individual where appropriate.
- c. The funding councils should consider what measures could be taken to make joint submission more straightforward for institutions.
- d. Where an institution submits a sub-unit of assessment for Research Quality Assessment, no fewer than 80% of the qualified staff contracted to undertake research within the sub-unit of assessment must be included in the submission.
- e. All staff eligible to apply for grants from the research councils should be eligible for submission to Research Quality Assessment.

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 9? Please indicate your views using the grid below:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Point a					
Point b					
Point c					
Point d					
Point e					

Comments on recommendation 9:

Recommendation 10 (see paragraphs 235-238 of the review)

Each panel should consider a research strategy statement outlining the institution's plans for research at unit level.

Do you agree or disagree with recommendation 10? Place a cross beside the appropriate answer:

- Strongly agree ...
- Agree ...
- Neither agree nor disagree ...
- Disagree ...
- Strongly disagree ...

Comments on recommendation 10:

Question 13 Equality of opportunity for all groups of staff

The funding councils wish to promote equality of opportunity for all staff regardless of age, sexual orientation, political belief, disability, gender, race or religion and seek to ensure that its research assessment policies are compatible with this objective. How successful do you consider that the proposals of the research assessment review are in this respect? Place a cross by the appropriate answer:

- Very successful ...
- Successful ...
- Neither successful nor unsuccessful ...
- Unsuccessful ...
- Very unsuccessful ...

Comments on question 13 – equality of opportunity for all groups of staff:

Question 15 Further comments

Question 15 – any further comments: