Appendix 1

## Guidelines for preparing the ResearcH Section of the Self-Review Portfolio

## 

The following considerations should inform the research section of programme or departmental **self-review portfolios** (or theSRPs of research groupings), although units under review may use their own discretion in the final structure of the SRP:

**THREE-YEAR REVIEWS**

**Descriptive Information**

* Describe the nature of the research activities undertaken in the research grouping under review. Outline the key focus areas and quantify their associated research outputs. Outline any structures or processes that exist to coordinate the research activities and enable collaboration.
* Explain the mechanisms and practices for promoting research and sustaining and developing an active and vital research culture in the research grouping under review.
* Describe the nature and quality of the research infrastructure, including facilities for research students.
* Provide a statement about the main objectives and activities in research over the next five years. The panel’s attention should be drawn to ongoing research work that is not producing immediate visible outcomes.

**FIVE-YEAR REVIEWS**

**Descriptive Information**

* Describe the nature of the research activities undertaken in the research grouping under review. Outline the key focus areas and quantify their associated research outputs. Outline any structures or processes that exist to coordinate the research activities and enable collaboration.
* Explain the mechanisms and practices for promoting research and sustaining and developing an active and vital research culture in the research grouping under review.
* Describe the nature and quality of the research infrastructure, including facilities for research students.
* Describe any arrangements that are in place for supporting interdisciplinary or collaborative research.
* Provide information on relationships with industry and commerce or other research users and, where appropriate, the account taken of national policy initiatives and objectives.
* Describe the arrangements for the development and support of the research work of staff.
* Describe any arrangements for developing younger and / or new researchers and for integrating them into a wider, supportive research culture.
* Provide a statement about the main objectives and activities in research over the next five years. The panel’s attention should be drawn to ongoing research work that is not producing immediate visible outcomes.

## Questions on quality of research output

* What counts as ‘research output’ in the context of this research grouping’s review? (Books, journals, patents, reports, materials, images, devices, performances etc.)
* What self-defined goals and criteria have been established for the research activities of this research grouping’s review?
* What measures of quality are applicable in your context (and what debates typically attend these measures)?
* How does your research grouping’s output fare in terms of these goals, criteria and measures?
* What conditions contribute to your current output profile?
* What initiatives are underway, or are planned, to further strengthen the quality of your output in terms of these measures?

## Questions on the development of research capacity

* What developmental goals does this research grouping have for future research projects or directions?
* What is the current profile of researchers in this research grouping in terms of qualifications and track record?
* What goals does this research grouping have in terms of this profile (e.g. succession planning, capacity gaps, equity issues etc.), and how are these related to broader institutional or national goals?
* What initiatives are underway, or are planned, to address the capacity developmental goals of the research grouping?
* What conditions currently support or frustrate the rollout of capacity development initiatives?
* Is there a succession plan in place?

**NOTE:** In cases where there is not much critical mass and the existence of a unit depends on the research interest of the director, it is acceptable not to have a succession plan in place, on condition that the relevant Faculty accepts that the unit will be de-credited when the leadership retires or leaves the institution.

Research groupings under review may want to comment on how they fare in terms of a combination of the following evaluation criteria, which are based on existing practice as well as on international examples of good practice. We acknowledge that the following approaches may not be universally applicable and that considerable debate exists over the use of these measures.

It would be important for research groupings under review to show how they are taking these debates forward in their own context of research:

* Quality of journal publications and other research outputs using appropriate international mechanisms of measure;
* Social impact of the research and how this is measured / evaluated.
* Promotion of engaged scholarship as it relates to research, and ways in which this is embedded in collaboration and postgraduate training.
* Quantitative assessment to measure the number of research outputs as with the DHET system for subsidy purposes;
* NRF rating of academics, across all disciplines;
* Level of collaborative work, nationally and internationally;
* Level of relationship established through research with industry, civil society and government departments;
* The critical mass of researchers, postgraduates and postdoctoral fellows within a specific research field;
* Income generated through appropriately-costed contracts; and
* Internal and external funding