Publication Strategies

A workshop for research staff and postgraduate research students

8 May 2014, 10:00-12:00 in Stoddart-7140

This workshop aims to encourage researchers to take a strategic approach to planning their research, focusing long-term with particular reference to the new REF cycle. In particular it will:

- Set out the requirements for inclusion in the REF
- Explain and illustrate the different REF quality levels
- Advise on effective publishing
- Explore the particular circumstances of publishing within a contract research environment
- Discuss the development of personal publication strategies
- Cover practical matters such as authorship criteria and open access requirements

It is anticipated that, following REF 2014, Quality Related (QR) funding will no longer be distributed to research graded at 2*. Sheffield Hallam opted to use a minimum 2.5* as the quality threshold for outputs to be submitted by the University. This resulted in a 20% decline in the number of staff submitted compared to RAE 2008 when the threshold was lower.

The University intends to at least sustain the size of its REF pool for REF 2020, even in the face of increasing competition across the sector. This will require long-term strategising and investment in talent across the institution.

This session is the second of a 'Focus 2020' series, looking at long-term planning for the 2014-20 REF cycle. The final workshop will be on the topic of Research Impact.

Who should attend?

The workshop is aimed at research staff and postgraduate research students (PGRs). It will be suitable for researchers from all disciplines and all levels of experience.

The workshop’s programme is outlined overleaf

http://shardprogramme.wordpress.com/
**About the speakers**

**Professor Chris Hopkins** is Head of the Humanities Research Centre (HRC). He was Unit of Assessment Co-ordinator for English Language and Literature in REF 2014

**Professor John Leach** is Pro-Vice-Chancellor for the Faculty of Development and Society. He is Deputy Chair of the Education Sub-Panel for REF 2014

**Professor David Robinson** is Director of the Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research (CRESR). He was Unit of Assessment Co-ordinator for Architecture, Built Environment and Planning in REF 2014

**Professor Tom Smith** is Head of the Molecular Microbiology Research Group in the Biomedical Research Centre (BRMC)

**Dr Anita Gurney** is Research Development Manager in the Research and Innovation Office (RIO)

**Dr Keith Fildes** is Researcher Development Adviser in the Research and Innovation Office

**Booking**

Reserve your place at this workshop by going to: [http://shupubstrategies.eventbrite.co.uk](http://shupubstrategies.eventbrite.co.uk).

You do not need to print out the ticket generated through your booking.
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Why Publish?

- Part of the University's charitable mission - creation of new knowledge and understanding for the public benefit

- University research is part of a broad public conversation - responsibility to communicate results as way of advancing fields/subject areas + enhancing society and the economy

- Prestige/reputation of the individual and institution - peer-reviewed publication is how talent is demonstrated and research quality assured

- Career progression. Recruitment - future REF contribution will be very much in recruiters' minds at most HEIs. Promotion - anecdotal threshold: STEM - c.20 papers for grade 9, Arts - 2 monographs

- Revenue - publishing a condition of individual grants + QR/block funding is determined by collective outputs
REF Requirements

Dr Anita Gurney
What is REF?

Overview
- The REF is the new system for assessing the quality of research in UK higher education institutions
- It is undertaken by the four UK higher education funding bodies
- Submissions were made in November 2013
- Results will be announced in December 2014

Purpose
- Produces quality assessments to identify the best research
  - Selectively allocates research funding (QR) to HEIs
  - Demonstrates that investment in research is effective and delivers public benefit
  - Provides benchmarking information and informs league tables
  - Rewards HEIs that deliver benefits to the economy and society
How Does REF Work?

- REF is a process of expert review (academics and users)
- HEIs were invited to make submissions in 36 units of assessment (research areas)
- Research activity in the period 01 Jan 2008 to 31 Dec 2013 is submitted and assessed by an expert panel for each unit of assessment.
- Panels apply a set of generic assessment criteria and level definitions, to produce an overall quality profile for each submission.
- The key criteria is 'research excellence'; only staff who have outputs (i.e. publications) that are of the highest quality are selected for submission.
The Focus of REF

Outputs
65%
Research quality - originality, significance, rigour

Impact
20%
Reach and significance of economic and social impact

Environment
15%
Sustainability and vitality of the research environment

---

Expert review of selected outputs

Narrative and case studies

Narrative & metrics

---

SHU quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4*</th>
<th>3*</th>
<th>2*</th>
<th>1*</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% research

---

Excellence Profile
The key criteria is 'research excellence' - only staff who have outputs that are of the highest quality are selected for submission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality level</th>
<th>Criteria for assessing the quality of outputs - originality, significance and rigour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four star</td>
<td>Quality that is world leading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three star</td>
<td>Quality that is internationally excellent but which falls short of the highest standards of excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two star</td>
<td>Quality that is recognised internationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One star</td>
<td>Quality that is recognised nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Quality that falls below the standard of nationally recognised work or which does not meet the definition of research for REF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"the product of research, defined as a process of investigation leading to new insights effectively shared"

Produced by staff submitted to REF regardless of where employed when the output was published

Quality judged by
- Originality
- Significance
- Rigour

Publication Strategies
Additional Output Information

- **Research process:** Information about the research process or content where this is not evident from the output itself, e.g., for non-text or practice-based outputs.

- **Significance:** Factual information about the significance of the output, e.g., prizes or similar recognition.

- **Contribution:** Contribution of a researcher to a co-authored or co-produced output.

- **Grouping:** Rationale for grouping short items as a single output.

- **Revisions to earlier work:** Statement on how far earlier work published prior to the publication period have been revised to incorporate new material.

- **Outputs not in English:** Statement to describe the nature and content of the work.

- **Double weighted outputs:** Description of the extended scale and scope of the output (e.g., monographs).

- **Citation data:** Provided to selected panels to “inform expert review.”
Staff Inclusion in REF

Code of Practice
- Each HEI was required to apply a Code of Practice on selecting staff to embed the principles of equality and diversity in REF processes and to set out the criteria for staff inclusion

Criteria for inclusion
- **Eligibility:** Academic staff with a contract of employment of 0.2 FTE or greater and whose primary function is to undertake either "research" or "teaching and research"
- **Four research outputs:** staff must have published four research outputs during the REF assessment period (01 Jan 2008 - 31 Dec 2013) subject to individual circumstances
- **Minimum quality threshold:** staff must achieve an estimated minimum mean quality score of 2.5* for their outputs
- **Other factors:** UOAs to take into account panel criteria and range of factors that contribute to the overall quality profile
REF criteria allow for a reduction in research outputs in relation to:

**Clearly defined circumstances**

- Clear period(s) of leave during the REF period (e.g. maternity leave or adoption permits a reduction of one output for each period of leave)
- Part time working, unpaid leave and secondment (e.g. an absence of 12 months permits a reduction of one output)
- Early career researcher - first academic appointment on, or after, 01/08/09 (e.g. ECR after 1 August 2011 permits a reduction of 3 outputs)

**More complex circumstances**

- Allows for disruption to research of an ongoing or sporadic nature during the REF period due to an equality related reason (e.g. caring responsibilities, illness)
Output Submission Statistics

830 Outputs submitted across 11 units of assessment

83 (33%) Staff submitted with individual circumstances

3 Outputs on average submitted per member of staff (range from 1-4)

- Books
- Journal articles
- Physical artefacts
- Exhibitions
- Other
- Digital
Research Areas of Strength

Materials & Engineering

Health

Policy

Art & Design

Sport and Leisure

Humanities

Communication & Computing

Business

Education
### Units of Assessment at SHU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF 2014 Unit of Assessment</th>
<th>Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Metallurgy and Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Architecture, Built Environment and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Business and Management Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sport and Exercise Sciences, Leisure and Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>English Language and Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Communication, Cultural and Media Studies, Library and Information management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Assessment Exercise?

- HEFCE have indicated that there will be a future assessment exercise - REF 2020?
- Publication period is likely to run from 01 January 2014 - 31 December 2019
- Expect UOAs to remain broadly similar - work with the UOA Coordinator for your area
- Expect staff circumstances tariffs to remain
- There may be a need to increase the SHU quality thresholds for outputs to 3* - HEFCE funding policy will be monitored
- Citation data may be increasingly important for STEM subjects - choose journals wisely to reach target audience and deposit in SHU Research Repository
- New HEFCE Open Access policy will affect publication practice and behaviour - comes into effect on 1 April 2016 for journal articles and ISSN conference proceedings
Quality as Judged in the REF

Professor John Leach
www.ref.ac.uk
The REF is...

A funding allocation exercise.

Dual support:

- Government money for research allocated through RCUK grants

- 'QR' income to universities which is allocated through the REF
Peer review, not bibliometrics

- 4 main panels overseeing 36 sub-panels.
- Main panel Chairs are senior researchers and academic leaders.
- Main panel membership is the Chair plus each sub-panel Chair.
- Sub-panel Chairs appointed through a process of application.
- Sub-panel members are senior researchers nominated via academic and learned societies across the disciplines/fields.
- Users of research nominated through organisations that make use of publicly-funded research (e.g. research leads for charities).
4 REF Main and Sub-panels

PANEL A

1. Clinical Medicine
2. Public Health, Health Services and Primary Care
3. Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy
4. Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience
5. Biological Sciences
6. Agriculture, Veterinary and Food Science
MAIN PANEL B

7. Earth systems and environmental sciences
8. Chemistry
9. Physics
10. Mathematical Sciences
11. Computer Science and Informatics
12. Aeronautical, mechanical, chemical and manufacturing engineering
13. Electrical and electronic engineering, metallurgy and materials
14. Civil and construction engineering
15. General engineering
MAIN PANEL C

16. Architecture, built environment and planning
17. Geography, environmental studies and archaeology
18. Economics and econometrics
19. Business and management studies
20. Law
21. Politics and international studies
22. Social work and social policy
23. Sociology
24. Anthropology and development studies
25. Education
26. Sport and exercise sciences, leisure and tourism
MAIN PANEL D

27. Area studies
28. Modern languages and linguistics
29. English language and literature
30. History
31. Classics
32. Philosophy
33. Theology and religious studies
34. Art and design: history, practice and theory
35. Music, drama, dance and performing arts
36. Communication, cultural and media studies, library and information management
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submissions</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Main Panel A</th>
<th>Main Panel B</th>
<th>Main Panel C</th>
<th>Main Panel D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REF: Number of submissions</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAE: Number of submissions</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality judged in terms of:

- academic quality

- impact
Quality definitions (overall quality profile)

- **4* -** Quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour
- **3* -** Quality that is internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour but which falls short of the highest standards of excellence
- **2* -** Quality that is recognised internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour
- **1* -** Quality that is recognised nationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour
- **u/c -** Quality that falls below the standard of nationally recognised work. Or work which does not meet the published definition of research for the purpose of the assessment.
Quality Profile drives funding allocation

Overall quality profile
4* 3* 2* 1* u/c

Outputs
4* 3* 2* 1* u/c
65%

Impact
4* 3* 2* 1* u/c
20%

Environment
4* 3* 2* 1* u/c
15%
## RAE 2008 outcomes (%): Art and Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4*</th>
<th>3*</th>
<th>2*</th>
<th>1*</th>
<th>u/c</th>
<th>n= (fte)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHU</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality of outputs

ORIGINALITY

SIGNIFICANCE

RIGOUR
What is an 'output'? Indicators of quality?

- Research based book?
- Textbook?
- Refereed journal paper?
- On-line journal?
- Conference proceedings (refereed/not refereed)?:
- Invited book chapter?
- End-of-project report for a piece of contract research?
- Piece of sculpture?
- Dataset?
- Length? Funding source? Russell Group? Famous lead author?
- Does the place of publication matter (e.g. journal impact factor)?
- Does citation count matter?
- Has (insert Govt. minister of choice) quoted this work?

CHECK YOUR SUB-PANEL CRITERIA!
Improve the quality of your publication profile

Ask yourself:

- Do I have a writing plan for the next 3 years? Does it integrate conference writing and other writing?
- Is this chapter invitation the best outlet for my work?
- How can I turn a conference paper into a high-quality research output? *Hint: you should do this before writing your next conference paper!*
- How is it best to 'slice' a project into published outputs? *(Salami-slicing...)*
- Am I really seeking out and listening to critical feedback from people with experience?
- If I was sent this paper to referee for (insert journal name here) - would I recommend publication?
Publishing to Maximise REF Outputs

Professor Tom Smith
Identifying the Right Journal

- Highest achievable impact factor (IF)/ranking in the field
- Journal standing commensurate with the study
- One that will accept my article!

Guidance from:
- Your own knowledge
- Journal scope and editorial policies (on-line)
- Colleagues in SHU and elsewhere - especially people who have published in your target journals
- Web of Knowledge and Scopus

http://www.scopus.com/source/eval.url
http://wok.mimas.ac.uk (journal ranking - also information on calculation of impact factor)
Preparing to Submit

- If you have time, it pays to be ambitious with journal ranking - you can submit to a lower impact journal if your first choice(s) reject the paper.

- Write your paper to match the remit of the journal, format carefully according to instructions to authors, give it the right "feel" for the target journal.
Submitting your Manuscript

- Most journals now have on-line submission
- Follow the instructions obsessively
- Always recommend reviewers when you have the chance
- Choose your referees carefully and try to work out which ones like your work
- It's fine to request referees not to use
- Always include a cover letter even when not essential - they do no harm and many editors like them
Rejection

- If they reject your paper, in most cases it is best to take it on the chin and learn what you can from the referees' comments.

- There is usually an appeals process - opinions differ on the wisdom of using it.

- Don't be down-hearted - revise and submit to another journal if need be.
Revision

- Immediate acceptance is rare

If you can revise the paper:
- Address the comments as well as you can
- Write the rebuttal clearly with references to the comments and to page and line numbers in the text
- You may not have to do everything requested
- You can disagree with the referees but remember the referees may see your responses and the editor may be a referee
- Say that the comments have allowed you to strengthen the manuscript
Acceptance

- Tell your Head of Research Centre/Institute
- Celebrate
- Your paper is available for REF as soon as it is available on-line (or print published) in any form
BMRC looked at comparator institutions to correlate RAE 2008 scores with journal impact factors

- Work done by Dr Christine Le Maitre and Dr Neil Cross
A review of a number of RAE 2008 submissions from comparator institutions were made

Our initial attempt: > 4 IF or top quartile, over estimates the number of 3* and 4* submissions
Final Criteria

- 4*: Field leading or leading multidisciplinary journal. IF >8 typically, or journal internationally well respected

- 3*: IF top quartile of field and internationally respected (within top 15% i.e. top 10% of research journals)

- 2*: IF in 2nd quartile or quartile 1 but outside top 15%

- 1*: Low impact <2.5 and mostly in q3

- Unclassified: Inappropriate reviews or not indexed in JCR
## Match Analysis using these Criteria

### SHU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4/101</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>25/101</td>
<td>24.75%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td>40/101</td>
<td>39.60%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>22/101</td>
<td>21.78%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclass</td>
<td>10/101</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Portsmouth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>22/160</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>61/160</td>
<td>38.125</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td>50/160</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>15/160</td>
<td>9.375</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclass</td>
<td>6/160</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nottingham Trent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>11/51</td>
<td>21.56%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>21/51</td>
<td>41.17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td>16/51</td>
<td>31.37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>3/51</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclass</td>
<td>0/51 ( Some only submitted 3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Authorship

Dr Keith Fildes
Authorship Criteria

- Authorship credit should be based only on substantial contributions to **ALL** of the following:
  - Conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; **and** to
  - Drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; **and**
  - Final approval of the version to be published (accepting public responsibility for what it says)

*International Committee of Medical Journal Editors*
Participation solely in the acquisition of funding or the collection of data does **not** justify authorship.

General supervision of the research group is also **not** sufficient for authorship.

Authorship is based on intellectual contribution - would the paper have been possible without the contribution of that person?
An alternative, where contributors don't meet authorship criteria, for:

- Securing funding
- Providing resource
- Collecting data
- Managing/supervising researchers
Guest/honorary authorship - not enough contribution to be an author, but listed to increase status/likelihood of it being published, or as a gift to industrial partners.

Ghost authorship - significant contribution to the research or writing but is not listed. Professional writers are not uncommon in Medicine. Industrial partners may also wish to expunge their involvement to obscure conflicts of interest. There can be occasional exceptions e.g. matters of national security, but definitely not drug companies etc.
Consequences

- 17% of research misconduct cases relate to authorship (cf 20% responsible conduct, 18% ethics, and 17% fabrication, falsification & plagiarism) - UKRIO

- Professor Richard Eastell case (2005-9, relating to a 2003 paper)
  - Whistle-blower allegations that he had incorrectly claimed to have full access to data for a trial of a Procter & Gamble drug
  - Investigation established that the analysis for the trial had been carried out by Procter & Gamble and that Eastell did not in fact have complete access to the data
  - At a fitness to practice hearing it was determined that his actions had not been "deliberately misleading or dishonest", although he may have been negligent in making "untrue" and "misleading" declarations; the GMC did not make a finding of misconduct

www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/news/bone-professor-faces-gmc-probe/408347.article
Author Sequence

- There are disciplinary differences
- Some journals now require authors to detail their specific contribution; some also then publish this
- Important to agree sequence in advance at the outset of the project
- Don’t be shy to discuss authorship - better to have the conversations early
- Similar rules for all types of publications e.g. conference posters, books chapters
Usually single, or joint first, authors

PGR supervisors are not usually named as authors (in arts, more variety of practice in social sciences)
Author, Author, Author, Author....Author, Author

- **First author** - led the work, conducted the main experiments, majority of writing e.g. PGR student writing up their PhD work, postdoc employed on a grant
- **Last author** - corresponding author, supervisor, PI on research grant, generally responsible for the overall strategy of the research
- Middle authors - everyone else ordered by level of contribution, or alphabetically

- PGR's papers:
  - First author - student
  - Last author - supervisor
  - Middle author - secondary supervisor

Acknowledgement to Professor Catherine Biggs for this and the following slide
Grey Areas

- Provided material used in the paper - acknowledgements

- Technicians:
  - If a delineated set of experiments - acknowledgements
  - If involved in experimental design, troubleshooting - authorship
  - If built equipment has been described elsewhere - acknowledgements
  - If built equipment has been modified for the paper, conducted experiments - authorship
Authorship Resources

- University's Authorship guidance:
  www.shu.ac.uk/ assets/pdf/Principles-of-Good-Research-Practice-for-Publication-Autho.pdf

- Epigeum Research Integrity courses:
  https://shuspace.shu.ac.uk/webapps/blackboard/content/listContentEditable.jsp?content_id=4720393_1&course_id=280679_1
  (Login to Blackboard on another tab of your browser before clicking this link)
From Contract Research to Academic Outputs

Professor David Robinson
Context

- UoA16 REF coordinator (Architecture, Built Environment and Planning)

- submitted to RAE2001; RAE2008; REF2014

- active contract researcher - CRESR
  - government departments
  - devolved assemblies
  - local authorities
  - etc.
Overview

- starting point
- the virtuous circle of academic and contract research
- differences and distinctions
- some practicalities
possibility of having **one foot inside the policy tent**, engaging in discussion and debate about promoting positive change within the constraints of the current 'system'.....

whilst planting **the other foot firmly outside the tent** and engaging in philosophising about the way things are and might be

contract research does not inevitably create “**docile social scientists**” as Allen (2005) suggests, nor the inevitable acceptance of theoretical and policy language that *deflects criticism and resistance*, as Slater (2006) argues.
The Virtuous Circle

Contract Research

Academic Research

Impact Activities
commissioned on basis of **academic** knowledge and understanding

**contracted** to deliver applied, policy-orientated research

**impact** secured via sharing of insights with research users; active dissemination to community of policy interests and practitioners; subsequent provision of advice and guidance on basis of expertise

empirical data and insights into policy and practice world drawn on to underpin intellectual contribution to **academic** debates

data generated through contract research projects provided the empirical evidence underpinning more than 80% of outputs in UoA16 REF2014 submission
Social housing and worklessness: Qualitative research findings

Del Roy Fletcher, Tony Gore, Kesia Reeve and David Robinson with Nadia Bashir, Rosalind Goudie and Sonta O’Toole

A report of research carried out by the Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research at Sheffield Hallam University on behalf of the Department for Work and Pensions
# Differences and Distinctions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four star</th>
<th>Quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three star</td>
<td>Quality that is internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour but which falls short of the highest standards of excellence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two star</td>
<td>Quality that is recognised internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One star</td>
<td>Quality that is recognised nationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Quality that falls below the standard of nationally recognised work. Or work which does not meet the published definition of research for the purposes of this assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences and Distinctions

- academic research = very different exercise to the production of contract research outputs

- the holy trinity of academic **originality, significance, rigour** (OSR)

- contract research weak in academic measures of OSR - not what commissioners are interested in

- but rich in **empirical data**...and insight into **policy and practice**

- provides a basis for academic research and writing
Some Distinctive Features of Academic Research

- **academic research.....**
  - much more about very **specific questions**
  - more on **critical literature review**...and theoretical framework
  - **methodology** - don't neglect
  - more focus on findings / **answering questions**
  - more **reflective discussion**

- an increasing 'scientific' feel to social science papers?
Some Practicalities

- **intellectual property (IP)**
  - frequently remains with the research commissioner (e.g. government department)
  - most commissioners don't unreasonably withhold....but some problematic practices (e.g. data destruction)
  - some commissioners happy to cede foreground IP rights to the researcher - take advice before signing a research contract
  - employ strategies for making data public

- **co-authors** - contract research typically a collective effort
  - discuss and agree an academic publication plan
  - writing partnerships - linking with academics beyond contract research
Some Practicalities

- **paving the way for academic writing**
  - ethics - permissions and consent
  - data - form, nature and content; management and access; publication
  - research rather than evaluation?

- **time - lots of it!**
  - further analysis of data (qual and quant)
  - engagement with (international) literature
  - situating work within conceptual and theoretical debates

- **avoid recycling!**
  - a distinct and different output
Developing a Personal Publication Strategy

Professor Chris Hopkins
Do You Need a Publication Strategy?

- yes: is **essential**: improvisation and opportunism not enough
- personal research interest vs. local research strategies vs. funding drivers?
- humanities: a relatively autonomous model (enabled by QR and teaching + research base, and by 'lone scholar' tradition)?
  - as compared to other disciplines - advantages and disadvantages?
The Role of the HoRC and/or REF UOA Co-ordinator

- Despite relative autonomy, coherence is still important
  - but can be built in from the start?
  - appointments strategy
  - specialisms and focus; relation of teaching and research
  - the role of broad research groups (e.g. 'Language and Linguistics', 'Renaissance Literature', 'Imperial and Global History', 'Economic and Business History')

- Factors to consider in a publication strategy - e.g. planning research with '4 outputs in 6 years' in mind (or pro rata for fractional staff)
  - being REFable - most vital factor
  - monograph + 3 articles? 4 articles? (what is viable for you?)
  - avoidance of repetition: relation and variation
  - avoidance of substantial (re?) use of material published pre-2014
  - timing: the risks of publication in the final year of the cycle; a reserve?
Advice on developing a personal publication plan which is strategically-aligned

- Needs to be:
  - above all, likely to produce REFable profile
  - achievable
  - developed in first year of cycle
  - revisited annually, revised as necessary
  - focused on quality - on things likely to be 3* or 4*
  - but on sufficient quantity too
  - personally satisfying + career sensible

- Needs to
  - have some flexibility, preferably to include some reserves / plan Bs
  - maximise quality
  - draw on advice from Research Group Leaders, UoA Coordinator, HoRC
  - contribute to both variety and coherence of RC + UoA
  - contribute to coherence of overall UoA Research strategy / environment
Open Access Considerations

Dr Keith Fildes
In June 2012 the Finch Report advocated a move to open access publishing for all government-funded research.

The 'gold' open access model of publishing is where authors pay publishers an article processing charge (c.£1750+VAT) to have their work published which, upon publication, is made freely available to anyone (without subscription) on the internet.

The alternative 'green' model is where articles are published in subscription-based journals as now, but a peer-reviewed final copy is placed in an open access repository (such as an institutional repository like SHURA), usually with a 12-24 month embargo period.

The UK government controversially advocates 'gold' (publisher-friendly), but the EU, USA and institutions (including SHU, Oxbridge, the Russell Group) are swinging towards 'green'.
Research outputs must be made open-access (and be 'born open') to be eligible for submission to REF 2020.

This requirement will apply to journal articles and ISSN conference proceedings accepted for publication after 1 April 2016. This doesn't apply to monographs (humanities) and creative or practice-based outputs (art & design, creative writing).

www.hefce.ac.uk/media/hefce/content/pubs/2014/201407/HEFCE2014_07.pdf
Parallel, but less advanced, issue

Drivers to: facilitate data sharing and collaboration, maximise the opportunities for new research based on reuse and recombination of data from various sources, support the principle of open access to publicly-funded research, and assure research integrity

The future?: [www.shef.ac.uk/doncatchment/resources](http://www.shef.ac.uk/doncatchment/resources)

New SHU contact - Dr Juliet Harland, Research Data Manager, LIS (j.harland@shu.ac.uk)

Upcoming workshop - 23 or 25 June 2014 (TBC)
New University policy in development

Key SHU contact - Ann Betterton, Head of Information Resources, LIS (a.betterton@shu.ac.uk)

Workshop ran in March 2013 (http://shardprogramme.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/open-access-publishing.pdf), but more will be happening
Altmetrics?

- New alternative to journal impact factor and personal citation indices like the h-index

- Cover not just citation counts, but also other aspects of the impact of a work, such as how many data and knowledge bases refer to it, article views, downloads, or mentions in social and news media

- More diverse metrics to capture the significance of a piece of academic work - democratising venues for academic communication
Questions to Panel

Any questions?
More Information and Contact

- [http://shardprogramme.wordpress.com/](http://shardprogramme.wordpress.com/)
- [k.fildes@shu.ac.uk](mailto:k.fildes@shu.ac.uk) x3417
  @SHaRD_Programme