

Performance-Based Research Fund

Feedback template for Managing nominated research outputs consultation paper

Feedback from:	Otago Polytechnic
Contact details:	Jenny Aimers Research Office Otago Polytechnic Private Bag 1910 Dunedin jennya@tekotago.ac.nz

1 Purpose

The purpose of this template is to provide a mechanism for collecting feedback on the matters raised as part of the PBRF Managing nominated research outputs consultation paper.

The objective is to obtain feedback in such a way that will speed the collation and review of feedback pertaining to specific areas of interest.

Respondents are encouraged to answer the questions in this template, but should not feel limited from also providing comments in addition to those requested in the template.

Timeframe for feedback

Completed templates and any other comments should be emailed to PBRF.2012Redesign@tec.govt.nz or can be posted to Dr Damien Cole, Tertiary Education Commission, P O Box 27048, Wellington, 6141.

Feedback would be appreciated as soon as possible, but no later than 5pm, Friday 14 August, 2009.

2. Questions - Managing nominated research outputs

- i) Should researchers be able to submit Accepted Manuscripts (NISO standard RP-8-2008), ie. author's final manuscript as accepted for publication at the completion of the peer review process as evidence of NROs (see section 6.1)?

Yes, we agree

- ii) Would better resourcing of the TEC Secretariat resolve the issues experienced in the 2006 assessment (see section 6.1)?

Unable to comment as this is a panel/secretariat issue

- iii) Would the library systems be able to supply NROs to panel members in an efficient, timely and cost effective way (see section 6.2)?

Yes, although this doesn't necessarily need to be in paper form. Panel members would be able to access most of these online via their own University e-journal subscriptions, therefore not incurring inter loan fees. This method coupled with open access publications would account for at least half of the NROs from our institution.

This leaves books or journals without online presence that would still have to be interloaned along with other NROs relating to creative work.

- iv) If institutional repositories had a high proportion of NROs available as open access (based on allowing Accepted Manuscripts as evidence), should panel members primarily obtain NROs through this avenue (see section 6.2)?

We do not believe that institutional repositories are, or will ever be, a viable source for collecting NROs. Many institutions rushed to set up their repositories before really considering copyright issues. If you look carefully at these repositories you will see they only contain theses and articles from open source publications covering only a portion of the NROs that would be presented.

With a high proportion of our staff seeking to publish in copyrighted sources we decided not to continue with the development of a repository that was only going to be able to hold theses and a small number of publications from open access sources.

v) Are there sufficient advantages to an online TEC database to warrant the costs of developing such a database (see section 6.3)?

No. Overall the NRO web space idea seems like a lot of unnecessary work for both TEC and TEOs to collect only a limited proportion of NROs. We are not in favour of this approach.

In addition this may also incur all the problems associated with institutional repositories – you will still not be able to hold publications that are copyrighted without the relevant subscriptions from the journals concerned.

vi) Will researchers have decided on their NROs in sufficient time for them to be loaded onto an online TEC database (see section 6.3)?

Staff completing EPs already complete a field linking their NRO if it is available online. We are unclear what else you envision here?

vii) Are there any advantages or disadvantages of the options discussed that have not been raised in this paper?

As noted earlier we do not believe that institutional repositories are, or will ever be, a viable source for collecting NROs. Many institutions rushed to set up their repositories before really considering copyright issues. If you look carefully at these repositories you will see they only contain theses and articles from open source publications.

There is a suggestion on page 16 (6.1.1) that the assessment system will be “significantly” re-worked.

We would also want to make a strong plea for TEC to retain the basic format of the EP. We have put in a great deal of time and resources to develop our own interface to collect this information so our staff would not be burdened with having to provide the same information in different formats for both our annual reporting and PBRF. Any major change to this would be a significant compliance issue for us that would be very unwelcome.

viii) Are there other options that the SRG should consider?

The process proposed on page 18 (6.2.3) seems acceptable.

Alternatively we would be comfortable with a system that requires TEOs to supply either a URL link for NROs that were available online or a photocopy

or other hard copy format (eg DVD, CD) of each NRO at the time of the EP's submission. We more or less ended up providing that in 2006, the only difference was these were drip fed to TEC on request.

|