

## A Guide to Drafting your PBRF Portfolio

This document is designed for Unitec staff to assist with preparing their 2018 PBRF portfolio. It contains suggestions and guides on how to write up sections in the portfolio and includes examples. There is also some guidance on using ROMS in assembling the portfolio.

This document draws on material provided by the Tertiary Education Commission and experience of Unitec staff. Any identified errors do please let us know! [click here](#) to send an email.

### Contents

<b>Panel/Subject/Field of Research (keywords)</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Cross referral to Māori or Pacific Panel</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Platform of Research</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Platform of Research examples .....	4
<b>Writing the Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) 'My Contribution' and 'Description' or justification statements</b> .....	<b>7</b>
'My Contribution' .....	7
Brief examples of 'My Contribution' .....	8
'Description' or justification .....	9
Examples of 'Descriptions' .....	12
<b>Research Contributions</b> .....	<b>13</b>
Importance of the Research Contributions .....	13
What are they? .....	13
The Research Contribution categories .....	13
How many Research Contributions? .....	13
What to include in the Research Contribution entry? .....	14
Suggested basic structure of an entry – based on an exemplar .....	15
Research Contribution examples .....	15
How to create Research Contributions in ROMS .....	18
<b>The Research Contributions guide</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>Evidence portfolio review checklist</b> .....	<b>22</b>

## Drafting your 2018 PBRF evidence portfolio - A guide for Unitec staff

### Panel/Subject/Field of Research (keywords)

Choosing your **Panel** and **Subject** area is an important decision. There are 13 **Panels** and 43 **Subject** areas. You should choose the **Panel**, and its related **Subject** area, that most closely aligns with the research outputs in your portfolio (not your teaching area or Pathway). If your portfolio covers two Panels, choose the Panel that covers the bulk of your research outputs, the Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) in particular.

If you're unsure which is the best Panel for you, review the Panel-specific guidelines; these give guidance on what each Panel covers and what might be particular to that Panel. This document is online and available [here](#) on the TEC website.

The current Panel members are known and available [here](#) on the TEC website. It is useful to understand who is on the Panel as this may give some insight to how the Panel might assess research quality.

The **Field of Research** is designed to further refine your area of research within the subject area. It provides guidance to the Chair of the Panel for who should be assessing your portfolio. Use keywords for your subject and indicate if it is interdisciplinary – including which disciplines, and if there are any foreign-language outputs.

Example: Panel: Education. Subject: Education. Field of Research: Educational psychology, dyslexia. One NRO in Russian.

**USING ROMS:** Go to the 'PBRF Info' tab in the toolbar to select your Panel, Subject and enter your Field of Research keywords.

**Technical:** Field of Research is limited to 200 characters.

### Cross referral to Māori or Pacific Panel

If your primary Panel is neither the **Māori Knowledge and Development Panel** nor the **Pacific Research Panel** you may cross-refer elements of your evidence portfolio to one or both of these Panels if your portfolio contains elements appropriate for their assessment. At least one of your NROs (Nominated Research Outputs) must be referred to either Panel to warrant a valid cross-referral.

You must reference **at least one**, and up to five components (by ticking the Panel box beside that item in ROMS) of your portfolio and you **must explain** why and how these components fit the assessment criteria for that Panel. Cross-referrals will be rejected if the explanation or justification is weak or insufficient.

The **Māori Knowledge and Development (MKD) Panel** will consider cross-referrals of evidence portfolios:

where they fit or overlap with the description of panel coverage and/or the definition of research in the MKD panel-specific guidelines;

where one (or more) NRO addresses an issue of importance for Māori and clearly shows evidence of involvement with Māori or is specifically relevant to Māori;

where they are of such a nature that they are able to contribute to the understanding of issues affecting Māori.

Note: Evidence portfolios that include a Māori component, for example, in their subject area, but do not involve Māori methodologies will not be assessed by the panel.

## Drafting your 2018 PBRF evidence portfolio - A guide for Unitec staff

The **Pacific Research Panel** will only consider cross-referrals of evidence portfolios that contain one or more NROs and OROs or Research Contributions that:

use Pasifika research methodologies and methods or involve Pasifika-centred subject matter; impact on Pasifika communities and have significance for the wider community, for example, through influencing the direction of policy or practice; are recognised by peers as an important contribution to Pasifika knowledge and development, indigenous knowledge and research by indigenous peoples.

**USING ROMS:** Go to the 'PBRF Info' tab in the ROMS toolbar to justify and explain the reason for your cross-referral and to review the (up to) five selected items. Select which (maximum of five) outputs or Research Contributions you wish the cross-referral panel to examine, using the edit function of an individual item. See graphic below.

My Contribution (only enter this for NRO):  
max 1050 characters

My contribution here

Description (only enter this for NRO) \*:  
max 1000 characters

Description here ....

Submit to Pacific Research Panel?: Yes ☐ No ☒

Submit to Maori Research Panel?: Yes ☐ No ☒

## Platform of Research

### Purpose and audience

The purpose of the 'Platform of Research' section is to provide an overview that gives a coherent picture of your research for the panel. Your story should align with, and provide a context for, the details provided in your portfolio. This narrative about your research activity should:

1. Position your work in the discipline – your research interests as contained in your portfolio.
2. Briefly summarise your portfolio – highlights.
3. Provide a wider context for your activity – historical factors (e.g., practitioner new to academia) and/or situational (e.g., part-time).

You can draw links to your other research outputs that you haven't described (either pre-2012 or pending), or explain any issues that need clarifying. You can explain a switch in research direction, variance in your themes, thematic links to your other research outputs or a summary of outputs in your career.

Note: This field is located at the beginning of the portfolio. Reviewers should read this first; however it is NOT scored, but serves to introduce you and your material.

**USING ROMS:** Go to the 'PBRF Info' tab in the toolbar to enter the text for your Platform of Research  
**Technical:** The Platform of Research is limited to 2500 characters (including spaces).

### Suggested points to cover

- Outline main areas of your research and specific focus – as reflected in the portfolio.
- Elaborate briefly on these areas, situating your Top Four Nominated Research Outputs in the main areas of your research. This may also encompass the broad focus of your (up to 12) Other Research Outputs (OROs). Your aim is to give a context for your research activity.

## Drafting your 2018 PBRF evidence portfolio - A guide for Unitec staff

- Provide a brief summary of the highlights of your research outputs and activity in the period – a quick sketch of what the Panel members can expect in your portfolio.
- State how your research has contributed to knowledge in the discipline.
- Explain any impact on your audience and in the wider domain.
- Remove any ambiguity regarding quality assurance, research output category, or broad impact of the other outputs listed in your portfolio. For example, indicate if any are in a foreign language and explain why (context).
- If you have any mitigating circumstances that are not valid Exceptional Circumstances, such as part-time employment, state this at the very end as a stand-alone item (i.e., new paragraph) with a space between this and the previous paragraph to ensure it is not missed.

### Platform of Research examples

#### Subject Area: Languages

The outputs listed in this portfolio relate to current international research in the fields of second language acquisition (SLA) theory and practice (in particular, the role of oral and written feedback in helping learners of English as a Second Language [ESL] acquire accuracy in their use of the target language) and academic discourse (in particular, the difficulties that native- and non-native-speaking postgraduate students experience when meeting the requirements of a diverse range of genres). The topics relating to the SLA focus include the role of negotiated feedback in language learning, the efficacy of corrective feedback in ESL writing, and the effectiveness of different teaching approaches for implicit and explicit linguistic knowledge. Topics relating to academic discourse centre around a range of issues that native and non-native postgraduate students encounter when entering this new discourse environment.

My Top 4 NROs focus on the SLA research rather than the academic discourse research, which was not printed until 2016. Each of the publications and presentations have been informed by primary research undertaken alone or in collaboration with colleagues at AUT and the University of Auckland. All publications have been double blind peer reviewed and have been published in prestigious journals by Elsevier in the United Kingdom. Most of the conference presentations have been made in front of critical international audiences in the United Kingdom, USA, Europe and Australia.

#### Subject Area: Business Accounting

My research centres around two themes. The first is health-sector management accounting, particularly costing policy and practice, benchmarking and performance management. My research in this area is mainly qualitative (interview-based) and aims to inform policy-making as well as theory and practice; two of my NROs are in this area. The second theme is capital investment decision-making. This area builds on my PhD research (one of my NROs) and a book I wrote in 2012 (since reprinted twice, most recently in 2017). I focus on the interface between investment analysis and organisational decision-making, drawing on economic, sociological and political models of decision-making behaviour and using both qualitative and quantitative research methods.

My six years at Imperial College London (2007-2013) allowed me to develop international research links in both health sector research (currently with colleagues in the UK, Japan & Germany) and investment research (currently with colleagues in the United States, Japan & Germany). As a result, most of my research is collaborative and co-authored. The

## Drafting your 2018 PBRF evidence portfolio - A guide for Unitec staff

predominantly qualitative and interpretive nature of my research means I publish mainly in European journals that are strong in this genre of enquiry. My international reputation derives from my work in health-sector costing and performance management, capital investment decision-making and the use of qualitative research methods in management accounting, and is reflected in numerous conference invites, some of which are listed in my portfolio.

From the beginning of 2015 I moved to a 0.6 FTE position in order to better care for my ageing and ill parents.

### Subject Area: Business Marketing

My research agenda is guided by a philosophy that scholarship and sport can be used as a vehicle to develop people and positively advance society. I am passionate about the advancement of organised sport and engage in research so that the process can be used as a change agent for organisations. This philosophy has guided my research in the strategic governance of national sport organisations and cooperative education in sport. In primarily utilising an interpretative action research approach for my work in governance, this collaborative research method has promoted change and learning within the highly guarded boardroom setting.

More specifically, in focusing on the development of board strategic capability, I have advanced knowledge on board involvement in strategy, board-CEO shared leadership, and inter-organisational relationships as they relate to the board's strategic role. This work is situated within the global discipline of sport management but draws from/contributes to research streams outside of sport management, commonly referred to as corporate, organisational and non-profit governance.

I use a multi-dimensional approach to theory, drawing on/contributing to established theories such as agency, stewardship, institutional and stakeholder theory. In this way, my research, while focused on sport, is positioned to transcend the sport context. This is evidenced by my Nominated Research Outputs, three of which are published in the world's top sport management journals, and one outside of the sport setting. Through this work, I have established myself as a leading expert in sport governance. I have also developed a highly effective partnership with my co-authors, Professors Shilburton and Donaldson, who, while originally PhD supervisors (I graduated in 2008), have continued to work with me. In July 2007, after 9 years at Unitec, I moved to AUT University (July 07–June 09). Then, seeking off-shore experience, I was offered a role in Melbourne at Deakin (July 09–Dec 11) before coming back to AUT in 2012.

### Subject Area: Creative Arts

My research explores possibilities of creative practice in a collaborative model, and operates in collective art making and curatorial practice. Growing from long-term collaboration with S. Jones, the collective F4 formed in late 2012. A conceptual and structural response to the introduction of children into this partnership, life and art merge in this collaboration in which a family live and make art together, exploring the dynamics of family life and the influence of creative practice. A 2013 paper reflecting on F4 in relationship to the history of the representation of family was presented at NYU in the Art & Society Conference, and published in their journal. F4 has exhibited consistently, curated into the 2014 exhibition 'Hybrid'(NRO2), curated by Ian Gwilt/Brit Bunkley exploring hybrid art making, at MIC Toi Rerehiko. Double Vision (NRO3), curated by Helen Kedgley, also in 2014, looked at collaborative practice in NZ. 'The Correction' (NRO1) won the Wallace Paramount Award in 2015, resulting in the family participating in the International Studio & Curatorial Program in New York, and having shows in Manhattan, Chicago and Colorado. In 2015, F4 participated in 'Intermodem' (NRO4) at the

## Drafting your 2018 PBRF evidence portfolio - A guide for Unitec staff

Contemporary & Modern Art Centre, in Hungary, curated by Abel Kolya, which focused on collective practice in the context of New Media.

My curatorial practice focuses on collective art-making prevalent in Russia. In 2013 I was commissioned to write 'The Unsharp Mask', an essay for Landfall, on the Blue Noses. Research resulted in a number of exhibitions in NZ including 'I was Russia', a survey of collective practice at the Dunedin Public Art Gallery in 2009, featuring Oleg Kulik, Olga and Alexander Florensky and The Blue Noses. 'The Greatest Idiot in NZ' was a major project experimenting with the curator collaborating with artists' collective FNO, as well as a group of NZ artists, a social worker with her family of foster children. The project resulted in a number of high quality outputs including two international conference papers, three journal articles, two exhibitions, a public symposium & a range of screenings, lectures & presentations.

[Item is fictionalised]

The four Nominated Research Outputs, your best four outputs over the assessment period, are the **most important** items of your portfolio, where the reviewers will focus most closely, and will have the most impact on your grade. Choose outputs that reflect the highest-quality research achievements of the assessment period (e.g., that demonstrate originality, creativity and novel discovery).

### Factors to consider are:

Quality of outlet (high-ranked journal, prestigious gallery, book with reputable publisher).

Your level of contribution to the item should be significant.

Additional quality indicators, e.g., awards, funding, citations, favourable reviews.

### Avoid:

Demonstrating the breadth of your research interests at the expense of highlighting the highest-quality outputs.

Selecting personal favourites, e.g., masters or PhD theses, when other items demonstrate higher measurable quality.

Textbooks and teaching materials, as these demonstrate little or no research.

Reports, as they are often difficult to assess in terms of research component and quality.

### USING ROMS

To select an item as a Nominated Research Output (NRO), or as one of the up to 12 Other Research Outputs (OROs), identify the item in the reference list, select 'Edit' then scroll down the page to select the item. See graphic:

Is your main research object a large sound or video file? Yes ☐ No ☒

Four PBRF NRO?: Yes ☒ No ☐

Twelve PBRF ORO?: Yes ☐ No ☒

My Contribution (only enter this for NRO): max 1050 characters

Description (only enter this for NRO) \*: max 1000 characters

My contribution here

Description here ....

## Writing the Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) 'My Contribution' and 'Description' or justification statements

### 'My Contribution'

#### Purpose

To clearly outline the nature and significance of your contribution to the output. The focus here should be on the critical contributions to the item such as intellectual input (e.g. your concept, analysis etc).

#### Structure

Identify the components of the research process that you contributed to, including the level of your contribution in each case. Do not use percentages, but clearly state all your tasks/responsibilities. The list below is designed as a starting point:

- Developing the concept
- Initiating the project
- Designing the study
- Securing funding
- Reviewing the literature
- Organising the data collection
- Developing criteria or model for analysing data
- Analysing the data
- Drafting the paper – or particular sections
- Revising the paper
- Corresponding author (with publisher)

#### Features to consider in writing your 'contribution'

- Focus on the key steps in the research process, even if you are sole author.
- State important aspects of your contribution, such as a leadership role.
- Indicate the status of co-authors where relevant (e.g. co-authoring with leading scholars).
- Share your contribution text with co-authors who are also putting in the same item.
- Include a statement that co-authors agree about their contributions, if this might be controversial – e.g., you're third author but state it's mostly your work.
- Avoid using percentages.

#### USING ROMS

To enter the text for 'My Contribution' and the Description of an NRO select 'Edit' then scroll down the page to enter the text in the relevant section.

**Technical:** Each 'contribution' has a limit of 1050 characters, including spaces.

The screenshot shows a web form for entering research output information. It includes several sections with radio button options for 'Yes' or 'No':

- Is your main research object a large sound or video file?: Yes ☐ No ☒
- Four PBRF NRO?: Yes ☒ No ☐
- Twelve PBRF ORO?: Yes ☐ No ☒

Below these are two text input fields, both highlighted with a yellow border:

- My Contribution (only enter this for NRO):** max 1050 characters. The input area contains the text "My contribution here".
- Description (only enter this for NRO) \*:** max 1000 characters. The input area contains the text "Description here ....".

## Drafting your 2018 PBRF evidence portfolio - A guide for Unitec staff

### Brief examples of 'My Contribution'

1. As sole author I developed the project, secured the funding, carried out the research and wrote the paper.
2. I developed the rationale, designed the study, secured the funding in conjunction with my co-author, and wrote the theoretical and organisational structure. I wrote the initial draft, and I wrote the final version in response to editorial comments. My co-author helped carry out the research on two of the four sections and reviewed the first draft.
3. This paper is one of three from my study of X. I was solely responsible for the initial study, the subsequent analysis of the data and writing the paper.
4. I was responsible for the development of the research questions, the data collection and analysis, the synthesis of new ideas and the writing of the paper. My co-authors provided advice on method and reviewed drafts of the article.
5. My co-author and I shared the responsibilities for this paper equally. We discussed the concept and designed the study together. My co-author covered the contemporary sections, while I wrote the theoretical discussion. We both wrote the final draft and shared the proofing and editing.
6. I coordinated the group of researchers who all collaborated on the conceptualisation and design of the study. We all analysed the data, which was collected by a research assistant. I wrote the original draft of the article and the co-authors offered suggestions and amendments.
7. I was one of 15 co-authors of a large multi-centre research project. As Hamilton centre manager I co-ordinated data collection in my region, ensured correct analysis of the data and helped review the final paper.

### Notes

1. Structure: Only describe the role of the other contributors where necessary, otherwise leave out what they did. Keep the focus on you.
2. Structure: Describe your role first, describe the roles of the other contributors last – if they need to be described.
3. Structure: Think sequentially in the role you played i.e., start to end.
4. Content: The key elements are those that required the most intellectual input, e.g. concept, design, analysis, writing the paper – or that were imperative to the research occurring, e.g., getting the team together, obtaining the funding. Focus on these activities.
5. Form: Use 'first person' narration (i.e., "I did ...") to seek engagement with the assessors.



# Drafting your 2018 PBRF evidence portfolio - A guide for Unitec staff

## 'Description' or justification

### Purpose

The purpose of your 'Description' is to explain the nature and quality of your NROs. It should tell the story of your output, supported by evidence where possible. It may be easier, conceptually, to treat this as a space to 'justify' why the item is in the Top Four. As you consider what to say, please keep in mind that your audience is the PBRF panel.

**Technical:** The 'Description' has a limit of 1000 characters, including spaces.

### Structure

#### a. Summary of your research with findings

Sum the research up in a nutshell – your abstract may help you here. What was the research? What did you do, how did you do it, and what did you discover/conclude/produce?

#### b. Contribution of your research

What were the main findings? What knowledge gap did it fill?

#### c. Impact of your research: post-publication story

Describe any impact of your research after publication. Check that you include all the events that followed on from the publication. These include: citations, reviews, positive comments, further funding, uptake by industry or the profession, awards for the item, status and affiliation of colleagues who invited you to speak publicly or write another article. Include any other recognition or commendations for your work.

#### d. Quality of the medium for disseminating your research, and other quality indicators

If possible state any quality indicators associated with your research, e.g., prestigious co-author, highly ranked journal, reputable gallery, authoritative publishing house. Was it funded? If so, by whom?

The structure of your 'Description' will change according to the material you have available. If your publication has had little impact so far, focus on a concise, clear summary of the research as indicated in sections a, b and d of the structure above. If, however, you have had a lot of feedback about your research subsequent to publication, it is important that you include all aspects of recognition that demonstrate the quality of your work.

### Metrics

1. When stating citations, ensure you cite the source of your information. Example: My paper received 67 citations (Source: Scopus).
2. When stating a journal rank, ensure it is relevant and meaningful. If you use impact factors or similar, are they informative? For example, if you state your journal paper has an impact factor of 2.66, will the panel members be sufficiently knowledgeable to know what a good impact factor is in your subject area? Consider instead listing the impact factor with the subject order, e.g. The Journal of X has an impact factor of 2.66 and ranking of 4/89 in the subject area of Z.
3. Consider if your metrics are relevant to the panel – will they be familiar with the measure, e.g., the Scopus metrics CiteScore, or SJR or SNIP. Similarly, [Altmetrics](#) is an example of a new and interesting measure, but will it be familiar to your panel and are the numbers meaningful?

# Drafting your 2018 PBRF evidence portfolio - A guide for Unitec staff

Unitec library staff and knowledge specialists are happy to help staff find out the metrics on their outputs.

## Features to consider

### 1. Introduce item

**What is it about, in a nutshell?**

**What motivated the research?** (Is it an under-represented group, a new idea, concern over confused discussion of the issue, a new methodology?).

Some examples:

- I was invited by the editor of Journal X who suggested ...
- This paper is a rejoinder to commentaries by two academics that ...
- My earlier research led to this focus on ABC in the context of DEF.

### 2. Situate your research in the wider discipline context

**Is this an emerging field, a new approach, a new methodology?**

**Does it argue against accepted theory?**

**Does it target a local problem or does it have international application?**

Some examples:

- This article is part of my wider study of X, but explores in more depth one of the main findings, which ...
- The article focuses on Y, and the agenda set by marine biologists, R & S, claiming that ...
- This article reports on an empirical study of X and also measures Y and Z.
- This article contends that A and is particularly relevant to those engaged in B.

### 3. Outline the contribution it makes

**What gaps does it fill?**

**Are you reporting on a neglected field? First in NZ context?**

**What literature does it challenge/call into question?**

Some examples:

- This paper addresses a noticeable lack of research in the area as well as providing...
- My paper raised interest in the topic as worthy of further research investigation, beyond theorising.
- Although studies have referred to X, none have analysed it in relation to Y.
- The paper argues for a theory of X, one that is largely missing from the literature.
- My paper adds to the emerging body of research in the area. [Be careful not to overstate this, e.g. "my research adds to the body of knowledge" since all research should do this.]

### 4. Explain timing and duration of research, if significant

**What current issues does it address?**

Some examples:

- It provides a timely review of the provision of X, given the government call for Y.
- My research addresses the ongoing issue of X that is currently highlighted by Y.
- It represents five years' work ...

### 5. Outline significant findings

## Drafting your 2018 PBRF evidence portfolio - A guide for Unitec staff

### **Do findings endorse or contradict previous research, expand the context, bring a new perspective?**

Some examples:

- Commensurate with previous studies, findings indicate that ...
- The results contribute an additional angle to the theory and practice of X.
- The unexpected finding from this study was Y.
- We examined X and, contrary to previous studies, concluded that Y.
- This research overturns previous thinking about XYZ ...

### **6. Describe readership/audience**

#### **Who were you writing your study for?**

#### **Why is it relevant to particular groups?**

Some examples:

- This article was aimed at policy makers and stakeholders working to meet the government target of Y.
- These findings have proven to be relevant for North American researchers seeking an effective model for X when working with Y.
- This article addresses a long-standing issue in the profession, which is why I chose to publish it in the professional journal.

### **7. Explain the quality of the outlet for your item, e.g. journal, gallery, publisher**

#### **Why did you select this journal, gallery, publisher? (Is it an international or local audience?)**

Some examples:

- This article has significance beyond the field of X, and its acceptance by Journal Y acknowledges this wider application.
- This journal, the official publication of X, is an A rated journal (reference).
- This is a key gallery for NZ artists. Prominent academics on their advisory board include ...

### **8. Quote evidence to demonstrate the impact of the article**

#### **How many positive citations, invitations to speak or email enquiries did the article trigger?**

Some examples:

- The government used the findings of my report on X to support a commission of inquiry into Y.
- Researchers have cited my contention that X is B as a prompt for their own research.
- Considerable interest in this aspect of the study is evidenced by the number of subsequent studies (e.g., Moody 2017; Austin, 2016).
- This study initiated a discussion in this journal, about X, which has continued since 2013.
- This study has been widely discussed and cited in a number of subsequent articles including one by Prof X of Z University in Journal Y, an A grade journal (reference).

# Drafting your 2018 PBRF evidence portfolio - A guide for Unitec staff

## Examples of 'Descriptions'

### Example 1

This research is the first complete holistic treatment of the use of the KZW technique in the bioinformatics field. It highlights the key issues researchers need to consider in their research design using this technique. It uses exemplars from the literature to illustrate the research design decisions. This paper has assisted researchers in the use of a cognitive technique in their research methodology. It has been discussed in a variety of subsequent research articles which have employed the KZW technique to collect data, not only in the bioinformatics area (Zhang & Li, 2016), but also in health systems (Hewitt, 2014), marketing (Jaeger & Meiselman 2015) and psychology (Walker et al., 2017). ABC Journal is regarded as the top journal in the informatics discipline. This is evidenced by its consistent ranking as the number one journal over the years, its 2013 impact factor of 4.884 and an A\* rating by the ABDC list.

### Example 2

This study focused on board involvement in strategy, and the interaction between the board and CEO in strategy design. As a critical yet under-researched issue, this rich study of the governance was framed by a multi-dimensional use of governance theories, using the context of non-profit sport organisations. Findings established that greater board involvement in strategy advanced the board's ability to perform its strategic function; and the need to integrate strategy into board process as part of the complex interplay in balancing the power relationship between board and CEO. The Journal of Sport Management is a prestigious journal, and widely regarded as the top journal in our field. It received an A\* rating in the initial round of ERA and is rated A+ by the Australian Business Deans' Council.

### Example 3

Supported by a co-author's Marsden grant, this article demonstrates for the first time that the roles of lay members on New Zealand research ethics committees, in spite of their professed importance, are poorly defined – particularly in tertiary contexts. Based on semi-structured interview data analysed thematically, the article provides robust evidence for the need to reconsider lay roles for research ethics deliberations. Documented problems with these roles in North America attest to the international relevance of this topic. The authors suggest that committees in New Zealand, with uniquely high numbers of lay members, are well-positioned to create clearer role definitions and terms of reference. The journal Research Integrity, founded in 2001, is published by Sage and edited by Professor Sam Ward, Imperial College London and Dr Hunter Jones, University of Sydney.

## Research Contributions

### Importance of the Research Contributions

The Research Contribution section of the PBRF portfolio is worth 30% of the overall assessment score. Historically, staff typically fail to recognise all of the items that can be included as contributions to research and this section of the PBRF portfolio is often completed poorly, impacting on the final score. It is probably the most difficult section of the portfolio to assemble.

### What are they?

Research Contributions are the research-related activities or events that have occurred during the **assessment period (1 January 2012 – 31 December 2017)**. There are 12 Research Contribution categories and each category has broad inclusive coverage of items. See Appendix 1 to help both identify and then categorise possible research contributions. The Research Contribution Guide available on the ROMS login page.

### The Research Contribution categories

- Contribution to research discipline and environment (e.g., ethics committee)
- Facilitation, networking and collaboration (e.g., organise conference)
- Invitations to present research or similar (e.g., keynote at conference)
- Outreach and engagement (wider community)
- Recognition of research outputs (e.g., citations, good reviews)
- Research funding and support
- Research prizes, fellowships, awards and appointments
- Researcher development (e.g., mentoring)
- Reviewing, refereeing, judging, evaluating and examining
- Student factors (e.g., supervision)
- Uptake and impact (beyond academia)
- Other evidence of research contribution

### How many Research Contributions?

You can list up to 15 Research Contributions, but each Research Contribution entry can have many items within it. You are limited to a maximum of 1500 characters (including spaces). The ROMS system will indicate how many characters you've entered and will stop you entering more than 1500 – see below on where the character count is indicated in ROMS.

[Back to Research Contribution List...](#)

Type:

Contribution to research discipline and environment ▼

Description\*:

Organised two (annual) School PG Graduation Breakfasts at Waikato University (April 2012 and April 2013). This formal breakfast, attended by approximately 30 people, recognised the achievements of our PhD, masters and PG diploma students. Friends and family were invited as were supervisors and staff. Supervisors were asked to speak about their student's research.

365 characters

Fifteen RC?:

Yes ☒ No ☐

Year:

2012

## Drafting your 2018 PBRF evidence portfolio - A guide for Unitec staff

### What to include in the Research Contribution entry?

You should provide a comprehensive description of the nature and significance of the items and include sufficient information and descriptive evidence of the quality and prestige of the items to help support the assessment. This should also provide information to evidence the claims – where applicable – (e.g., journal rank), including key details of the activity, such as dates and organisation(s) or others involved.

Use the Guide (Appendix 1) to help identify all of the possible items you could include. Then group 'like' or similar items together and categorise them according to the Guide.

#### **One Contribution entry can contain many items or activities**

You can have up to 15 Research Contribution entries, each entry can contain many components or activities – for example if you have reviewed papers for two Journals and two conferences these should all be entered as one Research Contribution as outlined below:

I have reviewed manuscripts for two journals and two conferences.

#### Journals.

2015-2017. Journal of International Behaviour (ranked 29/42 by Scopus). Reviewed 4 manuscripts.

2013-2016. Australian Journal of Behaviour (ranked 19/42 by Scopus). Reviewed 6 manuscripts.

#### Conferences.

2015. 4<sup>th</sup> Australasian Conference on Behavioural Issues Conference. Auckland. Reviewed 5 x full papers and 6 x posters.

2017. 5<sup>th</sup> Australasian Conference on Behavioural Issues Conference. Melbourne. Reviewed 8 x full papers and 12 x abstracts.

The ACBI conference is held every second year and is the leading conference for academic and behavioural specialists in the Australasian region.

# Drafting your 2018 PBRF evidence portfolio - A guide for Unitec staff

## Suggested basic structure of an entry – based on an exemplar

1. First sentence/s should be a summary of the entire entry – so is easy for reviewers to understand. This also helps with initial drafting of each Research Contribution. The summary sentence is not necessary for single or few items.
2. Order best items first. (e.g. order PhD supervision first (highest quality) then Masters. In-progress items last).
3. Within groups (e.g. PhD supervision is a group, the Masters is a group), prioritise each group or item by quality/importance over chronological order.
4. Include 'quality details', e.g. scholarships, student publishing, awards, research jobs the student obtained – i.e. quality markers.
5. In the example below note that the Thesis title is not included but the student name and year is, however do include the title if there are few items.
6. If you have a lot of similar material in one category, split it into two or more, e.g. if lots of PhDs and Masters create one entry for PhDs and another for Masters.
7. Note the clear layout of dates and items, it should look, neat and be easily read.
8. You **must** put the date/s within the description panel.

## Research Contribution examples

### Category: Student Factors - [Key commentary points are highlighted yellow]

I have supervised 3 PhDs and 5 Masters to completion, most as primary supervisor. I have supported some students to publish or present and two have obtained scholarships. 1 PhD and 2 Masters in progress. [Summary of this entry – use 2016 as the date of this clustered item in the ROMS template]

#### PhD Completions [lead with 'best' items]

2016.

Dane French. Thesis Title. (Principal supervisor) [Your role]. Assisted French to present at the SME Australasia Conference in Fiji. [activity/outcomes/outputs and quality indicator for student – publishing and scholarship]

2013.

Fred Dagg. Thesis Title. (Principal supervisor). I assisted Dagg to present a paper at the AFANNZ and we also published a paper in the Journal of Science (2014). Dagg's research was supported by a Masonic Foundation Scholarship \$4,500 [activity/outcomes/outputs and quality indicator for student – publishing and scholarship]

2015.

Jean Wang. Thesis Title. (Associate supervisor).

Completion expected 2019.

Daniel Kirkpatrick. PhD. Topic. (Associate supervisor). [Associate supervisor ranked after Principal roles]

#### Masters completions

2016.

Smegral Invectio. MBus. Thesis Title. (Principal supervisor). Smegral won the Dean's award for best thesis and we have now published a paper (2017) in the Journal of International Accounting Studies. [quality indicator for students – award and publishing]

2015.

Angela Wang. MBus. Thesis Title. (Associate supervisor). Obtained a \$1,500 Asia Foundation scholarship.

2014.

Freda Marcelo. MBus. Thesis Title. (Associate supervisor). International student.

2012.

Donal Guam. MBus. Thesis Title. (Principal supervisor).

Dane French. MBus. Thesis Title. (Principal supervisor). I helped Dane obtain a summer studentship at KPMG. Dane has gone on to complete a PhD.

## Drafting your 2018 PBRF evidence portfolio - A guide for Unitec staff

Completion expected 2018.  
Cindy Chu. MBus. Thesis topic. (Principal supervisor).  
James Chang. MBus. Thesis topic. (Associate supervisor).

### Category: Research Prizes, Fellowships, Awards and Appointments

2014-2015. I've had 5 appointments as visiting professor at Asian universities. [If these are of similar quality, put in chronological order, from most recent to oldest. Otherwise, order from strongest to weakest. In this clustered example, use 2015 as the date of the item in the ROMS template]

2015.

Visiting Research and Teaching Professor at Xing Ping University of Finance & Economics, Malaysia. Seminar on xxxxxx. May-June

Visiting Research and Teaching Professor at Zing Ping Polytechnic, Xandue, China. Seminar on xxxxxx. July

2014.

Visiting Research and Teaching Professor at This University, Province, China. Seminar on xxxxxxxx. November

Visiting Research and Teaching Professor at Best University of Commerce, Region, Taiwan. Seminar on xxxxxxxx. October

Visiting Research and Teaching Professor at Beijing Information and Science Technology University, Beijing, China. Seminar on xxxxxxxxxxxx. January-March

### Category: Research Prizes, Fellowships, Awards and Appointments

Institutional Award for outstanding service and best poster award.

2017.

Awarded the Unitec President's Award for Outstanding Service (2017). This is the top service award at Unitec and included recognition for my contribution to the School of Nursing in developing the research environment as well as my own research activities.

2013.

Awarded the Best Poster Presentation for an emerging researcher at the National Conference on Emerging Researchers, Suva, Fiji. The conference was attended by over 300 emerging researchers from the Australian and South Pacific region.

### Category: Reviewing, refereeing, judging, evaluating and examining

I am asked to review manuscripts for academic journals approximately 15 times each year and am able to complete approximately 10. Those I can find evidential records for during the assessment period 2012-2017 include the following high quality journals – all being ranked in the first quartile according to Scopus:

- Adolescent Education (x10 reviews)
- Australian and New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies (x4)
- European Journal of Higher Learning and Education (x6)
- International Journal of Nursing and Education (x4)
- International Journal of Learning Disorders (x1)
- International Learning Studies (x5)
- Journal of Multiple Disorders and Learning (x8)
- Journal of Psychology and Learning (x2)
- New Zealand Medical Journal (x4)
- Psychometric Research (x5)
- Sociological Studies in Education (x7)

As a result of my research and supervision reputation, I have been invited by two tertiary institutions in New Zealand to be the external moderator and monitor of their 'subject area' related postgraduate programmes:

2014 and 2016.  
Victoria University of Wellington, 'Subject Department'



## Drafting your 2018 PBRF evidence portfolio - A guide for Unitec staff

2013 and 2017.  
Open Polytechnic of New Zealand

In this role I examined the programme and wrote evaluative reports on their assessment processes, their quality of support materials and standards. All programmes required students to conduct research projects as part of the assessment.

### Category: Invitations to Present Research or Similar

Invited to contribute to an International Special Collection.

In 2014, I was invited by co-editors Professor Scriven (University of Sydney) and Professor Jaimes (UCLA) to prepare a chapter for a special edition on 'International Best Practice in the Art of Writing' to be published by Palgrave Macmillan on the anniversary of the death of Professor McTavish who won the Grahame Prize – a prestigious European award for lifetime contributions to a particular discipline. I was invited to write about the programme I've developed and offered, and continue to offer on creative writing in business and academia – both here in New Zealand and overseas in North America and Europe. My work has become well known due to the many presentations I've given, and as a result of a number of conference papers and invited seminars. Other invited contributors to this special edition include well-known scholars Professor David Kilpatrick (Trinity College), Professor Janis Swain (University College London) and Professor Del Ardison (Lund University). The special edition will be published in May 2018.

Invited to contribute to a global text – selected international case study.

In late 2014 I was invited to write a book chapter on Governance of Not for Profit organisations in New Zealand for a global text published by Routledge entitled, 'Governance of NGOs: An International Case Study Perspective'. The lead NGO governance scholars from 16 different countries around the globe were invited to author a chapter on their respective countries. Such scholars included Professor Lance Channing (NYU) and Professor Christine Michaels (UCLA) from the USA, Professor Don Shrewsbury (Oxford) and Professor Ann Summers (UQ), Australia, and myself for the New Zealand setting.

### Category: Outreach and Engagement

I have delivered numerous presentations to professional and amateur sporting groups, both national and regional organisations, and led a submission in Australia to investigate reforms of the sporting system.

2012-2017.

Numerous presentations to professional and amateur sporting groups around New Zealand on best practice governance. Examples include:

- NZ Olympic Committee, April and May 2015
- NZ Rugby (senior management and staff) Nov 2014, Dec 2017
- NZ Warriors (senior management and staff) July 2014, June 2015, June 2016
- NZ Waterpolo, July 2017
- Sport Auckland, May 2013 and Nov 2016;
- North Harbour Sport, June 2012
- Canterbury Districts Cricket, Sept 2013

On behalf of the Sport Management Association of Australia and New Zealand (SMAANZ), I led the organisation's submission to the Australian Independent Sport Panel (November 2012). Initiated by the then Minister for Sport in Australia, Kate Ellis, the Independent Sport Panel was established to investigate reforms to Australia's sporting system. I coordinated submissions from the SMAANZ membership, and wrote aspects of the final document. The main thrust of our submission was to argue the research capability of SMAANZ members in investigating and supporting sporting reforms.

### Category: Uptake and Impact

Design for artificial reef for surfing and recreation implemented and providing economic benefits in the South Pacific.

In 2006 and 2008 I published a number of papers (e.g., Journal of Ocean Engineering and Science 2006 x2, Ocean & Coastal Management 2008 x1) outlining the design of an artificial reef that I and two colleagues, Dr Truefold (Waikato University) and Dr John Tik (Tonkin and Taylor Consultants), finalised after much research. We had obtained funding from MBIE (NZ\$130,000) and T&T consultants (NZ\$42,300) in the course of the research. Previous designs had typically been costly to implement and in 93% of implementations did not result in the desired outcome (e.g., irregular wave sets) and in 56% of cases the reefs rapidly degraded due to natural oceanic pressures.

## Drafting your 2018 PBRF evidence portfolio - A guide for Unitec staff

Our design has now been implemented at 5 sites in New Zealand, 3 in Fiji and 2 in Tonga. The Fijian cases were all off-shore island resorts: Malalee Resort (deployed 2011) and Friendly Isles (deployed 2012) in the Yasawas and Narongo's Paradise Resort (deployed 2010) on Tavenuni. In all three cases there have been almost no negative effects (e.g., increased erosion or unsafe water for local fishermen) and in all three cases there has been a more than 300% increase in tourists and occupancy rates. A 2014 study commissioned by the Fiji Tourist Association and available at [www.fijitourist.com/Surfing/ImpactReports.html](http://www.fijitourist.com/Surfing/ImpactReports.html) [fictional link] confirms the wider economic impact of our design that has occurred through the PBRF assessment period. The Tongan Tourist Ministry is commissioning a similar report for 2018. New Zealand implementations have all been positive, based on confidential reports.

Note: The fictitious example of 'Uptake and Impact' demonstrates how the research activity can occur outside of the PBRF assessment period but the impact must have occurred within the period.

### How to create Research Contributions in ROMS

Creating each Research Contribution will probably be the most difficult task in compiling the portfolio, particularly if you have a lot of material. To create each entry you can either:

- Create a new Research Contribution (recommended)
- Modify an existing Research Contribution.

If you have a lot of similar entries already in ROMS (e.g., student supervision) that you need to assemble into a single entry there are a couple of methods:

1. Order your Contributions by Type by clicking on the 'Research Contribution Type' header. This will group same types together. Then select and copy the text from each entry into 'Word'. Edit in Word and then copy that text and paste into a new Research Contribution item. Edit and format accordingly, select as one of the 15 Research Contributions (RC) and in the ROMS year field put the year as the most recent activity in the entry but it must be between 2012 and 2017 (Recommended method).
2. Generate a report of all of your outputs and contributions. Go to Reports in the toolbar and select 'Yearly Report', choose 'all' (as in all years) and generate the report. You will then need to copy the relevant items either into Word and then paste that text into an existing Research Contribution (not recommended) or create a new item.

### ORDER

Put your best Research Contributions first, but you must keep same category types together.

### USING ROMS

Go to the Research Contributions, select 'Edit', choose the 'Type', insert text, select as one of the 'Fifteen RC' and put the year in the ROMS year field as being the most recent activity in the entry, but it must be between 2012 and 2017. Order your Research Contributions strongest to weakest, and the keep same types (e.g., Student Factors) together.

[Back to Research Contribution List...](#)

Type:

Student factors

Description\*:

I have supervised 3 PhDs and 5 Masters t  
some students to publish or present and t  
progress.

PhD Completions

2016.

Dane French. Thesis Title. (Principal supe

Fifteen RC?:

Yes ☒ No ☐

Year:

2017

The Research Contributions guide	
Contribution Type	Description and some indicators
<b>Contribution to Research Discipline and Environment</b>	<p>‘Contribution to research discipline and environment’ items reflect the staff member’s contribution to the development of their discipline or improvements to research capability and/or the research environment inside and/or outside of academia.</p> <p>Indicators of this contribution can include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o developing new discipline methodologies or knowledge</li> <li>o developing new laboratories and/or organising new equipment</li> <li>o leadership positions that increase capability, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– director of a laboratory or research facility</li> <li>– head, or deputy head, of school, department, centre, or research group with a focus on research development or initiatives in that role</li> </ul> </li> <li>o initiatives to grow mātauranga Māori and kaupapa Māori knowledge bases and capacity</li> <li>o initiatives to grow Pasifika knowledge bases and capacity, including those that build non-Pasifika researchers’ knowledge and understanding of Pasifika research and paradigms</li> <li>o membership of a research or postgraduate committee</li> <li>o fostering internal or external linkages, cooperation, collaborative research and development with other departments, institutions or organisations</li> <li>o support of research and development within professional bodies and industry</li> <li>o organising or participating in departmental or institutional research seminars.</li> </ul>
<b>Facilitation, Networking and Collaboration</b>	<p>‘Facilitating, networking and collaboration’ items provide an indicator of the contribution the staff member makes to the research environment, specifically through developing and supporting research networks and collaborations which develop their discipline or improve research capability inside and outside of academia.</p> <p>Indicators of this contribution can include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o facilitating or organising conferences or other formal networks, such as symposia, meetings, workshops, seminar series, hui, fono, wānanga, online forums</li> <li>o participating as a conference chair, track chair or session chair</li> <li>o partnering with iwi and Māori entities on shared research priorities</li> <li>o partnering with Pasifika entities and Pasifika organisations to increase research capability in Pasifika research and researchers</li> <li>o membership of a conference programme committee, technical programme committee or conference panel</li> <li>o director of a consortium or research group</li> <li>o member of collaborations and consortia</li> <li>o internal or external research collaboration</li> <li>o fostering internal or external linkages, cooperation, collaborative research and development with other departments or organisations</li> <li>o activities that improve research opportunities, such as working in collaborations or consortia</li> <li>o invited presentations to conferences or other formal networks may also appear under ‘Invitations to present research or similar’</li> <li>o hosting esteemed visitors.</li> </ul>
<b>Invitations to Present Research or Similar</b>	<p>‘Invitations to present research or similar’ items provide an indicator of the staff member’s reputation within and outside of academia, and as such, these items are about invitations that are specifically based on the staff member’s research reputation.</p> <p>Indicators of this esteem can include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o invited to give a keynote address or plenary, or to be a principal speaker or invited speaker</li> <li>o invited member of a research advisory, strategy, reference or working group, task force, or steering committee for internal or external organisation</li> <li>o invited to present research to professional groups or organisations</li> <li>o invited to develop iwi, Māori or Pasifika community-based projects</li> <li>o invited to produce a journal article, review paper, chapter or reprints specifically based on the staff member’s research reputation</li> <li>o invited to overseas organisations or events</li> <li>o invited to work in an overseas institution</li> <li>o invited or commissioned to create, perform, or produce creative work</li> <li>o invited to contribute to Pasifika conferences, Pasifika development panels, Pasifika research fono and Pasifika advisory boards</li> <li>o invited to present research to other non-professional groups, community interest groups, ethnic or cultural representatives.</li> </ul>
<b>Other Evidence of Research Contribution</b>	<p>‘Other evidence of research contribution’ may include other items which are not included in the research contribution categories, but demonstrate the contributions made, and esteem held, by a staff member and their research within or outside of academia.</p> <p>Indicators of this esteem and/or contribution can include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o requests to provide or providing tenure references</li> <li>o producing reference materials such as encyclopaedia and dictionary entries.</li> </ul>

## Appendix 1 – Research Contributions Guide

<b>Outreach and Engagement</b>	<p>‘Outreach and engagement’ items reflect the contribution the staff member makes to the wider community in New Zealand and/or internationally through their research-based expertise.</p> <p>Indicators of this contribution can include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o outreach activities</li> <li>o community engagement</li> <li>o contributions to Māori social, economic and cultural advancement</li> <li>o contributions to Pasifika social, economic and cultural advancement</li> <li>o contributions to public understanding of a particular issue or discipline</li> <li>o ‘critic and conscience’ of society and debate in the discipline</li> <li>o media coverage of research</li> <li>o presentation of research to professional groups or organisations.</li> </ul>
<b>Recognition of Research Outputs</b>	<p>‘Recognition of research outputs’ items reflect the esteem in which a staff member’s specific research outputs are held by their peers and other stakeholders.</p> <p>Indicators of this esteem can include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o positive commendations and/or reviews for your research outputs</li> <li>o metrics such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– citation counts (excluding self-citation)</li> <li>– h-index (relevant to some science subjects)</li> </ul> </li> <li>o other metrics, for example those that relate to different forms of media, such as social media, number of downloads, Google Analytics</li> <li>o acknowledgment by iwi and Māori leaders, kaumatua and kuia of contributions to Māori economic, social and cultural advancement</li> <li>o acknowledgment and support by Pasifika stakeholders of contributions to Pasifika economic, social and cultural advancement</li> <li>o selected for important or esteemed public/private collection or performance venue</li> <li>o extended exhibition or performance dates due to demand</li> <li>o reprints of your research or repeated exhibitions or performances.</li> </ul>
<b>Research Funding and Support</b>	<p>‘Research funding and support’ items provide an indicator of the contribution the staff member makes to the research environment, or reflect the staff member’s esteem where the funding/support is competitive.</p> <p>Indicators of this esteem and/or contribution can include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o securing external contestable grants for example, Marsden Fund</li> <li>o competitive funding from your own organisation</li> <li>o funding from external organisations</li> <li>o funding for research facilities or gaining competitive access to facilities</li> <li>o travel grants</li> <li>o securing in-kind or pro-bono support to facilitate research including key people (including kaumatua and community engagement capability), resources, equipment and materials.</li> </ul>
<b>Research Prizes, Fellowships, Awards and Appointments</b>	<p>‘Research prizes, fellowships, awards and appointments’ items indicate the staff member’s research reputation within and outside of academia, and as such, these items are about selective memberships. Only elected/awarded memberships, fellowships, awards, appointments, etc. should be included.</p> <p>Indicators of this esteem can include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o best paper, poster or presentation</li> <li>o awards and prizes for creative arts outputs</li> <li>o adjunct appointment</li> <li>o research fellowship</li> <li>o mandated iwi and Māori authority leadership roles</li> <li>o mandated cultural leadership roles (for example, chairperson, church minister or honorific chiefly title)</li> <li>o fellow of a professional body, for example, the Institution of Professional Engineers New Zealand (IPENZ) or Fellow of the Royal Society of New Zealand</li> <li>o member of a society or academy with restricted or elected admission, for example the British Society of Audiology.</li> </ul> <p>Activity as part of a standard membership of societies must be listed under ‘Contribution to research discipline and environment’.</p> <p>Membership of funding committees must be listed under ‘Reviewing, refereeing, judging, evaluating and examining’.</p>
<b>Researcher Development</b>	<p>‘Researcher development’ items reflect the staff member’s contribution to the range of activities related to mentoring colleagues in relation to research development.</p> <p>Indicators of this contribution can include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o mentoring and supervising other staff members including new and emerging researchers</li> <li>o growing institutional support for, and the pool of, iwi and Māori researchers</li> <li>o increasing institutional capacity for growing the pool of Pasifika researchers</li> <li>o supervising postdoctoral fellows</li> <li>o head of department where there is a focus on researcher development activities while in the role</li> <li>o research mentoring.</li> </ul>

## Appendix 1 – Research Contributions Guide

<b>Reviewing, Refereeing, Judging, Evaluating and Examining</b>	<p>‘Reviewing, refereeing, judging, evaluating and examining’ items provide an indicator of the esteem a staff member may have amongst their peers.</p> <p>Indicators of this esteem can include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ member of funding committee which reviews or evaluates funding proposals or grant applications</li> <li>○ member providing specialist or expert advice to a research advisory, strategy, reference, working group, task force or steering group</li> <li>○ member of a committee providing specialist or expert advice to or for a relevant external organisation</li> <li>○ member of an editorial board</li> <li>○ external thesis examiner</li> <li>○ editor or guest editor</li> <li>○ invited to contribute to indigenous/first nation peoples development panels, boards and major programmes</li> <li>○ invited to be a member of a selection panel for awards and prizes</li> <li>○ reviewing a journal article, conference paper, book manuscript</li> <li>○ reviewing abstracts (as part of the selection of presenters) and conference proceedings (following selection)</li> <li>○ peer reviewer for industrial, commercial or government organisations.</li> </ul>
<b>Student Factors</b>	<p>‘Student factors’ items reflect the staff member’s contribution to student-related activity, as well as esteem factors associated with their research students.</p> <p>Indicators of this esteem and/or contribution can include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ attracting, supervising and supporting students including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– PhD, Master’s, honours research</li> <li>– Māori and Pasifika students</li> <li>– summer research students and visiting research students</li> <li>– other high-quality postgraduate students</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ assisting student publishing, exhibiting or performance</li> <li>○ research student placements</li> <li>○ supporting Māori students to connect with their iwi through mutually beneficial research</li> <li>○ supporting students to gain scholarships, prizes or awards</li> <li>○ supporting students to gain positive employment outcomes.</li> </ul>
<b>Uptake and Impact</b>	<p>‘Uptake and impact’ items provide an indication of the contribution the staff member’s research has had outside of academia.</p> <p>Indicators of this contribution can include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ uptake/adoption of research by industry, iwi, Pasifika, community, or professional bodies nationally and/or internationally as standard practice or policy</li> <li>○ providing expert advice to the public sector, communities, and/or the private sector nationally and/or internationally which informs or influences policy and/or practice</li> <li>○ improvements to existing practices, policy, law, businesses, process or products</li> <li>○ commercialisation of research</li> <li>○ contributing to economic prosperity, social wellbeing, innovation and entrepreneurial activity through the design and delivery of new products, processes or services</li> <li>○ contributing to Māori social, economic and cultural advancement</li> <li>○ other evidence that the knowledge generated by the research is in use outside academia</li> <li>○ other technology and knowledge transfer</li> <li>○ expert witness or testimony</li> <li>○ consultancy based on research expertise.</li> </ul>

## Evidence portfolio review checklist

### Panel:

- ☐ Is my selected panel and subject the best fit for the majority of my research outputs, particularly for my Nominated Research Outputs (NROs)?
- ☐ Does the Field of Research description only contain discipline/sub-discipline level information to clearly describe my research AND if relevant, key areas of interdisciplinary research?

### Cross Referral

- ☐ Have I explained why I selected a cross-referral to either the Pacific Research Panel or Māori Knowledge and Development Panel, if relevant? And have I selected up to 5 items for the referral?

### Platform of Research – contextual summary

- ☐ Does my Platform of Research contextual summary tell my research story clearly: Who I am? What is my research about? Does it tie all my EP components together?

### Research Outputs - Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) – list four

- ☐ Are all my Research Outputs within the period between 1 Jan 2012 and 31 Dec 2017?
- ☐ Are my four Nominated Research Outputs the very best of my research during the assessment period?
- ☐ Does my NRO My Contribution field clearly describe the nature and significance of my contribution and the status of any co-authors, where relevant?
- ☐ Does my NRO Description field describe the nature, significance and any impact of the research, and provide details on any wider story about output, including addressing potential ambiguous factors such as the quality assurance process (e.g. reports) or the publication outlet (e.g. unknown journal, or practitioner outlet)?
- ☐ Is all the necessary evidence included for assessment, for example, have I included my actual research (i.e. published full text or good quality images), not just supporting information?
- ☐ Are my NROs ordered best first?

### Research Outputs – Other Research Outputs (OROs) – maximum of 12

- ☐ Have I selected the best of the rest of my available research outputs?
- ☐ Have I grouped my outputs by category (e.g. journals listed 1-5, book chapters 6-8, proceedings 9-12)?
- ☐ Have I ordered my outputs best first?

### Research Contributions (RC) – maximum of 15

- ☐ Have I identified all possible activities and items that could be considered Research Contributions?
- ☐ Do each of my Research Contribution comprise a number of similar or related items (when there are many items to include)?
- ☐ Are my Research Contributions categorised correctly?
- ☐ Have I got a spread of Research Contributions categories (when content permits)?
- ☐ Have I ordered my Research Contributions best first?

### Review

- ☐ Have I asked colleagues to review my portfolio so it is presented as well as possible?