

本署檔號 OUR REF.: UGC/GEN/233/92(22)

來函檔號 YOUR REF.:

電話 TELEPHONE: 2524 1795

中國香港灣仔港灣道6至8號瑞安中心7樓
7/F Shui On Centre, 6-8 Harbour Road
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China
電話 Tel: (852) 2524 3987
傳真 Fax: (852) 2845 1596
電子郵件 E-Mail: ugc@ugc.edu.hk
網址 Homepage: www.ugc.edu.hk

9 September 2005

[Heads of Institutions]

Dear Vice-Chancellor/President,

Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) 2006

I am writing to advise you of the formal launch and arrangements for the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) 2006 and to call for the submission of the necessary documentation.

Guidance Notes

In July 2004, we sought views from institutions on the broad principles of future research assessments of the higher education sector. According to the feedback, institutions, in general, recognized that the past RAEs had driven a remarkable and sustained improvement in the research performance of the higher education sector, both in terms of quality and quantity. Furthermore, the preference of the majority of institutions was to maintain an RAE-like assessment mechanism, though with improvements better to evaluate disciplines such as Arts & Humanities etc. In the light of the comments of the institutions and on the advice of the Research Ad Hoc Group (RAG), my Committee decided in August 2004 that the next exercise on research assessment should be conducted in 2005/06. The purpose, principles, framework and the conduct of the RAE 2006 were set out in an information note on RAE 2006 which was issued to institutions in November 2004. The notes was also posted on the UGC website at <http://www.ugc.edu.hk/eng/ugc/publication/prog/rae/rae.htm>. Further to that and drawing on comments on the RAE 1999 and the views of the UGC on RAE 2006, my Committee consulted you on the operational details and format for RAE 2006 on the basis of the draft Guidance Notes issued in February 2005.

The UGC was grateful for the many thoughtful and helpful comments and feedback received from institutions. Comments from all the 13 RAE panel convenors were also sought. In August 2005, my Committee, as advised by the RAG, considered carefully all the comments then received and as a result, a revised and the final version of the Guidance Notes for RAE 2006 is now produced at [Annex A](#).

For your ease of reference, we will highlight some of the major areas of interest as reflected in the Guidance Notes at [Annex A](#) as follows :

(1) Eligibility of Staff Members (paragraph 37 of the Guidance Notes)

We received various comments and suggestions from institutions on the employment eligibility date (i.e. 1 January 2005), such as deferment of the employment eligibility date to introduce greater flexibility, accepting academic staff who are retiring in 2004/05, and staff with offers of employment made by no later than 1 January 2005 whose actual employment begins no later than the specified census date (i.e. 31 December 2005). My Committee had carefully considered all the suggestions. The setting of the date is a difficult issue. We need to strike a balance between taking account of recent appointments and preventing the possibility of the use of inappropriate means to obtain higher RAE scores, say by taking on transient or short-term academic staff with high-quality research outputs. On balance, we consider it appropriate to maintain the date at 1 January 2005. As such, paragraph 37 of the Guidance Notes will remain unchanged.

(2) Assessment Period and Research Output Items for Submission (paragraphs 46, 55 and 60 of the Guidance Notes)

Several institutions raised the concern that it would “not be fair” to staff members if their research outputs during the three gap years (i.e. 1999 to 2001) would not be recognized, especially those in the Humanities where a longer lead time could be required in generating research outputs. Some institutions also raised the concern that allowing only one exceptional item was not sufficient.

My Committee had carefully considered the above concerns. In order to recognize the special needs of different disciplines and to address the concern that the research performance of some researchers might not be properly evaluated due to the gap years (i.e. 1.1.1999 to 31.12.2001), we have decided that each eligible staff may submit a maximum number of six items in the following manner at their discretion -

- (a) four regular items within the assessment years (i.e. 1.1.2002 to 31.12.2005), one regular item within the gap years (i.e. 1.1.1999 to 31.12.2001), and one exceptional item before the assessment year period (i.e. prior to 1.1.2002); or
- (b) five regular items within the assessment years (i.e. 1.1.2002 to 31.12.2005), and one regular item within the gap years (i.e. 1.1.1999 to 31.12.2001).

Furthermore, to ensure that the quality threshold standard is raised and also taking into account the presence of the three gap years (i.e. the assessment being based on seven years, as opposed to four in RAE 1999), the UGC has also decided that each RAE panel should make an evaluation on the basis of what it regards as the best four instead of the best three items. In addition, to avoid double counting, re-submission of past RAE items will not be allowed.

(3) Co-authorship (Appendix E1 to the Guidance Notes)

Since the contribution of the students should be regarded as part of the contribution of her/his supervisor, the UGC has decided that students co-authors should be identified in the submission form. The relevant submission form (i.e. Appendix E1 to the Guidance Notes) is amended accordingly.

I also attach a Q & A on some general RAE-related issues at [Annex B](#) for your reference, and that of your staff.

Updated RAE 2006 Timetable

An updated timetable for the implementation of RAE 2006 is at [Annex C](#). In particular, I would draw to your attention that two workshops¹ have been scheduled for 24 January 2006 to provide opportunities for institutions to meet with members of the Carnegie Foundation with a view to strengthening their understanding of the four types of scholarship, which will be adopted by the RAE 2006 to categorize the submissions. The UGC views clear understanding of our approach using the four types of scholarship as very important to this exercise. The RAE Panel Members/Convenors will also have a workshop to ensure they are fully familiar. The Secretariat will liaise with your institution separately on the details of the workshop arrangements.

¹ Two similar workshops will be held in the morning and afternoon of 24 January 2006. It is envisaged that four institutions will join the first workshop and the remaining four the second workshop.

Formation of Panels

Unlike RAE 1999, we have split the 'Social Sciences & Education Panel' into two panels, namely Social Sciences Panel and Education Panel. As a result, the number of panels is increased from 12 to 13 in RAE 2006. I am pleased to inform you that 26 distinguished academics have accepted our invitation to serve as Convenors or Deputy Convenors of the 13 panels for RAE 2006. A list showing their names is attached at the [Annex D](#) for your information. Taking into account the panel membership nominations submitted by you and the other seven UGC-funded institutions, the respective Panel Convenors and their deputies will, in consultation with the Convenor, RAG and the Secretariat, finalise the list of panel membership for RAE 2006 based on the General Guidelines for Panel Convenors on Panel Formation attached at [Annex E](#). We envisage that the proportion of non-local panel members in RAE 2006 will be larger than that in RAE 1999.

Transparency

With a view to enhancing the transparency of RAE 2006, the following documents - Guidance Notes for RAE 2006, the Q&A, the list of Panel Convenor and Deputy Convenor, the General Guidelines for Panel Convenors on Panel Formation, and a generalized version of this letter are being uploaded on the UGC website for public's information –

<http://www.ugc.edu.hk/eng/ugc/publication/prog/rae/rae.htm>

Submission Timelines of RAE 2006 Documentation

I should be grateful if you would ensure that the necessary documents are properly completed in accordance with the Guidance Notes and returned to the Secretariat promptly in accordance with the specified timetable. Table 2 - the list of the institution's staff eligible for assessment in RAE 2006 - should be submitted by **1 March 2006**. The Research Strategy Statement, Table 1 and Table 3, the research output items as described in paragraph 46 of the Guidance Notes together with sufficient supporting documents requested in paragraph 51 should all be submitted by **13 March 2006**. The templates for all the various forms have been mounted on the UGC web to facilitate their reproduction and distribution within the institutions.

Enquiries

For enquiries about the Guidance Notes and arrangements for RAE 2006, please contact either Mr Anthony Chan, Assistant Secretary-General (Research) at 2844 9916 or Ms Wendy Wong, Senior Research

Administrator (1) at 2844 9917. They can also be reached via fax at 2845 1183 or e-mail at achan@ugc.edu.hk and wendywong@ugc.edu.hk, respectively.

Yours sincerely,

(Alice Lam)
Chairman

Encl.

c.c. Convenor, RAG

University Grants Committee
Research Assessment Exercise 2006

Guidance Notes

Contents

This document consists of the Guidance Notes, a set of forms numbered Tables 1 to 3, and Appendices A to G. The document is also accessible from the UGC Web at <<http://www.ugc.edu.hk>>.

Distribution

Each institution should issue this document to every member of its academic staff, and to every member of its administrative staff responsible for research policy and support, in order that the principles, aims and methodology of the RAE are fully understood. Institutions may ask their staff members to obtain a copy of this document from the UGC Web.

Enquiries

All enquiries should be routed through respective RAE coordinating offices of institutions.

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraph</u>
I. Purpose of the RAE	1 - 34
General Background on UGC Policy	4 - 8
Background to RAE 2006	9 - 13
Review of RAE Mechanism	14 - 20
Principles and Philosophy for RAE 2006	21 - 30
Recognition at the Top-end	31
Quality	32
General Scheme	33 - 34
II. Cost Centres	35 - 36
III. Number of Academic Staff in Each Cost Centre	37 - 42
IV. Submission of Data for Each Eligible Staff	43 - 64
Who to submit	43 - 45
What to submit	46 - 48
Assessment period	49
Definition of output	50 - 53
New researchers	54
Quality criterion	55
Co-authorship	56 - 59
Exceptional item	60
Data required	61 - 62
Sample submission	63
Further information	64
V. Evaluation Guidelines	65 - 80
Panels	65 - 69
Threshold standard	70 - 79
VI. Handling of Results	80 - 87
Transparency	83 - 85
Timetable for the submission of data for RAE 2006	86
Form of submission	87
Appendices A to G	
Tables 1 to 3	

I. PURPOSE OF THE RAE

Since 1993, the University Grants Committee (UGC) has adopted a zero-based model which relates the level of funding allocations both to the tasks that each institution is expected to accomplish during the funding period, and to the quality of its recent performance.

2. The funding of each institution is made up of three main elements: provision for teaching; provision for research; and provision related to performance against role. It is the UGC's intention that public funds in support of research should be allocated preferentially to those institutions which demonstrate that they can use them well. There is therefore a need to assess research performance in some way so that it can be reflected in the funding level.

3. The Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) is thus part of the UGC's performance-based funding assessment process. It aims to measure the output and quality of research of the UGC-funded institutions by cost centre as one of the key factors for allocating the research portion of the institutional recurrent grant for the next triennium (i.e. 2008-2011) in a publicly accountable way.

General Background on UGC Policy

4. There have been significant developments in the general policy background since the 1999 RAE. These relate primarily to the 2002 Higher Education Review and the UGC's recent measures to take forward key elements of the Review.

5. A key element and driver of policy is the determination to promote role differentiation in the UGC sector, combined with international competitiveness within those roles. To this end, in 2003/04 the UGC worked with all the eight institutions and agreed with them revised role statements for the institutions, which reinforce role differentiation. All institutions are to pursue teaching at an internationally competitive level – and each then has different foci related to their specific roles.

6. Related to this is the development of a Performance and Role Related Funding Scheme, which will inform 10% of the funding for the 2005-08 triennium. The purpose of this scheme is to encourage performance against role – and performance in general. The focus on role and performance will continue to be reflected in the 2008-11 grant assessments.

7. Another policy initiative of the UGC is to encourage deep collaboration in all areas of institutional activity. This of course also applies to research activities, and the UGC wishes to encourage deep collaboration in research and the RAE 2006 provides for assessment of such.

8. These policy initiatives are important background to the RAE 2006 as they show that the UGC is concerned to see not only international competitiveness in

all areas of institution activities but also that such activities are within the role agreed for and by the institutions - which includes research.

Background to RAE 2006

9. So far, three assessment exercises have taken place at three-year intervals to coincide with the triennial funding cycle: the first RAE in 1993, the second in 1996 and the third in 1999. Subsequent to the completion of RAE 1999, the UGC decided that future RAEs should be undertaken at 6-year intervals and the next exercise should be conducted in 2005/06.

10. The first RAE in 1993 was essentially modelled on the UK system and was implemented with the help of external consultants. However, a quality threshold which was not overly stringent was used. The second and third RAEs were built on the basis of the previous RAEs, but giving more recognition to the call for more diversity.

11. The size of the panels was expanded from 111 members in 1996 to 180 members in 1999 and the number of non-local panel members was significantly increased from 15 in RAE 1996 to 42 in RAE 1999. All the non-local members functioned as full panel members together with the local members.

12. A conscious decision was also taken to adopt a higher quality threshold in the 1999 exercise in view of the improvement in the quality of research. The UGC subsequently concluded that the results of the third RAE revealed that there had been real and significant improvements in terms of both quality and quantity of research work being carried out by academics in Hong Kong.

13. In retrospect, the RAE has been effective as a means of -

- (a) informing funding;
- (b) symbolising public accountability; and
- (c) inducing improvement in research.

Review of RAE Mechanism

14. Nonetheless, there were concerns that the RAE, in its traditional form, had driven institutions to put undue emphasis on research because of the significant marginal return involved – as compared to teaching. Other comments related to the perceived mechanical process, the perceived narrow focus on traditional research, insufficient differentiation in performance at the top-end, and the absence of any consideration of institutional roles.

15. Having considered the concerns of various sectors of the local higher education community regarding the existing RAE mechanism, the UGC decided at its April 2004 meeting that a Research Ad Hoc Group (RAG) should be formed to

consider the wider issue of the UGC's overall quality assurance activities in research and to recommend how future assessments should be conducted. In the course of the review, the RAG not only reviewed the existing RAE mechanism but also re-visited the basic principles of research assessments. Institutions' views were also sought on the broad principles of future research assessments of the higher education sector.

16. Taking into account the views of the institutions and the advice of the RAG, the UGC decided that another RAE on the lines basically similar to those of previous ones should be conducted for disbursing the majority of the research ('R') funding in the block grant for the 2008-11 triennium. The threshold standard should be raised to continue to emphasize and improve quality. Fractional scores would continue to be included so that all university-level teachers could aspire to doing quality research that is recognized, but nevertheless do so in an environment which does not force this to the exclusion of all else.

17. Furthermore, subject to the funding level of 2007-08 and the 2008-11 triennium, a small percentage of total funding (low single digit) would be allocated from 'R' funding of the block grant to the RGC in order to recognize and reward research performance at the top-end. This measure was introduced in recognition of the difficulty in distinguishing achievement at the top-end through a broad-brush exercise such as the RAE, since assessment at the top end would require detailed reading of the submitted items which in many cases demand highly specialized expertise. The problem could be further compounded with other problems such as local assessors running into possible and/or perceived conflict of interests and overseas assessors not having sufficient understanding of the local context. In this connection, the UGC decided that it would be more appropriate to make use of the peer-review system of the RGC, which is widely recognized as a fair tool, to identify and reward research excellence.

18. Details of the UGC's decision were conveyed to institutions in November 2004 in the form of an Information Note.

19. In accordance with the agreed arrangement, the fourth RAE will be undertaken by the UGC in 2005/06. Like the third RAE conducted in 1999, the purpose of the exercise is to assess the research output performance of the UGC-funded institutions by cost centre, to be used as one of the bases for allocating the 'R' funding of the block grant for the triennium 2008-11.

20. The UGC again wishes to emphasize that the research assessment exercise does not imply an interest in research to the possible detriment of teaching quality. The Committee recognizes that both teaching and research are important and are inter-related elements in the development of higher education. Indeed, the majority of the recurrent grants allocated to institutions is and should be attributed to teaching. Nevertheless, it is necessary for the Committee to adopt different approaches to assessing the funding requirements for teaching and research in view of the different nature of these activities.

Principles and Philosophy for RAE 2006

21. The RAE 2006 will be conducted on lines basically similar to those of RAE 1999, albeit with improvements in several areas. The RAE will continue to rate cost centres, not individual staff members. It will determine 'research indices' for all cost centres in each UGC-funded institution which will be aggregated to obtain an overall research index for that institution.

22. The results of the past RAEs directly informed funding, in that they were factored into the determination of a significant part of the 'R' funding of the block grant. The UGC notes that this may have unduly influenced institutions' commitment to research versus teaching, and therefore wishes to reiterate the principles and philosophy of RAE in the 2006 exercise.

23. The UGC is of the view that research is not an isolated activity; rather it should support and illuminate teaching and learning. On the definition of research, the UGC considers it important to maintain the Carnegie definition of scholarship in the RAE 2006 to reinforce further **the message of a broadened definition of scholarship so that high quality output in all forms of scholarship will be encouraged and assessed across a broad front. This will help address the perceived bias in favour of basic/traditional research. The word 'research' should be read in this context in this document.**

24. The RAE 2006 will continue to identify and measure, on the basis of outputs, the following kinds of scholarship :

- (a) scholarship of discovery;
- (b) scholarship of integration;
- (c) scholarship of application; and
- (d) scholarship of teaching.

25. A brief definition of these four kinds of scholarship, adapted from the two Carnegie Foundation's Special Report entitled "Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate", 1990 and "Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate", 1997 are at Appendix A.

26. Since the broadened definition of scholarship was only introduced for the first time in RAE 1999, the UGC considers it useful to strengthen further the understanding of the Carnegie definition of scholarship among local faculty. In this regard, a special workshop will be arranged for local academics and institutions' administrators in January 2006.

27. For the conduct of RAE 2006, each institution will be required to submit, on the basis of a self-assessment, a Research Strategy Statement to reflect its research philosophy, vision and priorities in relation to its **role** and stage of development, and the distribution of research efforts in the four categories of scholarship and (where appropriate) across discipline. As described earlier, the UGC

views role differentiation as a key policy goal. Thus, institutions are reminded that the distribution of research efforts across the four categories (and across disciplines) should conform to their role. Any possible drift of research efforts from the role will be carefully looked at by the UGC in other review exercises such as the Performance and Role-Related Funding Scheme.

28. The Research Strategy Statement should state the institution's research focus areas and explain why they are selected. It should also state the institution's existing strengths and standard as well as its overall research strategy in the long-run. A template for preparing the Research Strategy Statement is at [Appendix B](#). The declared research strategy will provide a context for viewing the research index of the institution as a whole (and of the cost centres; see paragraph 36) on completion of the RAE. It is expected that the distribution of the RAE submissions will be coherent with the statements at the institution and cost centre levels.

29. The UGC-funded institutions' principal functions are to teach and, to varying degrees, to undertake research. The funding of each institution should be the sum of funding for teaching ('T'), 'R' and performance against role. In respect of research, it should be recognized that for the purpose of 'R' funding assessment, there are some research activities which should appropriately be funded by public funds administered by the UGC, and others which should not, in which case the institutions concerned should obtain the necessary funding from the appropriate sources or seek full-cost recovery including on-costs, where appropriate, from the clients.

30. Although the fourth RAE will again look at individual records, the UGC wishes to stress that it is **not** intended to be an assessment of individuals' research performance. It will rather be an assessment of each institution's research performance by cost centre. The subject panels will only produce a total score for each cost centre. Even if the score(s) of an individual researcher or researchers can be inferred from the cost centre's final research index (especially in the case of very small cost centres), the institution concerned should not use the inferred information for internal evaluation of the performance of the researchers concerned, because staff appraisal must involve dimensions other than research, however widely defined. Even for research alone, methodologies that are appropriate for assessment in the aggregate for funding purposes may not be appropriate for the assessment of the performance of individuals for the purposes of personnel decisions.

Recognition at the Top-end

31. In previous RAEs, panel members (especially some non-local members) commented on the insufficient differentiation at the top end. However, the RAE should not be seen in isolation – 'R' funding is to be distributed by a combination of two mechanisms: the RAE which admittedly does not (and given the breadth of the assessment cannot) effectively discriminate at the top-end, and the RGC competitive grants which, in effect, place resources principally in the hands of the top 10-20% of researchers. The recognition at the top-end will be further enhanced, subject to the funding level of 2007-08 and the 2008-11 triennium, by allocating a small percentage of total funding (low single digit) from 'R' funding of the block grant to the RGC.

Quality

32. Given the rising standards both in Hong Kong and elsewhere, the threshold standard is to be raised (see paragraph 71 below) in the RAE 2006. As in previous exercises, all subject panels will work to the same threshold definition although they will have to exercise their judgment with due regard for the nature and culture in different disciplines.

General Scheme

33. The general scheme of the fourth RAE will be to determine the research index of a cost centre, i.e. the percentage of full-time equivalent researchers in each cost centre whose research work is judged to have reached or surpassed the quality threshold. The index, p , is determined by the following formula:

$$p = 100\% \times A / T$$

where

T = the total number of academic staff (in fte) in a cost centre who meet the criteria stated in paragraph 37 - 41 regardless of whether they submit research output items for assessment; and

A = the total number among those who are judged by the Panel to have reached or surpassed the quality threshold, including fractional counts.

34. These Guidance Notes therefore explain in detail the way in which assessments will be made, the kind of information required and how it will be presented to the RAE panels for assessment. The following areas are covered by the Guidance Notes:

- (a) the definition of cost centres (Section II);
- (b) the convention for counting the total number of academic staff in each cost centre to arrive at the denominator T (Section III);
- (c) the submission of data for each eligible staff included (Section IV);
- (d) the evaluation guidelines for the panels in their judgment of the submissions to arrive at the numerator A (Section V); and
- (e) the handling of the results (Section VI).

II. COST CENTRES

35. To bring departments onto a common classification system, institutions are asked to map their departments and research units onto a common list of 'Cost Centres' according to the list in Appendix C. The mapping should be the same as that

used in the UGC's Common Data Collection Format (CDCF) returns. The Cost Centre forms the basis of the data we are now seeking.

36. For each cost centre, an appropriate representative from the institution, e.g. Department Head or Faculty Dean, should submit a one-page summary in the form of Table 1, giving a factual description of the research activities, including the distribution of work in the four categories of scholarship (paragraph 24 above), in the cost centre. The descriptive summary will not be assessed, but will provide a context for the panel's deliberations.

III. NUMBER OF ACADEMIC STAFF IN EACH COST CENTRE

37. The UGC considers that the sustainability of institutions' research capacity is one of the key factors that determines the long-term research development of the higher education sector. In this regard, the UGC has decided that all the academic staff who meet both of the following criteria will be counted in the total *T*, and may submit information to be assessed:

- (a) they are holding a paid appointment at the institution concerned for a continuous period of twenty-four months or more covering the specified census date (see paragraph 42), provided that the beginning of the employment start date was no later than 1 January 2005; and
- (b) they do not hold concurrent paid positions at other institutions.

38. In the light of the revised staff eligibility rules for Earmarked Research Grants as adopted by the UGC in April 2003, the RAE 2006 will adhere to the same general principle of covering only core academic staff who are wholly funded by the institution proper¹ for degree or higher degree work and are within staff grades of 'Professor' to 'Assistant Lecturer'. These correspond to Staff Categories 'A' to 'I' as defined (see Appendix D) for the purpose of CDCF.

39. Institutions are required to submit in the form of Table 2 the list of all academic staff who meet the above criteria regardless of whether they intend to submit items for assessment. The institutions' Table 2 returns will need to be submitted to the UGC Secretariat by 1 March 2006.

40. Part-time staff who fall within the definition in paragraph 37, other than those remunerated on an hourly rate, should also be included in Table 2 and will count towards 'T' on a fractional basis. As with full-time staff, they may submit items of research output to be assessed. Each staff member reported, whether he/she is full-time staff or part-time staff, will be counted in full-time equivalent terms against the cost centre(s) to which he/she contributes and will be expressed as a fraction (employment fraction) in the cost centre. To illustrate, a full-time staff member counted against one single cost centre will be expressed as a whole unit '1'. A part-time staff member equivalent to 0.5 full-time staff member contributing solely and

¹ Excluding staff in the continuing education arms and sub-degree work.

equally to cost centres A and B will be expressed as 0.25 in cost centre A and 0.25 in cost centre B.

41. For the avoidance of doubt, inclusion of staff should only make reference to their job categories, and not to whether they are research active. Moreover, justification will be sought in respect of the following:

- (a) any staff carrying titles that would superficially suggest inclusion in Categories 'A' to 'I' (e.g. 'Professor', 'Assistant Lecturer') who are nevertheless not included; or
- (b) staff carrying titles that are significantly different from the standard ones for Categories 'A' to 'I' (e.g. 'research officer', 'director') who are nevertheless included.

42. The census date for the reported data is 31 December 2005, which is the middle of the academic year 2005/06.

IV. SUBMISSION OF DATA FOR EACH ELIGIBLE STAFF

Who to submit

43. Institutions are invited to submit research material in respect of any member of staff (as listed in Table 2) who the institution feels has output that can be assessed. Such submission should be made in accordance with Table 3 and should reach the UGC Secretariat by 13 March 2006.

44. The research submissions will normally be assessed by the subject panel that is designated for the relevant cost centre. In the case where a staff member has a strong reason to request a specific panel to review his/her submissions, such request should be indicated in column 19 of Table 3. The subject panels will take into account the requests when considering the final assignment work.

45. The UGC recognizes that research, even as more widely defined in this exercise, only represents part of an institution's activities, and understands that there may be valid reasons why some valuable and respected members of staff may not, for the period in question, contribute to the institution's research index. For example, some staff could be heavily involved in public service, or in institutional administration. Therefore each institution is free to decide, in consultation with the individual, not to make a submission, and no stigma should or will be attached to any individual in respect of whom such a decision is taken.

What to submit

46. Each eligible staff member can only submit a maximum number of **six** research output items. The maximum number of items that can be submitted under each category is set out as follows:

		‘Assessment year’ items	‘Gap year’ items	Exceptional items⁴	Maximum⁵ number of submission items		
Assessment Period¹		1 January 2002 to 31 December 2005	1 January 1999 to 31 December 2001	Prior to 1 January 2002			
Number of research output items per eligible staff member²	A	up to four ³	<u>and</u>	up to one	<u>and</u>	up to one	6
	B	up to five ³	<u>and</u>	up to one			6

¹ See paragraph 49 for detailed information on assessment period.

² See paragraphs 50 – 53 for definition of research output items.

³ See paragraph 55 for information on number of research output items.

⁴ See paragraph 60 for detailed information on exceptional items.

⁵ See paragraph 55 for information on the maximum number of research output items.

47. The UGC expects the work submitted by each cost centre to show a reasonable distribution given the nature of the subject and the role of the institution. The spread of submissions across the four categories of scholarship and, where appropriate, across disciplines may provide a basis for the UGC to consider the research performance of an institution against its role. However, scoring will be made without regard to the category of the items submitted.

48. It is suggested that each cost centre convene a meeting of staff who are considering making a submission to discuss the four categories of scholarship in relation to the centre's role and mission (the meeting may also be used to help coordinate within-cost centre co-authorship as discussed in paragraphs 56 - 59).

Assessment period

49. For the purpose of paragraph 46 above, the assessment periods for the items under the three categories will be as follows:-

- (a) Research output items produced in the ‘assessment year’ – from 1 January 2002 to 31 December 2005;
- (b) Research output items produced in the ‘gap year’ – from 1 January 1999 to 31 December 2001;
- (c) Exceptional research output items – Prior to 1 January 2002.

Definition of output

50. All output items submitted for assessment must meet all of the following criteria:-

- (a) the output contains an element of innovation;
- (b) the output and the process involved contribute to scholarship;
- (c) the output is publicly accessible; and
- (d) the output is of interest to peers and is generalizable.

Provided that all the above criteria are fully met, it does not matter whether the research activities leading to the output items submitted for assessment are funded by the UGC.

51. The following are considered to be items falling within the research output items in paragraph 46 above :

- (a) any publication, patent, artifact, etc., provided it was -
 - (i) published or made publicly available in other form within the assessment period; or
 - (ii) not yet published, but officially accepted for publication (without any prior condition for its publication) within the assessment period as set out in paragraph 49. In this case, a letter of acceptance must be attached; or
- (b) other output that may or may not be in publishable form, e.g. drama, concert performance, video tape, computer software programme, buildings, or any creative work that can be evaluated for merit and an assessment obtained (RAE panels to decide on the basis of the criteria in (a) above, see also paragraphs 24, 46, 61, and 62.)

52. On the other hand, proprietary research that does not result in output that is accessible to the public and the profession is **not** accepted as an output for this purpose. However, output items of exhibitions and demonstrations relating to proprietary research which are (i) accessible to the public and the profession, (ii) non-traditional output for assessment, and (iii) contain enough information for evaluation, can be submitted for assessment.

53. For the avoidance of doubt, the UGC wishes to stress that output items need **not** be restricted to papers in journals, and **all output items will be assessed without regard to the venue or language of publication**. In order to facilitate the assessment process, institutions are required to alert the UGC in the list of submissions by academic staff (i.e. Table 3) if the submission is non-English so that

appropriate assistance can be identified in good time. **In addition, ‘assessment year’ items and ‘gap year’ items (see paragraph 46 above) should be treated equally.**

New Researchers

54. New researchers, including senior professionals who have just joined academia, present a special case, since they may not have had time to produce significant or publishable outputs according to the RAE definition. Therefore, all staff who first took up an academic appointment (anywhere) only within the last three years i.e. on or after 1 January 2003, will be given special consideration by the RAE panels. Apart from the kind of output defined at paragraphs 46 and 51, doctoral dissertation research may be included by these new appointees in the lists of research outputs for assessment.

Quality criterion

55. Although a **maximum of six** output items can be submitted (see paragraph 46 above), **individual staff member may wish to submit fewer items, even only one item.** A researcher can be judged to meet the quality threshold on the basis of one single item of high quality. The UGC wishes to emphasize that the focus of the RAE is **not on quantity**, but on the **quality** of output. It is believed that in the majority of cases, a clear decision should be able to be made on the basis of **four** items.

Co-authorship

56. Research output items produced under co-authorship are also accepted. In assessing such co-authored items, the individuals concerned will be regarded as proxies for the cost centre, as the RAE is to evaluate the cost centre, not individuals.

57. Thus, to allow the RAE panel to form a view as to the extent of the cost centre's involvement in the work, the staff member submitting the item for assessment should list all the authors when completing Table 3 and underline those who belong to the cost centre. The RAE panel will then have a basis to assess (apart from the quality of the item in question) whether the co-authors involved have made a significant and substantial intellectual contribution to that item.

58. So long as the panel is satisfied that the cost centre as a whole has made a significant and substantial intellectual contribution, there will be no discount or pro-rating. It is emphasized that the proportion of co-authors from within the cost centre will not be used as a multiplier in rating the item. Thus there should be no discouragement for genuine collaborations with each party contributing to the research output.

59. In the case of multiple submissions (i.e. co-authored item submitted more than once) from the same cost centre of an institution, the staff members submitting that item for assessment should provide additional information by filling in

the declaration form at Appendix E1. There is no need to complete this form if the item is submitted only once. To avoid double-counting within a cost centre, the coordinator of submissions from each cost centre should draw multiple submission(s) from within the same cost centre to the RAE panel's attention by completing Appendix E2.

Exceptional Item

60. As indicated at paragraph 46 above, individual staff may submit up to one exceptional item produced prior to 1 January 2002 if considered appropriate. This is to cater for situations where output items could not be produced during the 'assessment year' period. This provision is based on the understanding that works of great impact may take more than four years to complete and that they therefore tend to be infrequent. **However, the exceptional item must not be an item which had been submitted in previous RAEs.**

Data required

61. Each item falling within paragraph 46 above should be labeled as Dis, Int, App, Tch according to the four categories of scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching as set out in paragraph 24 above. The information required to be submitted in respect of each output item is one copy of the full set of the output item to be assessed (all such copies will be returned after the assessment exercise); and in addition 5 copies of the following:

- (a) in the case of a journal paper, the first page together with the conclusion page and the abstract pages;
- (b) in the case of a book, a short description of the book, the title page and table of contents;
- (c) where appropriate, documentary evidence to demonstrate the impact of the research outputs, e.g. book reviews, etc.;
- (d) in the case of a co-authored item or multiple submissions, additional information/indication in accordance with paragraphs 56-59; and
- (e) in the case of non-traditional items as described in paragraph 51(b), the staff member must provide extra information on (i) novelty of the work, (ii) the deliverables, and (iii) the dissemination method. In addition, particular attention should be drawn to the following:
 - for submissions in relation to performing arts, such as drama, music composition, stage performance or an creative work, they should include tapes, DVDs, CDs, or other forms of recording; and

- for submission in the areas of design, buildings, multi-media, visual arts, or communications, photographs of the originals must include dimensions and good reproduction.

(f) in other cases, sufficient information for the items to be assessed.

62. For submissions in paragraph 60, and categories (b), (c) and (e) of paragraph 61, the description required for each is limited to one A4 page.

Sample submission

63. A sample submission is shown in Appendices F1 to F3.

Further information

64. If a RAE panel requires any further information, it will approach the institution(s) concerned through the UGC Secretariat for assistance.

V. EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Panels

65. Since the RAE covers the whole range of cost centres, with different types of academic research outputs, the cost centres are grouped and placed under separate panels for assessment. The preliminary grouping of the cost centres and the list of RAE panels are in Appendix G.

66. Each panel will consist of local and overseas academics in the relevant disciplines and, where appropriate, also professionally qualified people from business, government and the arts. They will be appointed on an **ad personam** basis and will be specifically required not to represent the interests of their own institutions. The standards will thus ultimately be set and the judgments made by academic peers and not by the UGC.

67. To ensure that non-traditional output items (i.e. those labeled Int, App and Tch) receive adequate attention, a sub-group with suitable membership (including members drawn from outside academia, where appropriate) may be constituted under each panel to evaluate such items separately, and to make recommendations regarding their assessment to the full panel.

68. Having taken into account the comments of the subject panels of the RAE 1999 and the recent developments in the higher education sector, the following changes to the panel structure will be made:

- to form a separate subject panel for the area of Education;
- to establish a new cost centre for the area of Sociology; and

- (c) a cost centre for the area of Chinese Medicine will also be created in response to the recent developments in the field.

The proposed changes are reflected in Appendix G, which also sets out the original grouping of the cost centres in the RAE 1999.

69. Comments have been invited with regard to the number, size and composition of subject panels, and the mapping of cost centres to the subject panels for the RAE 2006.

Threshold standard

70. The UGC perceives two objectives for research in UGC-funded institutions:

- (a) to participate in the global endeavour to extend human understanding and thus, keeping the knowledge base in the institutions current; and
- (b) to increase the proportion of work which is linked with the interest of the community and to carry out more of it with local partners, both active and passive.

71. In view of the emphasis on quality, the threshold standard will be raised. The definition for the 2006 exercise is:

"Quality of output equates to a level of excellence appropriate to the discipline in Hong Kong, and showing evidence of international excellence."

72. The UGC will continue to encourage research outputs with social relevance. These outputs will be captured and assessed in the context of the four scholarships (e.g. the scholarship of application) as defined in Appendix A.

73. The UGC will strive to ensure broad comparability across disciplines, but it will be up to each panel, with its subject expertise and knowledge of local circumstances, to translate this general definition into more precise benchmarks appropriate to each discipline or group of disciplines. The panels will also be expected to interpret 'international excellence' with due regard to the nature of those subjects that may, by their nature, necessarily have a strong local or regional focus. In the case of publications or other outputs of a local nature, the panel will need to assess whether the item represents a contribution to the work of the international research community in terms of its intellectual content, as well as rigour of process and methodology.

74. To minimize any possible divergence in judgment, all RAE subject panels will be asked to make reference to the following amplifications to the definition in paragraph 71 above:

International excellence This should not be equated with output items published outside of Hong Kong or the region; rather it is intended that evaluation should be made with reference to the best international norms in the mainstream of that discipline or sub-discipline. It is possible that in some particular disciplines, such norms are set by output items published in Hong Kong or the region.

International vs. local A distinction should be made between (a) a publication that is local because it addresses local issues, and (b) a publication that is local because it does not meet the standards of rigour and scholarship expected internationally in the mainstream of that discipline. In the former case, the item will not be discounted; in the latter, it will be.

75. The RAE panels will be expected to view the submission as a whole, and not score each item individually. In particular, panels will be asked not to define thresholds for each item or give fractions on $n/6$. Although each eligible staff member may submit up to 6 items for assessment, each RAE panel will need to strive to make an evaluation on the basis of what it regards as the best 4. Thus, for those which do not quite reach the threshold on the basis of these 4 items, RAE panels need not consider the 5th and/or the 6th item. It is believed that in the majority of cases, a clear decision should be able to be made on the basis of 4 items. Moreover, the quality of each item will be judged on its own merits and **not** solely in terms of its category (e.g. a journal paper is not necessarily of higher or lower merit than a book chapter, nor is a refereed article necessarily of higher or lower merit than an unrefereed one), venue or language of publication. Individual RAE panels will attempt to decide their own thresholds, calibrate with one and other, and consider common working procedures as soon as they are formed.

76. It is expected that the panels will consider, first of all, a binary cut, i.e. whether the output of each individual concerned does or does not meet the threshold standard as defined.

77. However, it is recognized that in some cases it may prove difficult to adopt a binary cut, in which case it will be up to individual panels to consider whether a fractional score (i.e. lower than 1) should be assigned. In assigning fractional scores, RAE panels will be expected to give simple grading. The panels will be instructed not to adopt a mechanical approach during the assessment.

78. Output items will be judged on their own merits and will not be judged simply on their category or venues of publication. In many disciplines, an output item appearing in a quality venue, e.g. an article in a prestigious journal, or a musical composition performed in an internationally acclaimed concert hall, may be presumed to be of high quality, and there is no need for the panel to study the item in detail. However, panels should recognize that there could be quality output items in venues that may not be prestigious. In these cases, and in any case when in doubt, the panel

(or designated member(s)) will study the item in question and not judge it automatically according to the venue.

79. The RAE panels will have slightly more non-local members, including professional members as appropriate, than in the RAE 1999. All panels will receive training before the actual assessment process begins, and will be invited to state in writing, for dissemination afterwards, the standards and criteria they have used, and a description of how these have been applied. The RAE Guidance Notes for Panels, when finalised, will be mounted on the UGC Web for public information.

VI. HANDLING OF RESULTS

80. As indicated earlier, the primary purpose of the RAE is to assess the research output performance of UGC-funded institutions by cost centre; it is **not** intended to evaluate the performance of individual staff within the institutions. The subject panels will only produce total scores for each cost centre in each institution.

81. In RAE 1993, each institution was provided the proportion of Full-time Equivalent Active Researchers as well as the panels' comments on the research activities of certain cost centres in the institutions. In RAE 1996 and RAE 1999, each institution was provided the research index and the staff in full-time equivalents meeting the threshold standards (by cost centre) as well as the average and median sector-wide research index (by cost centre) so that they could have a rough indication of the level of attainment of a particular cost centre. But, the sector-wide average and median indices of cost centres that were found in fewer than three institutions were not released. Moreover, the results of an institution were only provided to the university concerned and were not made known to other institutions nor to the public.

82. The RAE 2006 is again intended ultimately to assess the research output of a cost centre, not individuals, so it will not generate individually identifiable scores. Only the total score of a cost centre will be produced. The results of the RAE of an individual institution will be conveyed **only** to the Head of the institution concerned, together with the sector-wide average and median indices of the cost centres. However, the sector-wide average and median indices of the cost centres that are found in fewer than three institutions will not be provided.

Transparency

83. As pointed out in the Higher Education Review (HER) Report 2002 and the Audit Commission's Report 2003, there is an increasing demand for greater accountability and transparency of the public sector bodies in Hong Kong, as in elsewhere. In line with its principle of public accountability, the UGC has decided that the RAE 2006 results should be released to the public as follows:

- (a) operational details of the process, such as panel membership, evaluation methodology and the meeting schedules of panels, will be published for general information;

- (b) RAE results at the sectorwide level will be published (except for cost centres which are only found in fewer than three institutions);
- (c) at the institutional level, aggregate results in broad disciplinary areas will be published; and
- (d) some reading guides will be developed to help the public and the press understand the statistics and appreciate the trend of research performance of the higher education sector in the past years.

84. The UGC fully recognizes that different institutions have different roles, discipline profiles and histories and the purpose of the exercise is neither to identify and compare the number of 'star' researchers nor to measure the research output with a view to giving a grading to institutions for research performance.

85. The results will help the UGC form a judgment, in the light of other relevant factors, regarding the distribution of part of the 'R' funding of the block grants for institutions in the next triennium 2008-2011.

Timetable for the submission of data for RAE 2006

86. To summarize, institutions are requested to submit the following Tables and supporting documents in accordance with the dates shown below :

1 March 2006	- <u>Table 2</u> for each cost centre
13 March 2006	- <u>Research Strategy Statement</u> - Research Output Items as described in paragraph 46 above - <u>Table 1</u> for each cost centre - <u>Table 3</u> for each individual cited in Table 2 who wishes to make a submission

Form of submission

87. The form of submission of Tables 1 to 3 and any other data submitted in accordance with these Guidance Notes should be forwarded by way of hard copies to the UGC Secretariat. Tables 2 and 3 should be submitted with a soft copy. In view of the large volume of written submissions involved, **institutions are requested to ensure that the submissions are complete, clearly labeled, and hard copies are of good, readable quality.** The Secretariat may issue more operational guidelines with regard to the physical handling of RAE submissions.

* * * * *

UGC Secretariat
9 September 2005

Scholarship as defined by the Carnegie Foundation

Following the RAE 1999, the UGC has decided that a wider definition of scholarship as defined by the Carnegie Foundation in “**Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate**”² should continue to be adopted in the RAE 2006. In the report, the Carnegie Foundation argues that scholarship should have a broader and more efficacious meaning that would go beyond just teaching and research. The discovery of knowledge through research, the integration of knowledge, the application of knowledge and the sharing of knowledge through teaching should be treated as different forms of scholarship on a par with each other.

The Four Scholarships

2. The Carnegie Foundation considers that there is a more inclusive view of what it means to be a scholar - a recognition that knowledge is acquired through research, synthesis, practice, and teaching. Scholarship should comprise four separate, yet overlapping functions: They are the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching.

(a) Scholarship of Discovery

The scholarship of discovery, at its best, contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge but also to the intellectual climate of an institution. It is a scholarly investigation, closest to what is meant when academics speak of “research”, that confronts the unknown and creates new knowledge. It is not just the outcomes, but also the process, and especially the passion, that gives meaning to the effort.

(b) Scholarship of Integration

It is a serious, disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw together and bring new insight to bear on original research. This type of scholarship is closely related to that of discovery. Such work is increasingly important as traditional disciplinary categories prove confining, forcing new topologies of knowledge. This scholarship also means interpretation, fitting one's own research – or the research of others – into larger intellectual patterns. A variety of scholarly trends – interdisciplinary, interpretive, integrative – are examples of scholarship of integration.

(c) Scholarship of Application

It is a dynamic process of creating new intellectual understandings arising out of theory and practice. The term itself may be misleading if it suggests that knowledge is first “discovered” and then “applied”. The process is in fact

² A Special Report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, by Ernest L Boyer, 1990

more dynamic; new intellectual understanding can arise out of vital interaction between theory and practice and one renews the other.

(d) Scholarship of Teaching

It is a process that transforms and extends knowledge while transmitting an intelligible account of knowledge to the learners. As a form of scholarship, teaching encompasses a wide range of activities beyond classroom instruction.

Assessment of Scholarship

3. The broadening of the definition of scholarship helps ensure that scholarly work in areas both within and outside discovery can be appropriately recognized and rewarded, yet it does not seek to open the floodgate by treating anything as scholarship. This leads to the question of how the work should be documented and the criteria that should be used to assess its quality.

4. Academics feel relatively confident about their ability to assess specialized research, but they are less certain about what qualities to look for in other kinds of scholarship, and how to document and reward that work. In “Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate”³, the authors suggest that the four kinds of scholarly activities, regardless of how variable their products, must be evaluated according to a common set of criteria (referred to as ‘quality standards of excellence’ in the publication set out in footnote 2) that captures and acknowledges what they share as scholarly acts. They are:

- clear goals;
- adequate preparation;
- appropriate methods;
- significant results;
- effective presentation; and
- reflective critique.

5. The authors of the book also suggest a list of questions (see below) for each criterion to be considered when assessing a scholar’s achievements in a particular category of scholarship. In return, scholars should also take into account these guiding questions when preparing their work for evaluation :

- (a) For clear goals, the possible questions include whether the scholar states the basic purposes of his or her work clearly; whether the objectives are realistic and achievable; and whether he or she identifies important questions in the field.

³ A Special Report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, by Charles E Glassick, Mary Taylor Huber, and Gene I. Maeroff, 1997

- (b) For adequate preparation, the possible questions include whether the scholar shows an understanding of existing scholarship in the field; whether the necessary skills are brought to his or her work; and whether the necessary resources are brought together to move the project forward.
- (c) For appropriate methods, the possible questions include whether the scholar uses methods appropriate to the goals; whether they apply methods effectively; and whether they are ready to modify procedures in response to changing circumstances.
- (d) For significant results, the possible questions include whether the scholar actually achieves the goals he or she was aiming for; whether the scholar's work adds consequentially to the field; and whether the scholar's work opens additional areas for further exploration.
- (e) For effective presentation, the possible questions include whether the scholar uses a suitable style and effective organization to present his or her work; whether they use appropriate forums for communicating work to intended audiences; and whether the scholar presents his or her message in all of these forms with clarity and integrity.
- (f) For reflective critique, the possible questions include whether the scholar critically evaluates his or her own work; and whether they bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to their critique. For instance, do they talk to other people, to their peers, to their students, to their clients, and does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of their future work?

6. If a particular piece of work is going to be evaluated as scholarship, an important and critical audience of the scholar is his or her peers. In other words, the work would not be considered as a form of scholarship until it has been documented and could be exchanged in a generalisable way so that people beyond the very local context can learn from, can critique and can build on that knowledge. For example, an interesting piece of teaching material used in a class can at most be considered a scholarly work, as it is only presented in a private encounter between a teacher and a group of students. It will not be considered a work of scholarship of teaching unless it is systematically documented and disseminated to peers of the relevant field for wider debate and exchanges. In short, the six criteria set out in paragraph 5 above will form the basis on which the respective panels would evaluate the output in a particular category of scholarship. In order to be evaluated, outputs should be properly documented to produce evidence and the panels will seek to measure the impact on the basis of benchmark to be operationalised later.

7. To summarize, the quality dimensions proposed above allow sufficient flexibility for the same set of criteria to be applied judiciously to different types of projects from different disciplinary traditions, while enabling one to keep in view the qualities that discovery, integration, application and teaching share as scholarly activities.

Institution's Research Strategy Statement

Institution's existing research policy

In view of my institution's role statement attached (institution to provide from UGC documents), and stage of development of my institution, the current research policy of my institution is as follows (maximum length one page):

Research Funding Sources

My institution derives funding for research from the following sources, and the breakdown by funding source as a percentage total of overall funding is as follows:

Distribution of research activities among the four categories of scholarship and (where appropriate) across disciplines

Based on my institution's research strategy, the distribution on research activities among the four categories of scholarship is as follows:

(Where appropriate) distribution across disciplines is as follows:

Changes Expected

In RAE 1999, my institution's scores by cost centre were:

Institution's existing strengths and standard:

In the long run, the overall research strategy of the institution is:

Head/Deputy Head of Institution

Date: _____

COST CENTRES

for academic departments etc.

1	clinical medicine	32	mathematics & statistics
2	clinical dentistry	33	comp studies/science (incl. IT)
3	clinical vet studies	34	Law
4	nursing	35	Accountancy
5	other health care professions	36	public administration
6	biological sciences	37	business studies (incl. management)
7	pre-clinical studies	38	Catering
8	psychology	39	hotel management
9	other biological sciences	40	Economics
10	agriculture	41	Geography
11	physics & astronomy	42	social work
12	chemistry	43	other social sciences
13	materials science	44	Chinese language & literature
14	earth sciences (incl. oceanography, meteorology)	45	English language & literature
15	other physical sciences	46	Japanese language & literature
16	mechanical engineering	47	other languages
17	electrical engineering	48	Translation
18	electronic engineering	49	communication & media studies
19	chemical engineering	50	History
20	production engineering (incl. manufacturing & industrial engineering)	51	other arts/humanities
21	marine engineering	52	Art
22	biotechnology	53	performing arts
23	materials technology	54	Music
24	textile technology	55	other creative arts
25	civil engineering	56	Design
26	other technologies (incl. nautical studies)	57	Education
27	architecture	58	physical education
28	building technology	59	home economics
29	planning	60	Chinese medicine
30	surveying, land	61	Sociology
31	surveying, other		

STAFF GRADES, Modes and Funding Sources

Academic Grades

Academic, Senior

- A. Professor
- B. Reader
- C. Senior Lecturer (U)
- D. Principal Lecturer (P)*

Academic, Junior

- F. Senior Lecturer (P)
- G. Lecturer (U)
- H. Lecturer (P)
- I. Assistant Lecturer

*Academic Grades for D (Principal Lecturer(P), Senior) and E (Principal Lecturer(P), Junior) were combined starting from 1996/97 CDCF data collection exercise.

- J. Instructor
- K. Demonstrator/Tutor/Teaching Assistant
- L. Other, including language assistant, field work supervisor, etc.

Technical Research Staff (Staff who spend essentially all their time on research)

- M. Senior Technical Research staff ("leaders", usually Post Doctoral)
 - N. Junior Technical Research staff ("followers", usually Graduate)
-

Non-Academic Grades

Non-academic, Senior

- O. Admin, Senior
- Q. Technical, Senior

Non-academic, Junior

- P. Admin, Junior (including secretarial, clerical)
 - R. Technical, Junior
 - S. other, including "Mod 1"
-

Staff Mode

- F: Full-time
- P: Part-time

Source of Staff salary funding

- W: wholly from General Funds (WfGF)
 - P: partly from General Funds (PfGF)
 - N: not from General Funds (NfGF)
-

Appendix E1

Additional Information on Co-authored Research Output Item

(no need to complete unless the research output item has been submitted by more than one staff member from within the same cost centre; in completing Table 3 on the research output items for assessment, the submitting staff member should underline the names of co-authors from within the same cost centre)

Ref. No. of the submitted item: _____
(see note j of Table 3)

Description of the Research Output Item

Total Number and names of co-authors listed in the research output items

Number and names of Co-authors within the cost centre who have submitted the item for assessment

Number and names of student Co-authors whose names have appeared in Table 3

Nature of involvement by the staff member submitting the item for assessment

An estimate by the staff member submitting the item on the extent of contribution to the successful publication of the research output item:

Other remarks, if any

Signed: _____
(name of staff member claiming credit
from the item under assessment)

Date: _____

Appendix E2

Record of co-authored research output items which have been
submitted for assessment by more than one staff member from within the same cost centre
(one form per Cost Centre)

Institution:

Cost Centre:

Total number of staff members in Cost Centre eligible for assessment

in fte :
in head-count:

Total number of items submitted for assessment:

The following items have been found to have been submitted for assessment by more than one staff member from within the cost centre:

Item Description & References	Names of staff members who have submitted the same item for assessment under the same cost centre*

(add rows if necessary)

- * Staff members listed above should each complete and attach a form (Appendix E1) to his/her Table 3 submission explaining the nature and degree of his/her contribution to the research output item in question.

Cost Centre Coordinator

Date: _____

Research Assessment Exercise 2006

Table 1: Description of Research Activities by Cost Centre (paragraph 36 of the Guidance Notes refers)

HEI code =	<input type="text" value="CityU"/>	i.e. CityU, HKBU, LU, CUHK, HKIEd, PolyU, HKUST or HKU
Assessment period	<input type="text" value="020101-051231"/>	
Cost Centre =	<input type="text" value="37"/>	(code)
Date entered =	<input type="text" value="060301"/>	(06mmdd)
Total no. of eligible Staff in fte =	<input type="text" value="15.7"/>	i.e. 'T' as defined in paragraph 33 of the Guidance Notes

Overall View:

During the period from 1 January 2002 to 31 December 2005, the research portfolio of this cost centre were as follows:

During the same period, the distribution of research activities among the four categories of scholarship in this cost centre was as follows:

Signature : _____

Name : Professor A B Lee

Post : Head, Department of Business Studies

Research Assessment Exercise 2006

Table 2: List of Academic Staff (Grades A-I)

HEI code= i.e. CityU, HKBU, LU, CUHK, HKIEd, PolyU, HKUST or HKU
 Cost Centre=
 Census date=
 Date entered= (06mmdd)

1 No.	2 <i>Academic Staff^a</i>		4 Staff grade code	5 Mode of employment (FT/PT)	6 fte	7 ^b Date of appointment (yymmdd)	8 ^b Length of continuous service in institution as at 31.12.05		9 ^c New researcher (Y/N)	10 (for new researchers only) Length of experience as an academic as at the census date (years)
	Surname	First name(s)					(years)	(months)		
1	CHAN	Samuel W Y	A	FT	1	030101	3	-	N	-
2	CUNG	Sau Kuen	I	FT	1	990630	6	6	N	-
3	LEE	Mary K L	B	PT	0.5	011231	4	-	N	-
4	SMITH	Gary H	D	FT	1	970208	8	11	N	-
5	QIAN	Tom C W	G	PT	0.5	020531	3	7	N	-
6	LAI	Ming See	H	FT	1	050101	1	-	Y	1
7										
8										
9										
10										
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										
16										
17										
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										
26										
27										
28										
29										
30										

add additional rows as required

Note a Only staff who are wholly funded by the institution proper can be included, see paragraph 38 of the Guidance Notes.

Note b Columns 7 & 8 : see paragraph 37 of the Guidance notes.

Note c Column 9 : see paragraph 54 of the Guidance Notes.

(This information sheet will be destroyed after completion of RAE 2006)

Research Assessment Exercise 2006

Table 3: List of Submissions by Academic Staff (Grades A-I)

HEI code =

HKUST

 i.e. CityU, HKBU, LU, CUHK, HKIEd, PolyU, HKUST or HKU

Cost Centre (1-61) =

51

Assessment period = 020101-051231

Date entered =

060313

 (06mmdd)

Staff member's name (surname first, followed by first name): Smith, Gary H

12 ^d	13 ^e	14 ^f	15 ^g	16 ^h	17 ⁱ	18 ^j	19 ^k
Item no.	Description, Name(s) of Author and Co-author(s), if any	Put a 'N' for Non-English Submission	Category Dis/ Int/ App/ Tch	Type (Assessment/ Gap/ Ex)	Year published	Submission ref. no.	Requested Subject Panel
1	Book : "Selected Readings in Literature", 2 nd ed., Hong Kong University Press, Hong Kong Smith, Gary H; <u>Anthony Hall</u> ; K.K. Wong and Paul Y.C. Lau		Int	Assessment	2003	HKUST-51-4-1	
2	Conference Presentation/ Paper: "International Media and the Earth Summit: Centre and Margins", Conference on Environmental Consciousness and Mass Media, Hong Kong Baptist University <u>Smith Gary H and Paul T. C. Lau</u>		Int	Assessment	2002	HKUST-51-4-2	
3*	Journal Article : "Neither Structuralism Nor Lovejoy's History of Ideas: a Disidentification with Professor Ying-shih Yu's Review as a Discourse", Ming Studies 31 (2001), 42-86 <u>Smith Gary H; Amy Coke</u>		Tch	Gap	2001	HKUST-51-4-3	Social Sciences

Total no. of research output items including exceptional item (if any) submitted: 3 (To facilitate consideration by the RAE panel, please provide additional information up to one page each on non-traditional or exceptional item, and complete Appendix EI on each co-authored item if it is also being submitted for assessment by a colleague within the same cost centre of your institution)

Note d Column 12: see paragraphs 46, 55, and 60 of the Guidance Notes

Note e Column 13: Please underline co-authors from the same cost centre of your institution

Note f Column 14: see paragraph 53.

Note g Column 15: see paragraphs 24, 25, 61 of the Guidance Notes

Note h Column 16: Assessment = items produced from 01.01.2002 to 31.12.2005; Gap = items produced from 01.01.1999 to 31.12.2001; Ex = items produced prior to 01.01.2002 which had **not** been submitted in previous RAEs, see paragraphs 46, 49, 50 to 53, 55 of the Guidance Notes

Note i Column 17: see paragraph 51(a) of the Guidance Notes. (Please attach publisher's note of acceptance for publication if not yet published)

Note j Column 18: The submission reference number should be completed by the Institution's Administration. It should comprise a four tier identification i.e. p-q-r-s where:

p = HEI code e.g. HKU

r = staff number as assigned under Column 1 of Table 2

q = Cost Centre code

s : starts from 1 to n where n = total number of items submitted by the staff member

Each output item submitted for assessment should bear this submission reference number for identification purposes.

Note k Column 19: Only complete this box if the staff member has a special request on the assignment of the submission. Please place an '*' next to the Item Number and state clearly the subject panel which the staff member requests the item to be assessed. The subject panels will take into account the request when considering the final assignment of the submission. (see paragraph 44 of the Guidance Notes).

(This information sheet will be destroyed after completion of RAE 2006)

RAE Panels in RAE 2006

Cost Centre		Panel Title	Panel No.
6 9 10 22	biological sciences other biological sciences agriculture biotechnology	Biology	1
1 2 3 4 5 7 60	clinical medicine clinical dentistry clinical vet studies nursing other health care professions pre-clinical studies Chinese medicine	Health Sciences	2
11 12 13 14 15 32	physics & astronomy chemistry materials science earth sciences (incl. oceanography, meteorology) other physical sciences mathematics & statistics	Physical Sciences	3
17 18	electrical engineering electronic engineering	Electrical & Electronic Engineering	4
33	comp studies/science (incl. IT)	Computer Science / Information Technology	5
16 19 20 21 23 24 26	mechanical engineering chemical engineering production engineering (incl. manufacturing & industrial engineering) marine engineering materials technology textile technology other technologies (incl. nautical studies)	Engineering	6
25 27 28 29 30 31	civil engineering architecture building technology planning surveying, land surveying, other	Built Environment	7
34	law	Law	8
35 37 38 39 40	accountancy business studies (incl. management) catering hotel management economics	Business Studies & Economics	9

Appendix G (cont'd)

8	psychology	Social Sciences	10
36	public administration		
41	geography		
42	social work		
61	sociology		
43	other social sciences		
49	communication & media studies		
44	Chinese language & literature	Humanities	11
45	English language & literature		
46	Japanese language & literature		
47	other languages		
48	translation		
50	history		
51	other arts/humanities		
52	art	Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design	12
53	performing arts		
54	music		
55	other creative arts		
56	design		
57	education	Education	13
58	physical education		
59	home economics		

Table 1

Research Assessment Exercise 2006

Table 1: Description of Research Activities by Cost Centre (paragraph 36 of the Guidance Notes refers)

HEI code =	<input type="text"/>	i.e. CityU, HKBU, LU, CUHK, HKIEd, PolyU, HKUST or HKU
Assessment period	020101-051231	
Cost Centre =	<input type="text"/>	(code)
Date entered =	<input type="text"/>	(06mmdd)
Total no. of eligible Staff in fte =	<input type="text"/>	i.e. 'T' as defined in paragraph 33 of the Guidance Notes

Overall View:

Signature : _____
Name : _____
Post : _____

Table 2

Research Assessment Exercise 2006

Table 2: List of Academic Staff (Grades A-I)

HEI code= i.e. CityU, HKBU, LU, CUHK, HKIEd, PolyU, HKUST or HKU
 Cost Centre=
 Census date= 051231
 Date entered= (06mmdd)

1 No.	2 <i>Academic Staff^a</i>		4 Staff grade code	5 Mode of employ- ment (FT/PT)	6 fte	7 ^b Date of appoint- ment (yymmdd)	8 ^b Length of continuous service in institution as at 31.12.05		9 ^c New researcher (Y/N)	10 (for new researchers only) Length of experience as an academic as at the census date (years)
	Surname	First name(s)					(years)	(months)		
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										
16										
17										
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										
26										
27										
28										
29										
30										

add additional rows as required

Note a Only staff who are wholly funded by the institution proper can be included, see paragraph 38 of the Guidance Notes.

Note b Columns 7 & 8 : see paragraph 37 of the Guidance notes.

Note c Column 9 : see paragraph 54 of the Guidance Notes.

(This information sheet will be destroyed after completion of RAE 2006)

Research Assessment Exercise 2006

Table 3

Table 3: List of Submissions by Academic Staff (Grades A-I)

HEI code = i.e. CityU, HKBU, LU, CUHK, HKIEd, PolyU, HKUST or HKU
 Cost Centre (1-61) =
 Assessment period 020101-051231
 Date entered = (06mmdd)

Staff member's name (surname first, followed by first name): _____

12 ^d	13 ^e	14 ^f	15 ^g	16 ^h	17 ⁱ	18 ^j	19 ^k
<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Description, Name(s) of Author and Co-author(s), if any</i>	<i>Put a 'N' for Non-English Submission</i>	<i>Category Dis/ Int/ App/ Tch</i>	<i>Type (Assessment/ Gap/Ex)</i>	<i>Year published</i>	<i>Submission ref. no.</i>	<i>Requested Subject Panel</i>

Total no. of research output items including 'out' and 'exceptional' items (if any) submitted: _____ (To facilitate consideration by the RAE panel, please provide additional information up to one page each on non-traditional or exceptional item, and complete Appendix E1 on each co-authored item if it is also being submitted for assessment by a colleague within the same cost centre of your institution)

- Note d Column 12: see paragraphs 46, 55, and 60 of the Guidance Notes
- Note e Column 13: Please underline co-authors from the same cost centre of your institution
- Note f Column 14: see paragraph 53.
- Note g Column 15: see paragraphs 24, 25, 61 of the Guidance Notes
- Note h Column 16: Assessment = items produced from 01.01.2002 to 31.12.2005; Gap = items produced from 01.01.1999 to 31.12.2001; Ex = items produced prior to 01.01.2002 which had **not** been submitted to previous RAEs, see paragraphs 46, 49, 50 to 53, 55 of the Guidance Notes
- Note i Column 17: see paragraph 51(a) of the Guidance Notes. (Please attach publisher's note of acceptance for publication if not yet published)
- Note j Column 18: The submission reference number should be completed by the Institution's Administration. It should comprise a four tier identification i.e. p-q-r-s where:
 p = HEI code e.g. HKU r = staff number as assigned under Column 1 of Table 2
 q = Cost Centre code s : starts from 1 to n where n = total number of items submitted by the staff member

Each output item submitted for assessment should bear this submission reference number for identification purposes.

Note k Column 19: Only complete this box if the staff member has a special request on the assignment of the submission. Please place an '*' next to the Item Number and state clearly the subject panel which the staff member requests the item to be assessed. The subject panels will take into account the request when considering the final assignment of the submission. (see paragraph 44 of the Guidance Notes).
 (This information sheet will be destroyed after completion of RAE 2006)

Q&A of general RAE 2006-related issues

(I) Carnegie Scholarships

Q1. Will the categorizing of output items into the four Carnegie Scholarships serve as a means by the UGC to consider the roles or development stages of the institutions? Will this categorizing affect the scores of the output items?

A1. *Paragraph 23 of the Guidance Notes states that the purpose of introducing the four Carnegie scholarships in the Exercise is to “**help address the perceived bias in favour of basic/traditional research**”. It is also stated in paragraph 47 of the Guidance Notes that “[t]he spread of submissions across the four categories of scholarship and, where appropriate, across disciplines may provide a basis for the UGC to consider the research performance of an institution against its role. However, **scoring will be made without regard to the category of the items submitted**”.*

Thus, the role and mission of an institution will not per se be factored into the assessment process. This is because the RAE 2006 is an assessment of research performance, not an assessment of the institution’s performance against its role. The performance of institutions against role will be reflected in the Performance and Role Related Funding Scheme.

(II) Eligibility of Staff Members

Q1. If the intention (of paragraph 37 of the Guidance Notes) is to look at “sustainable” research capacity, setting a census date creates anomalies as taking a cross-section at the end of the period does not reflect the full record of achievement by the cost centre over the four years. Would it be more appropriate to stipulate that the person involved was at the institution during the previous four years for at least half of the time of his/her appointment, i.e. not on no-pay leave?

A1. *The suggested revision does not work well for those academics recently employed by the institutions, so as to reflect the updated research capacity of the institutions.*

Q2. The rationale for setting 1 January 2005 as the date for staff inclusion eligibility is unclear. Would it be more appropriate to reset the beginning of employment at a later date such as 1 July 2005 or 1 September 2005?

- A2. *The setting of the date is a difficult issue. We need to strike a balance between taking account of recent appointments and preventing the possibility of the use of inappropriate means to obtain higher RAE scores, say by taking on transient or short-term academic staff with high-quality research outputs. On balance, we consider it appropriate to maintain the date at 1 January 2005.*
- Q3. If, for example, one staff member transfers from one local institution to the next after January 2005, the staff would not be counted from either institution. In order to capture this staff member in the Exercise, could the staff eligibility date be moved from 1 January 2005 to 1 September 2005?
- A3. *The rationale behind the suggestion is noted. However, this example may represent only a rare situation. The deferral of the employment start date is considered not appropriate as explained in A2 above.*
- Q4. Are academic staff members who hold joint appointments at other institutions eligible for the RAE 2006?
- A4. *According to paragraph 37 (b) of the Guidance Notes, if the staff holds “concurrent paid positions at other institutions”, they will not be counted.*
- Q5. In view of the widespread adoption of the North American system of the four staff grades: Chair Professor/Professor/Associate Professor/Assistant Professor, can the categorization of eligible staff, i.e. the ‘A’ to ‘I’ (e.g. ‘Professor’, ‘Assistant Lecturer’) be revised?
- A5. *Paragraph 41 (b) of the Guidance Notes stipulates that “justification will be sought for staff carrying titles that are significantly different from the standard ones for Categories ‘A’ to ‘I’ (e.g. ‘research officer’, ‘director’) who are nevertheless included”, thus a channel has already been provided for the consideration of staff members who have titles different from the staff categories as defined for the purpose of CDCF.*
- Q6. Would staff category “M” (i.e. CDCF Grade “Senior Technical Research staff”) be included if the staff member carries an “academic” title such as Research Assistant Professor?
- A6. *As paragraph 38 of the Guidance Notes has clearly stated, “the RAE 2006 will adhere to the same general principle of covering only core*

academic staff... correspond to Staff Categories 'A' to 'I' as defined for the purpose of CDCF.” Staff category “M” (i.e. CDCF Grade “Senior Technical Research staff”) would not be included even if they carry an “academic” title such as Research Assistant Professor.

- Q7. Would academics at the Lecturer/Instructor grades who are expected to carry heavy teaching loads and are not required to do research be excluded in RAE 2006?
- A7. *Paragraph 41 of the Guidance Notes states that “**inclusion of staff should only make reference to their job categories, and not to whether they are research active.**” RAE 2006 will only cover staff carrying titles in Categories ‘A’ to ‘I’. Whether the staff carry heavy teaching load or not does not constitute an issue in affecting their eligibility. In addition, if the staff concerned is not required to do research, then they may not need to submit anything for the assessment, but they should be counted in the determination of T (paragraph 33 of the Guidance Notes).*
- Q8. Would staff members who are on no-pay leave during the 24-month period that is used to determine staff eligibility be included?
- A8. *According to paragraph 37(a) of the Guidance Notes, staff member must “**hold a paid appointment at the institution concerned for a continuous period of twenty-four months or more covering the specified census date (31 December 2005), provided that the beginning of the employment start date was no later than 1 January 2005**”. Therefore, if the academic staff concerned does not hold a paid appointment for a continuous period of not less than twenty-four months due to no-pay leave, he/she would not be covered by the Exercise.*
- Q9. If an academic staff member who is already tenured, i.e. having an appointment exceeding 24 months, is approved for a no-pay period that covers the census date, will he/she be included in the RAE?
- A9. *If the staff is not holding a paid position at the institution on the census date (i.e. 31 December 2005) due to no-pay leave, he/she will not be covered by the Exercise.*
- Q10. For staff members who have been working and contributing to their departments / faculties for the bulk of the period between 1 January 2002 to 31 December 2005, but will be retiring before the census date of 31 December 2005, will they be eligible for the Exercise?

A10. *As paragraph 37(a) of the Guidance Notes states, for staff members to be counted, they must be holding a “paid appointment at the institution concerned for a continuous period of twenty-four months or more covering the specific census date (i.e. 31 December 2005), provided that the beginning of the employment date was no later than 1 January 2005.” Therefore, for staff members who are retiring in 2004/2005 and will not be holding a paid employment on the census date, they will not be covered by the RAE 2006. We need to draw our line somewhere.*

Q11. Does paragraph 37 (b) of the Guidance Notes (i.e. eligibility requirement of academic staff) refer to both part-time and full-time staff members?

A11. *Yes, both part-time and full-time staff cannot hold concurrent paid positions at other institutions under paragraph 37(b) of the Guidance Notes. As set out in paragraph 40, part time staff who are not employed by another institution are counted on a fractional basis.*

(III) Assessment Period

Q1. It would not be fair for those staff members who had produced output items that fall in the three-year gap of 1999 to 2001, since their output items had not been assessed in RAE 1999 and would not be assessed in RAE 2006. This is especially true for Humanities subjects, since the output would require a prolonged duration to generate. Can a remedy be provided for this situation?

A1. *The UGC has carefully deliberated this issue and considered that since the purpose of the RAE is to take a snapshot of institutions’ latest research performance, the assessment period should be maintained. As a compromise and in heeding academics’ concern, the RAG proposed and the UGC agreed that each eligible staff could submit a maximum number of six items in the following manner at their discretion -*

(a) four regular items within the assessment years (i.e. 1.1.2002 to 31.12.2005), one regular item within the gap years (i.e. 1.1.1999 to 31.12.2001), and one exceptional item before the assessment year period (i.e. prior to 1.1.2002); or

(b) five regular items within the assessment years (i.e. 1.1.2002 to 31.12.2005), and one regular item within the gap years (i.e. 1.1.1999 to 31.12.2001).

Please see paragraph 46 of the Guidance Notes for details.

Q2. Will RAE 2006 accept research output items produced before 1999?

A2. *Each eligible staff may submit not more than one exceptional item prior to 1.1.2001. In this connection, he / she may submit one exceptional item before 1999 as well. However, to avoid double counting, re-submission of past RAE items is not allowed.*

(IV) Cost Centres

Q1. Previously Department X was evaluated under Cost Centre B. Can this Department be evaluated under Cost Centre A?

A1. *Institutions have full flexibility as to how and where they wish to map their departments to which cost centres.*

Q2. Some of the current cost centres include disciplines that should warrant new and separate cost centres be formed, to recognize the importance of the disciplines. Can this be done?

A2. *Whether a discipline has its own cost centre is a categorization matter and not a matter of whether the discipline is being viewed as important / not important. All disciplines, whether they have their own cost centres or not, are viewed as equally important by the UGC. The present classification of cost centres is the result of the consultation exercise held with the institutions on the Common Data Collection Format (CDCF) ended in February 2005.*

(V) Assessment Mechanism

Q1. Would the role and mission of an institution be fully incorporated and factored into the exercise, especially in the research index calculation model?

A1. *The role and mission of an institution will not per se be factored into the assessment process. This is because the RAE 2006 is an assessment of research performance, not an assessment of the institution's performance against its role. The performance of institutions against role will be reflected in the Performance and Role Related Funding Scheme.*

Q2. Would the assessment be based on the US-biased international journal lists?

- A2. *Paragraph 77 of the Guidance Notes has already stated that “**the panels will be instructed not to adopt a mechanical approach during the assessment**”. The assessment will be carefully discussed by individual panels based on the characteristics of each panel and will not mechanically based on international journal lists.*
- Q3. *Would the issue of local relevance be seriously and properly addressed in the assessment? Will credit be given to research that relates to local context and will the assessment criteria and membership of the Panel take care of the local relevance of research?*
- A3. *Paragraph 73 of the Guidance Notes states that “in the case of publications or other outputs of a local nature, the panel will need to assess whether the item represents a contribution to the work of the international research community in terms of its intellectual content, as well as rigour of process and methodology.” Paragraph 74 of the Guidance Notes also stipulates that – “**A distinction should be made between (a) a publication that is local because it addresses local issues, and (b) a publication that is local because it does not meet the standards of rigour and scholarship expected internationally in the mainstream of that discipline. In the former case, the item will not be discounted; in the latter, it will be.**” The nature and diversity of the disciplines would also be taken into account when Panel members are recruited.*
- Q4. *Would the comparability of standards, including the standard of handling co-authored items, be maintained across the 13 subject panels?*
- A4. *As stated in paragraph 32 of the Guidance Notes, “**all subject panels will work to the same threshold definition although they will have to exercise their judgment with due regard for the nature and culture in different disciplines**”. In addition, paragraph 75 of the Guidance Notes states that “**Individual RAE panels will attempt to decide their own thresholds, calibrate with one and other, and consider common working procedures as soon as they are formed.**” Furthermore, guidelines will also be provided to Panel Members to establish a set of common ground rules on the assessment, and be mounted on the UGC’s web at –*

<http://www.ugc.edu.hk/eng/ugc/publication/prog/rae/rae.htm>

as part of the effort to enhance transparency of the process of the RAE 2006.

- Q5. Could each researcher be allowed to make a personal statement which will not take up more than one A4 page, to supplement the researcher's publications record?
- A5. *As indicated in the paragraph 61 (c) and 62 of the Guidance Notes, staff members may submit “documentary evidence to demonstrate the impact of the research outputs” which “is limited to one A4 page”.*
- Q6. Research assessment should be informed by performance indicators other than published outputs and well-conceived strategies. Would additional appendices be allowed to provide elaboration of the research plans and strategies formulated at the cost centre level?
- A6. *Paragraph 51 (b) of the Guidance Notes has already allowed “other input that may or may not be in publishable form”. Research plans and strategies formulated at cost centre level can be included in Table 1 of the Guidance Notes by an appropriate representative from the institution as stated in paragraph 36 of the Notes.*
- Q7. Would a mechanistic approach of assessment be used? Would suitable criteria be used to assess Arts and Humanities subjects rather than by using parameters that are predominantly science-based, such as impact factors and citation indices?
- A7. *As indicated in paragraph 77 of the Guidance Notes, “the panels will be instructed not to adopt a mechanical approach during the assessment”. Paragraph 79 also states that “all panels will receive training before the actual assessment process begins, and will be invited to state in writing, for dissemination afterwards, the standards and criteria they have used, and a description of how these have been applied.”*
- Q8. Regarding paragraphs 71-74 of the Guidance Notes, please clarify the concept of ‘mainstream’ in the principles of ‘international excellence’ and ‘international vs. local’.
- A8. *Paragraph 74 states that international excellence “should not be equated with output items published outside of Hong Kong or the region; rather it is intended that evaluation should be made with reference to the best international norms in the mainstream of that discipline or sub-discipline. It is possible that in some particular disciplines, such norms are set by output items published in Hong Kong or the region.” This paragraph attempts to present the message that international excellence should **not** be equated with **where** the output items are published, be it in*

*Hong Kong or not in Hong Kong; rather, the evaluation should be made with reference to the best international norms in the **mainstream of that discipline or sub-discipline**. The word “mainstream” has not been intended to describe or to categorize the output to be evaluated, but rather to describe **how** the output items should be evaluated. RAE 2006 does not classify research output items into mainstream or sidestream.*

Q9. Could an academic book published between 2001 and 2002 be counted as one exceptional research output?

A9. *According to paragraph 60 of the Guidance Notes, individual staff may submit up to one exceptional item produced at any time prior to 1 January 2002 if considered appropriate. In this connection, an academic book published before 1 January 2002 can be counted as one exceptional research output **provided that the book had not been submitted in previous RAEs**. It can also be submitted as a regular item if it was published in the gap years (i.e. 1.1.1999 to 31.12.2001) in accordance with paragraph 46 of the Guidance Notes.*

Q10. Can more than one exceptional item be submitted?

A10. *As indicated in paragraphs 46 and 60 of the Guidance Notes, only one exceptional item can be submitted.*

Q11. Would exceptional items be treated equally as ‘ordinary’ items?

A11. *Exceptional items would be treated in the same way as in RAE 1999, i.e. exceptional items should be “works of great impact” (paragraph 60 of the Guidance Notes).*

Q12. How would research collaboration among institutions be assessed?

A12. *Inter-institutional research collaboration is recognized through allowing for co-authored output items, whereas inter-disciplinary collaboration within the same institution should be evident through the ‘fte’ distribution among different cost centres.*

Q13. For papers that have been accepted for publication, it is common that journals, in their acceptance letters to the authors, require them to make minor corrections to the concerned papers. The requirement for minor corrections to the concerned paper is, however, not a condition whatsoever for its publication. Therefore, can the phrase, “without need

for further amendments of any kind”, of current paragraph 51(a)(ii) of the Guidance Notes be rephrased to take account of this minor correction?

A13. *The UGC has taken note of this concern and has amended paragraph 51(a)(ii) of the Guidance Notes to accept output items which are not yet published, but officially accepted for publication without any prior condition for its publication.*

Q14. Would the outcome of propriety research, if they are showcased in exhibitions or demonstrations, be considered as a kind of non-traditional output and allowed to be submitted for assessment?

A14. *The UGC has amended Paragraph 52 of the Guidance Notes to allow the submission of output items of exhibitions and demonstrations relating to proprietary research which are (i) accessible to the public and the profession; (ii) non-traditional output for assessment; and (iii) contain enough information for evaluation.*

Q15. In paragraphs 16 and 71 of the Guidance Notes, “raised” threshold standard was mentioned. What does “raised” threshold standard mean?

A15. *As stated in paragraph 75 of the Guidance Notes, “**Individual RAE panels will attempt to decide their own thresholds...**”, therefore the specific definition of the “raised standards” will be decided by the individual panels based on the special nature of the discipline.*

(VI) Panel Structure

Q1. Would the assessment be undertaken by experts knowledgeable in that discipline?

A1. *Panel Convenors and their deputies will be instructed to nominate panel members who have sufficient expertise in the areas to be assessed. In addition, since panel member nominations are mainly provided by the eight UGC-funded institutions, a formal and proper channel has been in place for the institutions to recommend those experts whom they consider appropriate for assessing their submissions.*

Q2. Would the proportion of non-local members on the review panels be increased?

A2. *Yes, the UGC is prepared to increase the number of overseas panel.*

Q3. Would sub-panels be formed?

A3. *There is no restriction as stipulated in the Guidance Notes on whether the panel should or should not form sub-panels. Suggestions related to sub-panels by institutions have been forwarded to the relevant Panel Convenors for their consideration.*

Q4. Would the process of appointing subject panel members be made transparent, e.g. the criteria for appointment, the process of decision making and the names of the parties/persons who will be making the decision?

A4. *Panel members are nominated by the eight-UGC funded institutions, and selected by the respective Panel Convenors and their deputies in consultation with the Convenor of the Research Ad Hoc Group (RAG) and the UGC Secretariat, based on the General Guidelines for Panel Convenors on Panel Formation endorsed by the UGC. The General Guidelines for Panel Convenors on Panel Formation outlines the criteria for panel member appointment, and is available for public's information on the UGC web as follows: –*

<http://www.ugc.edu.hk/eng/ugc/publication/prog/rae/rae.htm>.

Q5. How do you select Panel Convenors and Deputy Panel Convenors?

A5. *The Panel Convenors and their deputies are selected based on the following guiding principles endorsed by the UGC –*

- (a) expertise in the related fields;*
- (b) impartiality;*
- (c) open-mindedness;*
- (d) leadership; and*
- (e) to the extent possible, RAE experience.*

(VII) Other General Questions

Q1. Will an open workshop be held to enable academic staff to ask questions related to the technical details of the Exercise?

A1. *This Q&A document has been prepared to enhance the institutions' understanding on the Exercise. This Q&A document is posted on the UGC web at:-*

<http://www.ugc.edu.hk/eng/ugc/publication/prog/rae/rae.htm>.

Further enquiries can be addressed to the UGC Secretariat (Mr Anthony Chan, Assistant Secretary-General (Research), at 2844 9916 or email at achan@ugc.edu.hk, or Ms Wendy Wong, Senior Research Administrator, at 2844 9917 or email at wendywong@ugc.edu.hk). Two Carnegie workshops will also be held for institutions on 24 January 2006.*

Last updated 9 September 2005

* Two similar workshops will be held in the morning and afternoon of 24 January 2006. It is envisaged that four institutions will join the first workshop and the remaining four the second workshop.

Research Assessment Exercise 2006**Timetable***(as at 9 September 2005)*

<u>Month</u>	<u>Major Events (date)</u>
May – Sept 2005	Panel Formation
August / September – November 2005	Panel Guidelines consultation
23 January 2006	Carnegie Workshop for local panel members
24 January 2006	Carnegie Workshop for institutions
1 and 13 March 2006	Receive institutions' submissions
April – May 2006	Trial Assessment of the submission
June 2006	Local Panel Convenor Meeting
June – September/October 2006	Submission Assessment
September – October 2006	Panel Meetings
November 2006	Panel Report to be submitted to the Secretariat
January 2007	Preliminary RAE results to be presented to the UGC
April 2007	Final RAE results to be endorsed by the UGC

Research Assessment Exercise 2006 – List of Convenors and Deputy Convenors for the 13 RAE Panels

Panel		Name	Affiliated Institution
Biology	Convenor	Prof Rudolf Wu	City University of Hong Kong
	Deputy Convenor	Prof Nam-Hai Chua	The Rockefeller University, USA
Health Sciences	Convenor	Sir Peter J Morris	Royal College of Surgeons of England, UK
	Deputy Convenor	Prof Karen Lam	The University of Hong Kong
Physical Sciences	Convenor	Prof Chung Loong Choy	The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
	Deputy Convenor	Prof Michael Doyle	University of Maryland, USA
Electrical & Electronic Engineering	Convenor	Prof Pak-chung Ching	The Chinese University of Hong Kong
	Deputy Convenor	Prof H.-S. Philip Wong	Stanford University, USA
Computer Science/Information Technology	Convenor	Prof Francis Chin	The University of Hong Kong
	Deputy Convenor	Prof Benjamin Wah	University of Illinois, USA
Engineering	Convenor	Prof Ronald M C So	The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
	Deputy Convenor	Prof Leroy Fletcher	Texas A&M University, USA
Built Environment	Convenor	Prof Charles W W Ng	The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
	Deputy Convenor	Prof Peter Waldron	University of Sheffield, UK
Law	Convenor	Prof James V Feinerman	Georgetown University Law Center, USA
	Deputy Convenor	Prof Albert Chen	The University of Hong Kong
Business Studies & Economics	Convenor	Prof Richard Ho	City University of Hong Kong
	Deputy Convenor	Prof Peter Pope	Lancaster University, UK
Social Sciences	Convenor	Prof Siu-lun Wong	The University of Hong Kong
	Deputy Convenor	Prof Lynn White	Princeton University, USA
Humanities	Convenor	Prof Laurence K P Wong	Lingnan University
	Deputy Convenor	Prof John Wang	Stanford University, USA
Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design	Convenor	Prof Wing-wah Chan	The Chinese University of Hong Kong
	Deputy Convenor	Prof Wu Hung	The University of Chicago, USA
Education	Convenor	Prof Wing-on Lee	The University of Sydney, Australia
	Deputy Convenor	Prof David Chan	The Chinese University of Hong Kong

General Guidelines for Panel Convenors on Panel Formation

<u>Guidelines</u>	<u>Rationale</u>
1. Deputy Convenor, to the extent possible, should be from overseas if the Convenor is local, and vice versa. Both of them should be respected researchers in the related fields. They should enforce an impartial and open-minded vetting process in the Exercise.	- to intensify the rigour of and credibility to the assessment process
2. Should slightly increase the number of non-local, professional and lay members, especially for assessing those cost centres (e.g. Dentistry, Nursing, Medicine, Biology, Business Studies and Economics) that panel members of the last RAE observed that there were apparent conflicts of interests among local members. The aim is have at least two non-local members on each panel.	- to intensify the rigour of and credibility to the assessment process
3. Panel members are appointed on personal basis, and should either be respected researchers or professionals in the related fields; each panel should comprise a good mix of members from the local institutions as far as practicable and feasible.	- panel members should not assess submissions coming from their own institutions with a view to avoiding conflict of interest
4. Should have a good mix of former RAE panel members and new members.	- to retain and widen experience in the research assessment exercise
5. The conveners may consider the following information (which will be provided by the Secretariat later) in determining the number of members of their panels - i. Number of panel members (local/overseas/lay members) in RAE 1999	- to have an appropriate size of panel for the assessment exercise

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Number of submission to the cost centres of the Panels in RAE 1999 iii. Number of eligible academic staff for each cost centre of the Panel in RAE 1999 iv. Average number of submission by each eligible staff per cost centre of the Panel in RAE 1999 v. Number of eligible academic staff for each cost centre on 31 December 2004 vi. Estimated number of submissions for each cost centre in RAE 2006 based on the above 	
<p>6. The Secretariat will provide the following information to assist the Convenors to consider and recommend memberships for their respective panels -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) RAE Panels for RAE 2006 ii) Panel membership nomination lists for RAE 2006 iii) Panel membership list of the RAE 1999 iv) Distribution of RAE 1999 submissions among four categories of Carnegie Scholarships v) Distribution of eligible staff member from each institution in RAE 1999 and from 2004 statistics vi) Distribution of submissions from each cost centre in RAE 1999 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to have a good composition of panel members who possess necessary expertise to assess the submissions according to the four Carnegie scholarships