education

Department of Education
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Directorate: Higher Education Policy and Development Support

Communiqué Number 1 – February 2009

Policy and Procedures for the Measurement of Research Output of Public Higher Education Institutions

Introduction

This is the first in a series of communiqués aimed at providing guidelines for Public Higher Education Institutions on the submission of Research Outputs to the Department of Education (DoE) in 2009. We hope that through this communication we will be able to minimise mistakes and the rejection rate of submitted claims. However, this is not the only form of communicating with the research offices and we are still available on email and telephone for individual and specialised enquiries. Furthermore, we will also continue with institutional visits, although we can only visit a few institutions each year. We are planning a second communiqué before your institutional submissions which are due on **15 May 2009**.

We welcome your comments and innovative ideas on how we can improve our working relations as well as the quality of submissions.

Procedures on Completing the Spreadsheets

When submitting **electronic** and **hard** copies of research outputs to the DoE please adhere to the following guidelines:

1. Ensure that all electronic submissions are completed on excel spreadsheets. Updated versions of these spreadsheets (for **books, proceedings and journals**) are attached to this communiqué. For an electronic version please contact Genevieve Simpson at the contact details provided at the end of this communiqué. When completing the spreadsheets please take note of the following:

- Title case must be used throughout (not capital letters).
- The title of the publication (especially for conferences) should be exactly as it is on the cover of the publication. For instance, if the conference proceedings are for the "Thirteenth Annual Conference" please enter it exactly as it is and not as the "13th Annual Conference". This consistency helps us, for example, when one institution

has not provided sufficient information. We are then able to cross-reference the conference to other institutions.

- Author and editor names must begin with the surname and titles should not be entered, e.g. Smith JF (no Prof or Dr).
- Author proportion must be in the format: 0.5 (not 50%).
- All authors of the publication must be mentioned (in the correct columns as specified) and the authors from the claiming institution must be underlined (not bolded). The sequence of authorship should be maintained as it is on the publication. For example, if the claiming author comes second out of three it should be retained as such.

Journals

2. Please ensure that audited Journal submissions meet the following guidelines:
   - Journal titles must be exactly the same as on the relevant index. Please do not use abbreviations as they cause confusion.
   - List the journals according to the index on which they appear and provide subtotals for the number of units claimed for each of the indices. The three recognised indices are:
     - The Institute of Scientific Information (ISI) (please note that only the three <u>Web of Science lists</u> (Science, Social Sciences and Arts & Humanities Citation Indices) and **not** the ISI Master List are accredited. Journals which appear only on the ISI Master List do not qualify for subsidy);
     - The International Bibliography of Social Sciences (IBSS); and
     - The Department of Education List of Accredited Journals (or DoE list).

     A hard copy of the ISI, IBSS indices and Approved DoE list as at 31 December 2008 will be distributed to institutions in early February 2009.
   - Provide a separate list of journals, again indicating the relevant approved list, submitted for late claims (year n-2). For the 2009 submissions, this means that all 2007 publications will be late submissions and each must be accompanied by an explanation from either the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research); or the Dean or Director of Research stating why the late submission should be considered (see further discussion on late submissions below). Ensure that the auditors certify that all such outputs have not been claimed before and that explanations for the lateness are provided for each submission.
   - All fractions must be expressed in decimal form and should be rounded off to two decimal places, for example 0.33.

Book Publications and Published Conference Proceedings

3. Please ensure that all hard copies of books and conference proceedings contain markers in the publications indicating the:
   - Publisher;
   - Editor/s;
   - ISBN or ISSN number;
   - Author/s and their affiliation;

- Chapters being claimed; and
- Evidence of peer-review (if it is in the publication).

4. If original copies of books and proceedings are not submitted, please make sure that copies are bound or stapled together so as to avoid any pages going missing. If photocopied, please include the following pages:
   - The cover of the publication (showing the title);
   - The imprint pages of the publication showing the date of publication, ISSN or ISBN number and the contents page;
   - The full chapter/s being claimed for;
   - The pages showing author affiliation if this is not indicated in the chapter; and
   - The final few pages of the book or conference proceedings (index, bibliography, etc.).

5. When submitting electronic publications, please ensure that a copy of the relevant pages is printed out and if the publication or article is contained in a CD, that it is photocopied and included in the submission. The printed version of the papers submitted to the DoE must be from the final published version of the publication and they must indicate the conference or publication name. Electronic publications also require an ISSN or ISBN number to be submitted.

Please note that only actual publications are acceptable, not pre-prints.

Major Reasons for the Non-Recognition of Submissions

During the assessment and adjudication of research outputs in 2008, it became clear that certain reasons for the non-recognition of submitted outputs continue to appear across all institutions. We encourage institutions to focus on these issues when preparing 2009 submissions so as to improve overall acceptance rates. Some of these elements are completely avoidable and can be dealt with by research offices. These main reasons are outlined below together with guidelines for avoiding such problems.

The submission of journal articles, which do not appear on the approved lists, as book publications

Only journal articles published in accredited journals, which appear on approved indices (as discussed above), are recognised for subsidy purposes. If a journal is not in any of the above accredited lists, it **cannot** be submitted as a book publication or a conference proceeding.

The submission of non-recognised types of publications

The *Policy and Procedures for the Measurement of Research Output of Public Higher Education Institutions* stipulates that the target audience for research publications must be specialists in the relevant field. It also states that certain publications, such as textbooks;

theses, commissioned work and works of fiction are not subsidised. The submission of such works must therefore be avoided. Furthermore, collections of papers from internal workshops, bibliographies, festschriften (tributes) and non-accredited journal publications are not subsidised as either books or conference proceedings.

Insufficient or no evidence of Peer Review

The policy requires that all publications submitted for research subsidy should be peer reviewed. The following guidelines regarding peer review and evidence of peer review should be followed:

- Peer review must be by specialists in the field;
- Peer review must be done prior to publication;
- Full articles, and not just abstracts (as it is the case with some conferences), must be peer reviewed;
- Conference papers or articles must be reviewed for publication and not only for presentation;
- Authors and Editors cannot be part of the peer review process of their own papers;
- Emails from authors confirming peer review are not considered to be sufficient evidence; and
- Evidence of peer review should be un-ambiguous.

Incomplete Submissions

Institutions should avoid this element at all cost, and we have observed an escalation of it with the previous submissions. The majority of the problems relate to institutions not providing ISSN or ISBN numbers. All publications must have such a number and it must be provided in the submission. Furthermore, in some cases, institutions do not provide full copies of the papers for which they are claiming. Abstracts or loose papers with no reference to the conference or publication are not sufficient. In short, all the information required on the spreadsheet should be supplied in full.

Reprints, previously published research and new editions

The policy specifies that publications must disseminate ‘original research and new developments’. Reprints of publications and second editions are therefore not subsidised unless there is clear proof of new research in the revised publication.

Late Submissions

The policy states that submissions for year n-2 (but no later) will be considered, as long as each submission is accompanied by an explanation from either the Vice Chancellor or DVC/ Dean or Director of Research. In 2009 institutions will be submitting 2008 publications, meaning that 2007 publications are late and each will have to be accompanied by an explanation. Any earlier publication (2006 and before) will not be accepted regardless.

No Translation of non-English language submissions

The *Policy and Procedures for the Measurement of Research Output of Public Higher Education Institutions* requires a brief outline of the content of all non-English language submissions. This should be a page long for books and shorter for conference proceedings. Submissions that do not comply with this requirement are not considered.

No Proof of Author's Affiliation

In most publications the author's affiliation is stated below their name (or in their contact email address). However, in some instances this is not the case. The policy requires that a letter proving affiliation signed by the Vice Chancellor or DVC/ Dean or Director of Research be submitted in such cases. Failure to provide such a letter results in non-recognition.

Conclusion

We hope that the above information is clear and that it will assist you with the forthcoming submissions. We endeavour to assist you as much as possible. Where there are issues that require clarity, please contact us at the contact details below. However, email is a preferred form of communication. We are planning to send out another communiqué and the issues we will cover shall also be based on the questions we receive from you and on other matters we think require further clarification.

We wish you a pleasant and productive 2009.

Enquires:	Dr Genevieve Simpson or Ms Thumeka Mantolo or Ms Patience Manqele
Tel:	012 312 6241 / 5283 / 5280
Fax:	012 325 4419
E-mail:	simpson.g@doe.gov.za or mantolo.t@doe.gov.za or manqele.p@doe.gov.za