



Mr P C Ruffles CBE, FREng, FRS R A Eng Working Group Chairman



Personal Background

Rolls-Royce University Technology Centres

R A Eng Report Measuring Excellence in Engineering

Research Jan 2000

HEFCE Review of Research Assessment May 2003

R A Eng Report on The Assessment of Research

Quality in Engineering Disciplines Jan 2005



### Fellows' Working Group

Chairman

Mr P C Ruffles CBE FREng FRS

Members

Dr S Bold FREng Professor D Clarke FREng FRS Dr R Dolby OBE FREng Professor R Eatock Taylor FREng Professor R Kitney OBE FREng Professor J Midwinter OBE FREng FRS Professor D Newland FREng Dr G Robinson CBE FREng Mr P Saraga OBE FREng



#### Background

The Royal Academy of Engineering published the report 'Measuring Excellence in Engineering Research' in Jan 2000.

Study identified five basic characteristics that determine excellence

- Mode 1 and Mode 2 research
- Research strategy
- Scholarship
- Vitality and sustainability

The latest report produced for the purposes of the 2008 RAE provides a workable methodology using these principles within the defined HEFCE framework



#### **HEFCE Framework**

Research Assessment for a Unit of Assessment (department) to be presented as a profile of 4\*,3\*,2\*,1\*,0\*grades of quality in 5% Gradations

Clear emphasis to be given to Applied (Mode2) research

Assessment to relate to outputs and not be directly attributable to individuals



#### Mode 1 and Mode 2 Research

Mode 1 and Mode 2 research rarely exist in isolation making separate measurement of each element difficult

Mode1 research is normally performed by individuals whereas Mode 2 research is more likely to result from those individuals working as part of a group

Proxy measures for Mode 1 and Mode 2 research are proposed



### Assessment of Research Quality in Engineering Basic Assumptions

The Unit of Assessment will normally be the Engineering Department

Research active staff will be submitted and allocated to natural groups

Ideally a researcher should be allocated to one group only



#### Mode 1 and Mode 2 Assessment

Mode 1	Mode 2			
Publications (4per individual) Esteem (group)	Research Relationships and Income (group)			
	Research Impact (group)			

Data provided under these headings is assessed as International (I), National (N) or Unrated (U) standard. The group marks are then assigned to the individual Publications



### Data for Mode 1 assessment

#### Publications

Refereed Paper in Journal or Conference Book or Chapter in book Software or patent

#### Esteem

Keynote addresses or papers Lecture tours, Editorships, Editorial Board membership Prize winning publications Honours and Awards, Prestigious Fellowships - FREng FRS etc Advisory Boards, Consultancies Learned Society involvement



### Data for Mode 2 assessment (1)

Research relationships and income	Research Impact			
Government funding (inc Europe)	Case studies on how research results have been exploited			
Charitable income	defining impact in quantified terms.			
Industry and other commercial income	size, growth rate and			
Profile of research partnerships	profitability			
	Awarded patents and licensed income			



### Data for Mode 2 assessment (2)

Note 1

4 Case studies per 20 researchers then one per 10 additional researchers. A spin-off company can be submitted as a case study. Case studies to be agreed with the participating party and approved by the Chief Executive of the Company concerned or the Technical Director for large companies.

Pro forma to be provided to ensure response is focussed



### Data for Mode 2 assessment (3)

Note 2

Where qualifying activity does not fit with current group activity, it can be included in the Departmental submission

Note 3

Where Case studies extend beyond the period under review they can be included but the impact assessment should relate to the review period.



### Assessment of Research Quality in Engineering Research profile

The Initial research profile is arrived at using the research grades (I,N,U) allocated to each publication according to the following table

Rating	4*	3*		2*		1*	
Publications			Ν	Ν	U	Ν	U
Other 2 of 3	I,N	2N	2	2N	I,N	N,L	J 2N

This approach avoids rewarding mediocrity implicit in averaging scores and gives flexibility in balance of Mode1 vs Mode 2 research



### Departmental assessment(1)

Purpose is to assess the departments strength with respect to Strategy, Scholarship, Vitality and Sustainability

It will serve to underpin or moderate the research profile derived from the individual and group Assessments

Where the initial profile is moderated the change must be recorded and fully justified

The profile resulting from this process is termed the Final Profile



### Departmental assessment (2)

Strategy

Strategic vision including evolution since last RAE and achievements Balancing Mode 1 and Mode 2 Research

Scholarship

Identify scholarly activities



### Departmental assessment (3)

Vitality and sustainability

**Encouragement of Creativity** 

Training and career development activity

Numbers of PhD students

Staff breakdown and demography

Total departmental Expenditure



### Assessment of Research Quality in Engineering Summary of the proposed process Step 1

Assess Publications, mark as international (I), National (N) or Unrated (U)

Step 2

Repeat Step 1 for group contributions. Allocate group scores to each publication category

Step 3

Combine the marks for publications and groups (best 2 of group scores) to arrive at a star rating profile



### Assessment of Research Quality in Engineering Summary of the proposed process

Step 4

Combine group profiles to give initial profile for the department by proportioning using the number of publications in each star rating category

Step 5

Complete a departmental assessment and establish whether this is consistent with the initial profile. If not moderate as necessary and justify the change

Step 6

Produce the final profile in 5% gradations



#### Summary

The proposal outlined above has been discussed with HEFCE and sent to them for consideration

The concepts proposed were broadly acceptable, although some concern was expressed over whether case studies can be an effective measure.

The R A Eng working group felt strongly that case studies were an essential part of the proposal.