2018 Quality Evaluation

# How does the scoring system work?

# The scoring system for Evidence Portfolios

## The numerical scoring system

The first stage in the assessment of Evidence Portfolios (EPs) is based on allocating scores for each of the two components of the EP.

The scoring scale used has the following characteristics:
› the scale has a range from zero to seven
› seven is the highest score on the scale and zero is the lowest
› a score of zero would reflect that no evidence has been provided in the EP for that component
› only whole number scores can be allocated
› the scores of two, four and six are tie-points – these are used to distinguish between different descriptions of quality.

Both the Research Output (RO) and Research Contribution (RC) components are scored using the zero to seven-point scale. Each component has a specific descriptor and tie-point descriptors to help the panels with scoring.

The component descriptor provides an introduction to the component being assessed. The tie-point descriptors encapsulate the standard expected for that score.

| Score | Significance |
| --- | --- |
| 7 | Maximum |
| 6 | Tie-point |
| 5 | |
| 4 | Tie-point |
| 3 | |
| 2 | Tie-point |
| 1 | Minimal evidence |
| 0 | No evidence supplied |

*A score of at least two on the RO component is required for the award of a C and a C(NE) Quality Category. The Holistic assessment, however, may over-ride this.*

## The weighting system for scores

The RO component is weighted at 70 percent of the total score while the RC component is weighted at the remaining 30 percent of the total score.

The weightings will be used for all EPs, to ensure maximum comparability in judgements across panels.

The weighting system is **not** intended as a mechanical or absolute method for determining Quality Categories. The weighted score may be overridden as part of the Holistic assessment of EPs.

A weighted score will be automatically calculated by the PBRF IT System for each component of each EP.

The table below provides an example of how a total weighted score is calculated.

| EP component | Raw score (0-7) | Weighting (%) | Weighted score |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| **RO** | 4 | 70 | 280 |
| **RC** | 5 | 30 | 150 |
| **Total weighted score** | | | **430** |

**Relationship between the total weighted score and Quality Categories**

The table below is used for the scoring of all EPs except those identified as new and emerging researchers.



|  |  | **RO Score** | | | | | | | |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
|  |  | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** |
| **RC Score** | **0** | 0 | 70 | 140 | 210 | 280 | 350 | 420 | 490 |
|  | **1** | 30 | 100 | 170 | 240 | 310 | 380 | 450 | 520 |
|  | **2** | 60 | 130 | 200 | 270 | 340 | 410 | 480 | 550 |
|  | **3** | 90 | 160 | 230 | 300 | 370 | 440 | 510 | 580 |
|  | **4** | 120 | 190 | 260 | 330 | 400 | 470 | 540 | 610 |
|  | **5** | 150 | 220 | 290 | 360 | 430 | 500 | 570 | 640 |
|  | **6** | 180 | 250 | 320 | 390 | 460 | 530 | 600 | 670 |
|  | **7** | 210 | 280 | 350 | 420 | 490 | 560 | 630 | 700 |
| **Quality Category** | | R | | C | | B | | A | |

*A score of at least two on the RO component* is required for the award of a C and a C(NE) Quality Category. The Holistic assessment, however, may over-ride this.

The table below is used for the scoring of all EPs identified as new and emerging researchers. A new and emerging researcher awarded a score of two for their RO component and a one or zero in their RC component, will have their total weighted score automatically rounded up from 140 or 170 to 200 in the 2018 Quality Evaluation.

| | | RO Score | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** |
| RC Score | **0** | 0 | 70 | **200** | 210 | 280 | 350 | 420 | 490 |
| | **1** | 30 | 100 | **200** | 240 | 310 | 380 | 450 | 520 |
| | **2** | 60 | 130 | 200 | 270 | 340 | 410 | 480 | 550 |
| | **3** | 90 | 160 | 230 | 300 | 370 | 440 | 510 | 580 |
| | **4** | 120 | 190 | 260 | 330 | 400 | 470 | 540 | 610 |
| | **5** | 150 | 220 | 290 | 360 | 430 | 500 | 570 | 640 |
| | **6** | 180 | 250 | 320 | 390 | 460 | 530 | 600 | 670 |
| | **7** | 210 | 280 | 350 | 420 | 490 | 560 | 630 | 700 |
| Quality Category | | R(NE) | | C(NE) | | B | | A | |

# What are the Quality Categories?

While the following descriptors provide a useful reference point, they are generalised in approach. In determining or assigning Quality Categories, panels are expected to take account of other factors including (but not limited to) extraordinary circumstances and the overall principle of Holistic assessment of EPs.

**Quality Category A**

For an A to be assigned it would normally be expected that the EP contains evidence of research outputs of a world-class standard and research-related activity that shows a high level of peer recognition and esteem within the relevant research subject area and indicates a significant contribution to the New Zealand and/or international research environments, and may also show evidence of other significant demonstrable impact during the assessment period.

*This Quality Category can be awarded to the EPs of all PBRF-eligible staff members **including** new and emerging researchers.*

**Quality Category B**

For a B to be assigned it would normally be expected that an EP contains evidence of research outputs of a high quality and research-related activity that shows acquired recognition by peers for their research at least at a national level and indicates a contribution to the research environment beyond their institution, and/or a significant contribution within their institution, and may also show evidence of other demonstrable impact during the assessment period.

*This Quality Category can be awarded to the EPs of all PBRF-eligible staff members **including** new and emerging researchers.*

### Quality Category C

For a C to be assigned it would normally be expected that an EP contains evidence of quality-assured research outputs and research-related activity that shows some peer recognition for their research and indicates a contribution to the research environment within their institution or the wider community during the assessment period.

*This Quality Category can be awarded to the EPs of all PBRF-eligible staff members **except** new and emerging researchers.*

### Quality Category C(NE)

For a C(NE) to be assigned it would normally be expected that an EP contains evidence of quality-assured research outputs produced during the assessment period. They may have limited or no research-related activity in the RC component.

*This Quality Category can be awarded to the EPs of new and emerging researchers only.*

### Quality Category R

An EP will be assigned an R when it does not demonstrate the quality standard required for a C Quality Category or higher.

*This Quality Category can be awarded to the EPs of all PBRF-eligible staff members **except** new and emerging researchers.*

### Quality Category R(NE)

An EP will be assigned an R(NE) when it does not demonstrate the quality standard required for a Quality Category C(NE) or higher.

*This Quality Category can be awarded to the EPs of new and emerging researchers only.*

## Defining 'world-class research'

The use of 'world class' in relation to the RO and RC component scoring descriptors denotes a standard, not a type or focus of research.

World-class research outputs are those outputs that rank with the best within their broader discipline, regardless of the topic, theme or location of the research, or place of publication.

Research outputs that deal with topics or themes of primarily local, regional or national focus or interest can be of world-class standard. For example, research that focuses on Māori or Pacific topics or themes, New Zealand history, or New Zealand culture, economy, wellbeing or ecology may rank with the best research of its discipline conducted anywhere in the world.

Research contributions that reflect the esteem of peers considered to be global experts in their field, or show how the staff member contributes to a world-leading research environment, can be considered of world-class standard.

The scope of world-class characteristics, as indicated in the tie-point descriptors for the RO and RC components, may overlap. The characteristics are not ranked in any particular order, other characteristics may also denote world-class research outputs or activities, and the characteristics are not cumulative.