RESEARCH OUTPUT PUBLICATIONS

Tshwane University of Technology

We empower people

Guidelines for the submission of research output

Dilla Wright

July 2010

Directorate of Research & Innovation

Guidelines for the submission of research output

1. Submission

The dates for the 2010 research output publications to the Directorate Research & Innovation are:

- 30 September 2010
- 28 February 2011

2. Process

1. Author

Submit the hard copies and supporting documents for each output to the Departmental Administrator [each academic department has a DA].

2. Departmental Administrator

a. Captures the information gathered on the InfoEd Research Management System.
b. Submit hard copies to Faculty Research Officer.

3. First round of evaluation (FRIC/faculty committee)

a. Screening in accordance with DoHET criteria.
b. Research Officer submits the hard copies of the faculty approved output to Directorate of Research and Innovation on submission date.

4. Second round evaluation (Directorate of Research and Innovation)

The Directorate will evaluate the submissions from faculties and give feedback to faculties on:

- Output approved;
- Incomplete submissions;
- Output that don't meet the criteria.

5. Submission of outstanding information

Faculties will have the opportunity to supply the outstanding information by a date communicated by the Directorate of Research and Innovation.

6. Feedback to Faculties

A summary of the submission of the faculty and the output that do not meet the criteria will be discussed with the Executive Dean as to reach consensus on what should be submitted.

7. Timeline

Step 1: Evaluation by R&I: 01 – 11 March 2011
Step 2: Feedback to FRIC: 14 – 18 March 2011
Step 3: FRIC submission of outstanding information: 04 April 2011
Step 4: Re-evaluation by R&I: 05 – 11 April 2011 ***Note 1***
Step 5: Audit of journals by external auditors: 12 – 14 April 2011
Step 6: R&I compile reports for FRIC: 15 - 16 April 2011
Step 7: Feedback discussion with FRIC: 18 – 22 April 2011
Step 8: R&I finalizes the reports for submission to DoHET: 03 – 06 May 2011
Step 9: R&I receives audit report and certificate: 06 May 2011
Step 10: R&I submits to DoHET: 10 May 2011

Note 1 If necessary, an institutional panel will be convened to review the selected conference proceedings and books to finalize submission to the DoHET.

3. Evaluation of contributions

The DoHET has specific criteria that must be adhered to in order to qualify for subsidy. Please ensure that these requirements are met when you evaluate the contributions.

3.1 Criteria

a. **In order to qualify for subsidy**, conference proceedings and books/chapters in books must adhere to the following:
   - Output (publications) can only be submitted for accreditation **once**;
   - All submissions must contain **new knowledge and original research**;
   - All submissions must be **peer-reviewed prior to publication** (full papers, not just abstracts and/or presentations) and **proof** must be provided. (This refers to a body of evidence, not just a statement);
   - The publication must be **scholarly** in nature;
   - The publication must be **based on research**;
   - May **not** have been **previously published**;
   - Non-accredited journals **cannot** be submitted as books or conference proceedings;

b. The following is not published in the DoE Policy on the measurement of research output, but must be adhered to when a publication is submitted for evaluation.

   i. Books/Chapters in Books

      - Documentary proof must be submitted (the books are divided amongst the evaluators and recommendations are made);
      - Proof from the Editor of the book on the peer review process must be submitted;
      - There must be evidence from the Publisher on the peer review process;
      - The Editorial Committee cannot peer review, it must be specialists who don't form part of the Editorial team;
      - An author may not be the Editor or part of the Editorial Committee;
      - Work in the book must be new and of high quality, i.e. the contents must be original;
      - Follow-on additions cannot receive accreditation.

   ii. Conference Proceedings

      - Evidence of the selection of papers, what percentage of papers are accepted/declined;
      - Evidence of the process that was followed;
      - Evidence of peer review by specialists – not the Conference Committee, Technical Committee or Organizing Committee;
      - Acceptance of publication must be peered reviewed;
      - Papers may not be published by invitation, e.g. workshop papers;
      - Should not have been published somewhere else;
      - An author may not be the Editor or part of the Editorial Committee;
      - Doesn't imply if the conference is approved it is automatic that individual papers have been approved;

3.2 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.

3.3 Technical screening

a. **Books/chapters in books**

- Title of Book
- Editor(s) (optional)
- Publisher
- CESM Category
- ISBN
- Title of contribution in the book
- Total no. of pages in the book
- Start page
- End page
- Total number of pages claimed
- Affiliation of TUT author(s) indicated

b. **Conference proceedings**

- Title of the Proceedings
- Editor(s) if applicable
- Publisher
- CESM Category
- ISBN
- Title of paper / article
- Affiliation of TUT author(s) indicated

3.4 Markers in the contribution

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.

3.5 Electronic Publications

- 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 DoHET 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.

3.6 Copies of contributions

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.).

4. Completion of Spreadsheets

The spreadsheets will fall away for R&I use, but can still be implemented at DRIC/FRIC level for reporting purposes.

- All the fields in the spreadsheet must be completed (see 3.3 Technical screening)
- 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 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).
- 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.

5. Key observations from the report on the evaluation of the institutional research publications

The panel specially wishes to note that institutions are responsible for ensuring the ethical integrity of their submissions. Breaches of propriety include the following:

- Submitting an output that is or has been submitted in the same or another format (conference proceedings, journal or book chapter);
- Submitting an output where the author is also the peer reviewer and/or editor of the collection, or otherwise plays more than one role that may compromise the integrity of blind and anonymous peer review;

- Although a grey area, submitting a series of outputs that all derive from one piece of research (so-called ‘salami slicing’).

The panel has noted that these practices have not been rife in the system but now are beginning to creep in. The Department of Higher Education and Training has been requested to deal with the matter.

5.1 Major Reasons for the Non-Recognition of Submissions (from DoHET report)

During the assessment and adjudication of research outputs, 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 future 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.

a. 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 recognized 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.

b. Submission of non-recognized 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 subsidized. 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 subsidized as either books or conference proceedings.

c. 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 (see 3.2 above).

d. 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.

e. 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** subsidized unless there is clear proof of new research in the revised publication.

f. 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 2011 institutions will be submitting 2010 publications, meaning that 2009 publications are late and each will have to be accompanied by an explanation. Any earlier publication (2008 and before) will not be accepted regardless.

g. 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.

h. 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.

6. CHECKLIST for the evaluation of contributions

No	Criteria	Yes/No
1	Does the publication meet all the criteria? (see 3.1)	
2	Is there evidence of peer-review prior to publication? (see 3.2)	
3	Are all the fields in the spreadsheet completed? (see 3.3 & 4) (Optional)	
4	Are there markers in the contribution? (see 3.4)	
5	Have all the relevant pages of electronic contributions been printed out? (see 3.5)	
6	Are there copies of all the required information? (see 3.6)	

Contact information:

Dilla Wright
Tel (012) 382-5154, Fax (012) 382-4409, Email wrightd@tut.ac.za

Ingrid Botha
Tel (012) 382-5872, Fax (012) 382-4409, Email bothai@tut.ac.za

References:

1. Department of Higher Education and Training
2. Policy and Procedures for Measurement of Research Output of Public Higher Education Institutions