



# Research Metrics

---

Glenn Lyons, 18 May 2016

Updated: 7 November 2017

## List of abbreviations

---

<b>AL</b>	Associate Lecturer
<b>BI</b>	Business Intelligence
<b>CPD</b>	Continuing professional development
<b>DOI</b>	Digital object identifier
<b>FTE</b>	Full time equivalent
<b>HEBCIS</b>	Higher education-business and community interaction survey
<b>HEFCE</b>	Higher Education Funding Council for England
<b>HEI</b>	Higher education institution
<b>HESA</b>	Higher Education Statistics Agency
<b>HR</b>	Human Resources
<b>ISBN</b>	International Standard Book Number
<b>ISSN</b>	International Standard Serial Number
<b>KPI</b>	Key performance indicator
<b>KTP</b>	Knowledge Transfer Partnership
<b>PASS</b>	Project Approval Support System
<b>PGR</b>	Post-graduate research
<b>QR</b>	Quality Research
<b>RBI</b>	Research, Business and Innovation
<b>RDAB</b>	Research Degrees Award Board
<b>REF</b>	Research Excellence Framework
<b>RSIG</b>	Research Strategy Implementation Group
<b>SSR</b>	Student:staff ratio
<b>TRAC</b>	Transparent Approach to Costing
<b>TSU</b>	Temporary Staff Unit
<b>WLM</b>	Work Load Model

**Bundle** A UWE unit of time measurement equal to 2.5 hours

## Summary

---

UWE Research 2020 sets out our institution's strategy for sustaining and strengthening our research environment and achievements, and ensuring that research contributes effectively to the overall mission of the university. At all levels of the institution we are making ongoing decisions about investment in people, facilities and activities in addressing UWE's Research with Impact priority. Such decisions are matters of informed judgement. They draw upon experience and expert insights but have the prospect of being further informed by quantitative indicators or 'metrics'. Metrics can help measure or track *over time* how particular features of our research are changing and potentially help inform the decisions we make. Some may also allow us to benchmark our performance against other HEIs.

This document provides a set of 15 metrics that UWE will track over time as a resource for monitoring and decision making. Informed by an HE sector initiative called Snowball Metrics<sup>1</sup>, the metrics cover the input, process and output stages of research. For each UWE metric this document specifies its method of measurement (or 'recipe'), the rationale for the metric and how data for the metric can be acquired.

UWE is drawing upon a sub-set of metrics in its identification of KPIs for research as part of its overall corporate scorecard with individual faculties considering future target values for such KPIs. Faculties and the University Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee are likely to make use of the full set.

It must be stressed that the use of metrics should be undertaken sensitively, being mindful of their limitations. They are not a substitute for experience and expert insights but a complement. Metrics can be very context specific and any comparison of metrics across different parts of the university should recognise this. Our collective intention is to use metrics responsibly such that decision making is as robust as possible and positive behaviours are encouraged.

The points above attune strongly with a recent HE sector report. In July 2015 the Independent Review of the Role of Metrics in Research Assessment and Management commissioned by HEFCE was published under the title of "The Metric Tide"<sup>2,3</sup>. This timely report provides a valuable and informed consideration of metrics and their limitations, with emphasis on the importance of 'responsible metrics'. Five important dimensions are highlighted: *robustness* (metrics based on the best possible data); *humility* (recognition that quantitative evaluation is not a substitute for qualitative assessment); *transparency* (being open with those being evaluated about how data are compiled); *diversity* (respecting the importance of context when employing metrics); and *reflexivity* (being mindful and responsive to the effects of how metrics are defined and used). We will be guided by these principles at an institutional level in our approach to and use of research metrics<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.snowballmetrics.com/> - Snowball Metrics aims to provide agreed, unambiguous 'recipes' to calculate metrics that can enable informed decision-making concerning research. A 2014 'recipe book' is available free of charge.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/Year/2015/metrictide/> - Wilsdon, J., et al. (2015). *The Metric Tide: Report of the Independent Review of the Role of Metrics in Research Assessment and Management*. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.1.4929.1363

<sup>3</sup> See also the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment - <http://www.ascb.org/files/SFDeclarationFINAL.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> As per recommendation number two of the Metric Tide report.

In the course of preparing this document, all four faculties have been consulted. A wider set of candidate metrics was considered from which this chosen set has emerged. The provision of data concerning the 15 metrics will be overseen by UWE’s Research Strategy Implementation Group (RSIG) and supported by RBI and other teams within professional services. Each metric has more than one denominator. Data provision will be considered for the following denominators: UWE; faculty; department; institute/centre/group; and REF Unit of Assessment. As a minimum, data will be provided for UWE and per faculty and department.

UWE’s chosen set of metrics is not exhaustive and different parts of the university may choose to supplement this set with further measures of their own. Each metric is a simplified abstraction of a characteristic of our research and should be viewed in this light. It is an input to a wider consideration but one that may nevertheless inform and assist our decision making.

RSIG will keep the chosen set of metrics under review. These are the indicators we expect to consider at least annually. It may be from time to time that further data gathering and analysis takes places on an as-needs basis.

The remainder of this document sets out in more detail each of the 15 metrics. Reference to academic staff includes, unless stated otherwise, staff on research contracts. The summary list of metrics is as follows:

Input metrics	
1	Proportion of academic staff with a doctoral level research degree
2	Proportion of academic staff who are professors or associate professors
3	External research funding secured per FTE academic staff member
4	External ‘other’ income (knowledge exchange indicator) secured per FTE academic staff member
5	Ratio of successful to total number of external research proposals where value to UWE is in excess of £15k
6	Proportion of academic staff involved in PGR supervisory teams
Process metrics	
7	Proportion of WLM academic staff time devoted to research supported by external funding
8	Proportion of WLM academic staff time devoted to research supported by internal investment
9	Proportion of academic staff (not including those on research contracts*) with 110 bundles or greater allocated to research
10	External research income per FTE academic staff member
11	Proportion of lecturing <sup>†</sup> contract staff with ‘Project Manager’ designation on externally funded projects
Output metrics	
12	Ratio of PGR (PhD, DPhil, Prof Doc) completions to total PGR FTE student population
13	PGR (PhD, DPhil, Prof Doc) completions per FTE academic staff member
14	Published quality outputs logged in UWE Research Repository (with ISBN/ISSN/DOI) per FTE academic staff member
15	Proportion of academic staff named as (co-)author on at least one published quality output logged in UWE Research Repository

<sup>†</sup> Lecturing contract staff refers to all staff on a standard UWE contract with an allocation of 550 bundles in the WLM (this includes lecturers, senior lecturers, Associate Heads of Department, Associate Professors, Academic Directors and Professors).

\* Research contract staff refers to those staff principally employed to undertake research with an allocation of 654 bundles in the WLM (this includes research associates, research fellows and senior research fellows).

Across the metrics, figures for the number of FTE staff will be based on the previous end of calendar year snapshot (since the rolling monthly average used for the purposes of SSR figures does not include research contract staff).

<b>1 Proportion of academic staff with a doctoral level research degree</b>	
Recipe	Total number of academic staff (excluding ALs, TSU appointments and visiting staff) holding a PhD, DPhil or Prof Doc divided by the total number of academic staff. Able to be measured at any point in time but default is to measure at year end (31 July).
Rationale	This is a proxy measure of 'talent' as input capability to UWE research. A doctoral qualification reflects someone who has been successful in becoming professionally trained to undertake research. UWE is strengthening its expectation of a norm in many areas for newly appointed staff to hold a doctoral qualification. An upwards expectation for this metric's value in those areas may guide staff recruitment behaviour and encourage some existing staff without a doctoral qualification to review their own career development (normally by considering registering for a DPhil). It is acknowledged that for some parts of the university where taught programme delivery calls for staff with practice-based expertise, doctoral qualifications may be less relevant or likely. This should be accounted for in how the metric is used.
Measuring	HR to provide (data for) this metric.
Notes	The metric excludes MPhil. It considers actual staff numbers, not FTE numbers. There are instances where professional bodies rather than Higher Education Institutions award qualifications (e.g. British Psychological Society's Qualification in Health Psychology). If such qualifications can be shown to be equivalent to a Prof Doc (including a substantive research element) then RSIG will consider including them in the measurement.

<b>2 Proportion of academic staff who are professors or associate professors</b>	
Recipe	Total FTE number of academic staff (excluding ALs, TSU appointments and visiting staff) who are professors or associate professors divided by the total FTE number of academic staff. Able to be measured at any point in time but default is to measure at year end (31 July).
Rationale	This is a proxy measure of research leadership capacity in relation to the total academic staff base. Measured over time it may signal areas of imbalance (when considered with other metrics).
Measuring	HR to provide (data for) this metric.
Notes	Benchmarking data will be important to contextualising this metric for a given denominator. Underlying the changing value of this metric would be a combination of talent management, staff turnover and external appointments. The metric covers research, knowledge exchange and teaching and learning-oriented roles but assumes its value as a proxy on the basis of the majority of professors and associate professors being research-oriented.

<b>3 External research funding secured per FTE academic staff member</b>	
<b>Recipe</b>	External project-based funding (classified as 'research' as defined for REF purposes) coming to UWE that has been confirmed on PASS as awarded (as opposed to actually spent) during the period divided by the total FTE number of academic staff (excluding ALs, TSU appointments and visiting staff) in post at the end of the period. Default period covered by metric is the academic year (1 August to 31 July).
<b>Rationale</b>	This is a measure of the external resource being secured to support our research environment alongside QR funding. It is likely to be seen as positive for this to be stable or increasing.
<b>Measuring</b>	RBI to provide (data for) this metric. The PASS system should be able to capture this accurately provided that positive outcomes are recorded in a timely way by the project managers concerned. Where an external funding award with a UWE net funding value of over £50,000 is shared between more than one denominator area of UWE in relation to the metric then this should be accounted for.
<b>Notes</b>	This metric can be 'distorted' because of large single grants in particular areas (e.g. Centres for Doctoral Training) and also by any large value equipment amounts. It is advisable to look at this metric in conjunction with the process metric "External research income spent per FTE academic staff member". Confirmed successful proposals for external funding may be subject to delay in negotiating final agreed award values. This may create some lag in accounting for actual funding success in the metric itself. Funding awarded in a given period does not mean it will be spent (and hence constitute 'income') during the period concerned. Research funding secured will be allocated to the relevant denominator based on the affiliation of the named project manager recorded on PASS. Research funding secured over £50,000 will be split across the relevant denominators only where finance data (i.e. NOC) is available on PASS.

4 External 'other' income (knowledge exchange indicator) secured per FTE academic staff member	
Recipe	External funding classified as 'other' (not attributable to teaching or research) coming to UWE that has been confirmed on PASS as awarded (as opposed to actually spent) during the period divided by the total FTE number of academic staff (excluding ALs, TSU appointments and visiting staff) in post at the end of the period. Default period covered by metric is the academic year (1 August to 31 July).
Rationale	This is intended to be a measure of resource that is supporting knowledge exchange activity and/or progression of research impact potential as distinct from teaching or research. This will be much more modest than for research income typically.
Measuring	RBI to provide (data for) this metric. The PASS system should be able to capture this accurately provided that positive outcomes are recorded in a timely way by the project managers concerned. Where an external funding award with a UWE net funding value of over £50,000 is shared between more than one denominator area of UWE in relation to the metric then this should be accounted for. Accurate measurement will rely upon all 'other' income being recorded through PASS.
Notes	<p>This can be 'distorted' by a small number of large awards (e.g. the iNets) and may especially benefit from contextual information. Some awards may see a significant share of the monetary resource not being retained within UWE but being administered and distributed by UWE to third parties (as was the case with the iNets). This metric can only be treated as a proxy for knowledge exchange income and note, for example, that Knowledge Transfer Partnerships (KTPs) are classified as 'research' and thus picked up within the input metric "External research funding secured per FTE academic staff member". Funding awarded in a given period does not mean it will be spent (and hence constitute 'income') during the period concerned. This metric includes CPD contracts.</p> <p>'Other' income secured will be allocated to the relevant denominator based on the affiliation of the named project manager recorded on PASS. 'Other' income secured over £50,000 will be split across the relevant denominators only where finance data (i.e. NOC) is available on PASS.</p>



5 Ratio of successful to total number of external research proposals where value to UWE is in excess of £15k	
Recipe	Total number of successful <i>research</i> proposals awarded during the period that have a value to UWE greater than or equal to £15k divided by the total number of research proposals with a value to UWE greater than or equal to £15k that were notified of an outcome in the period. Research proposals only. Default period covered by metric is the academic year (1 August to 31 July).
Rationale	This aims to set a threshold to distinguish between small and substantive projects and then judge both our level of activity and proportion of success in bidding for substantive projects. It is not intended to necessarily discourage a practice of pursuing some smaller awards (especially where these are prestigious or can produce important outcomes) but is intended to encourage the merit of targeting larger awards in terms of effort and return from bidding. It is also able to reflect the effectiveness of securing external funding. Outcome decisions for proposals do not perfectly correlate with their quality and the time invested in preparing them. However, selective bidding for which proposals are prepared to a high standard is likely to lead to a higher proportion of successful proposals. High volume bidding without a commensurate success rate places a strain on our research support services in RBI and Finance as well as the opportunity costs for the academics investing their own time. UWE's aim is to continue to encourage selective, high quality bidding behaviour including the use of formal/informal internal peer review.
Measuring	RBI to provide (data for) this metric. The PASS system should be able to capture this provided that positive outcomes are recorded in a timely way by the project managers concerned. Where a proposal involves staff from more than one denominator for the metric then the denominator with which the project manager is associated should be attributed with the proposal. This reflects the responsibility of the project manager for seeking to maximise the quality of outgoing bids from UWE.
Notes	Important to present this metric's value in two forms: (i) as an absolute value; and (ii) as a ratio and not to simplify the ratio but instead to preserve the numbers in the ratio from the recipe. The recipe as stated ignores proposals that have a value less than the threshold so as to concentrate on volume and performance of substantive grants only. If all proposals were included this would affect the ratio value. The metric does not, therefore, pick up how behaviour may be changing in relation to bidding for smaller proposals. Important to note that this metric concerns proposals classified as 'research'.

<b>6 Proportion of academic staff involved in PGR supervisory teams</b>	
Recipe	Number of academic staff who are part of at least one PGR student supervisory team where the student in question has been 'currently registered' within the period divided by the total number of academic staff (excluding ALs, TSU appointments and visiting staff) in post at the end of the period. Default period covered by metric is the academic year (1 August to 31 July).
Rationale	On the assumption that research students make an important contribution to the research environment, then this looks to identify the breadth of staff who stand to benefit from involvement with them through advancing their own knowledge, helping to advance knowledge and jointly publishing with PGR students. This metric could highlight problems of concentration of supervision and areas where there is little PGR student presence.
Measuring	Graduate School with HR to provide (data for) this metric. Graduate School to draw up annually a list of individual staff involved in supervisory teams along with their affiliations to then allow this to be put alongside data from HR on total staff numbers.
Notes	This should exclude staff supervising Prof Doc students who are not in the research element of their studies. Faculty Research Degrees Committees are responsible for approving supervisory teams for research students and this should guard against any growth in supervisory teams simply for the sake of affecting this metric as opposed to addressing the interests of our research students.

<b>7 Proportion of WLM academic staff time devoted to research supported by external funding</b>	
Recipe	Total bundles across all academic staff in the WLM (excluding ALs, TSU appointments, visiting staff and unattributed time costed into a project) that are identified for research where the time is associated with an <i>externally</i> funded grant or contract (excluding QR funding) divided by the total bundles for these staff as recorded in the WLM. Measured at 31 July.
Rationale	The share of time (whether internally or externally resourced) devoted to research allows comparison across parts of UWE and over time of the input of time to research as a share of total time demands. It is likely to be revealing when this metric is compared alongside other metrics – especially output/outcomes metrics. It is also important, when judging the appropriate level of internal investment, to be able to distinguish between internally and externally resourced research time – hence this metric being paired with the process metric below – “Proportion of WLM academic staff time devoted to research supported by internal investment”.
Measuring	BI to draw upon WLM to provide (data for) this metric.
Notes	The <i>proportion</i> measured by the metric is based on bundles within the WLM and does not therefore account for personal research and scholarship time.

<b>8 Proportion of WLM academic staff time devoted to research supported by internal investment</b>	
Recipe	Total bundles in the WLM across all academic staff (excluding Senior Managers, ALs, TSU appointments and visiting staff) that are identified for research where the time is attributed to <i>internally</i> funded research (including QR funding) divided by the total bundles for these staff as recorded in the WLM. Measured at 31 July.
Rationale	The share of time (whether internally or externally resourced) devoted to research allows comparison across parts of UWE and over time of the input of time to research as a share of total time demands. It is likely to be revealing when this metric is compared alongside other metrics – especially output/outcomes metrics. It is also important, when judging the appropriate level of internal investment, to be able to distinguish between internally and externally resourced research time – hence this metric being paired with the process metric above - “Proportion of WLM academic staff time devoted to research supported by external funding”.
Measuring	BI to draw upon WLM to provide (data for) this metric.
Notes	The <i>proportion</i> measured by the metric is based on bundles within the WLM and does not therefore account for personal research and scholarship time. Internally funded time for research includes that for Centre Directors (identified in TRAC as ‘Support for Research’).

<b>9 Proportion of academic staff (not including those on research contracts) with 110 bundles or greater allocated to research</b>	
Recipe	Number of academic staff (not including those on research contracts and not including ALs and TSU appointments) who have 110 bundles or more (excluding allocations of 110 bundles to professors, 55 bundles to associate professors and allocations for centre director roles) allocated to research divided by the total number of academic staff (not including those on research contracts and not including ALs and TSU appointments). Able to be measured at any point in time but default is to measure at year end (31 July) when supporting data likely to be most accurate.
Rationale	110 bundles taken to reflect a threshold of recognised annual time (internally and/or externally funded) devoted to research (above personal research and scholarship and allocations for research leadership) above which staff are capable of being ' <i>research intensive</i> ' within their workload and producing significant contributions to knowledge. Based on number of staff not number of FTE staff.
Measuring	BI to draw upon WLM to provide (data for) this metric.
Notes	Recipe currently assumes that staff who are on fractional contracts should not have the threshold reduced pro-rata in calculation of the metric's value.

<b>10 External research income per FTE academic staff member</b>	
Recipe	The total amount of external income for research within the period (i.e. funding spent) divided by the total FTE number of academic staff (excluding ALs, TSU appointments and visiting staff) in post at the end of the period. Default period covered by metric is the academic year (1 August to 31 July).
Rationale	Funding awarded in a given period is not the same as income (i.e. funding spent in a given period). A large grant award reflecting funding secured in one year may be spread over several years in terms of when it is spent and thus 'nourishing' the research environment. This metric gives an indication of the level of externally supported research activity that is taking place in the period. In some cases it could have distortions from large capital expenditure items included in projects. The metric is likely to be less volatile than the input metric "External research funding secured per FTE academic staff member". It is also what REF, HESA and HEBCIS measure.
Measuring	Finance to provide (data for) this metric. It could also be addressed through the annual returns to HESA from finance. There may be challenges concerning having timely and accurate end-of-year data from which to produce the metric.
Notes	-

<b>11 Proportion of lecturing contract staff with 'Project Manager' designation on externally funded projects</b>	
Recipe	The number of lecturing contract staff (excluding ALs) holding a designation of 'Project Manager' for any externally funded project (whether research, teaching or other) that was live during the period divided by the total number of lecturing contract staff (excluding ALs) as measured at the end of the period. Default period covered by metric is the academic year (1 August to 31 July).
Rationale	It is noted that more than one member of staff may be significantly involved in the management and running of a particular project. However, being project manager is a recognition of formal responsibility and leadership of externally funded work (including matters of research governance). This metric gives a sense of how distributed such leadership is across a given body of staff. If compared with other metrics it can also highlight a distinction between distribution of leadership and total activity in terms of externally funded projects that need to be led. Research contract staff are excluded from this metric on the assumption that they are actively involved by definition at some level in supporting externally funded research. Their exclusion is not to imply that instances of their being in project management roles are not considered important by UWE.
Measuring	RBI to provide (data for) this metric with support from HR. The PASS system should be able to identify a list of project managers for projects active within the period and this can then be considered alongside a list from HR of all lecturing contract staff as at the end of the period.
Notes	Some staff may be counted even if they are involved in very modest projects of a few hundred pounds or where projects are essentially being led by other organisations. Nevertheless in such instances the responsibilities of project management on UWE's behalf still apply. As currently stated, the recipe includes all externally funded projects whether designated as research, teaching or other. It is assumed that the majority of instances will relate to 'research' but that the wider extent of project management engagement should be accounted for as well.

<b>12 Ratio of PGR (PhD, DPhil, Prof Doc) completions to total PGR FTE student population</b>	
Recipe	The number of successfully completed PGR students as recorded by RDAB divided by the total number of FTE registered students at the end of the period (1 August to 31 July). Measured at 31 July. The ratio should be preserved rather than simplified so that actual number of completions and total PGR population can be seen.
Rationale	This ratio gives a proxy measure of rate of successful completion. It also enables PGR population size to be tracked as well as absolute number of completions over time. This may inform concerns about the size and distribution of the PGR population across UWE.
Measuring	Graduate School to provide (data for) this metric.
Notes	The component parts of the metric may be more useful than the ratio itself because of different rates of change of completions and population affecting the ratio. A part-time PGR student is assumed to contribute 0.5 FTE. Farscope PGR students are assumed to contribute 0.5 FTE to reflect their joint registration with Bristol University. Prof Doc Counselling Psychology students are excluded from this metric.



<b>13 PGR (PhD, DPhil, Prof Doc) completions per FTE academic staff member</b>	
Recipe	The number of successfully completed PGR students as recorded by RDAB divided by the total FTE number of academic staff (excluding ALs, TSU appointments and visiting staff) in post at the end of the period. Default period covered by metric is the academic year (1 August to 31 July). Measured at 31 July.
Rationale	This metric relates to the input metric "Proportion of academic staff involved in PGR supervisory teams". It cannot necessarily reflect the true capability of the research environment for a given denominator to successfully train and develop doctoral researchers because the number of doctoral students may be less than desired. However, it can be seen as a proxy for intensity of doctoral research success associated with a research environment.
Measuring	Graduate School with support from HR to provide (data for) this metric.
Notes	-

<b>14 Published quality outputs logged in UWE Research Repository (with ISBN/ISSN/DOI) per FTE academic staff member</b>	
Recipe	The number of outputs with publication dates within the period which have been logged in the UWE Research Repository and which have an ISBN/ISSN/DOI divided by the total FTE number of academic staff (excluding ALs, TSU appointments and visiting staff) in post at the end of the period. Default period covered by metric is the academic year (1 August to 31 July).
Rationale	This offers a proxy for the level of contribution to knowledge proportionate to the size of the staff body concerned. Change over time can be a signal of the extent to which we are strengthening our volume of quality research achievement. Publication provides at least a baseline measure of quality – it is recognised that more refined indications of quality are dependent on effective peer review but that outside of the REF process it is not possible to produce robust assessments of quality.
Measuring	Library Research Repository team to provide (data for) this metric with support from RBI. Quality is subjective and this metric is concerned with identifying substantive research outputs as distinct from outputs such as press articles, working papers or (unpublished) opinion pieces. An output that has been assigned an ISBN/ISSN/DOI is taken to reflect this. Challenges remain in relation to outputs that are artefacts or performances where this convention may not apply. It is not possible at this stage for this metric to address these. Some outputs will be logged in the Repository in advance of their publication date. This is not a problem. Others will be logged later in the Repository than their publication date and this may mean they are not captured in the period of interest. Staff should be encouraged to promptly log outputs (and this should now be the norm in light of future REF requirements concerning open access).
Notes	<p>Where the month of publication is unavailable, outputs to be attributed to the relevant academic years based on their year of publication (e.g. publication year 2014 attributed to academic year 2013/14, publication year 2015 attributed to academic year 2014/15). This is because the exact publication date is not always available from the Research Repository.</p> <p>Co-authored outputs to be attributed to each relevant denominator with the exception of co-authors from the same denominator, in which case the output is only attributed once.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that a small number of outputs may be associated with ALs, TSU appointments and visiting staff. It is assumed that all journal articles, books and book chapters would be counted as 'quality outputs'. Substantive reports for external clients may not have an ISBN/ISSN/DOI and would therefore not be counted. DOIs for conference items have to be recorded in the publisher's URL field on the Research Repository to be counted as 'quality outputs'. It is therefore important to acknowledge the proxy nature of this metric.</p>

<b>15 Proportion of academic staff named as (co-)author on at least one published quality output logged in UWE Research Repository</b>	
Recipe	The number of academic staff (excluding ALs, TSU appointments and visiting staff) named on an output with a publication date within the period which has been logged in the UWE Research Repository and which has an ISBN/ISSN/DOI divided by the total number of academic staff (excluding ALs, TSU appointments and visiting staff) in post at the end of the period (1 August to 31 July). Measured at 31 July.
Rationale	This metric is about extent of engagement across our academic staff base in making a contribution to knowledge. If more staff are contributing to knowledge then this shows a developing research culture within which we are likely to see greater amounts of research-informed teaching.
Measuring	Library Research Repository team to provide (data for) this metric with support from RBI and HR. This would involve a list of academic staff from HR then being examined by the Repository team/RBI to identify those in the list who have appeared on the Repository in one or more new entries with publication dates within the period.
Notes	Where the month of publication is unavailable, outputs to be attributed to the relevant academic years based on their year of publication (e.g. publication year 2014 attributed to academic year 2013/14, publication year 2015 attributed to academic year 2014/15). This is because the exact publication date is not always available from the Research Repository. See the metric “Published quality outputs logged in UWE Research Repository (with ISBN/ISSN/DOI) per FTE academic staff member” for further commentary concerning output ‘quality’.