



## Faculty of Health Sciences

### Research Metrics

#### Background

The Health Sciences Faculty Research Metrics (FRM) will replace the college-wide ABC Research Productive metrics model (2014-2017) which itself replaced the RQM (Research Quality Metrics) model noted to Council on 20/10/2010.

The Health Sciences FRM have been designed and agreed following a detailed and inclusive consultation process undertaken between June 2016 and June 2018. The Dean of the Faculty, Professor Mary McCarron, in partnership with senior decision makers in the Schools of Medicine, Dental Science, Nursing & Midwifery and Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Science oversaw the project. Input was received from Faculty academic staff, assisted by administrative and support staff in consultation with Research Informatics in the Library.

The Health Sciences FRM will generate the Research Productive Report via the Research Support System (RSS). The FRM Report will feed into the Baseline Budgetary Model (BBM) from 2018 onwards.

The ABC model will be used for research productive reporting purposes for 2017/18, with the FRM Report being piloted in the School of Nursing & Midwifery. It is anticipated that after the pilot in 2017/18, the FRM Report will be implemented across the Faculty in 2018/19. The FRM will be reviewed periodically to ensure that they accurately reflect the sophisticated character of Health Sciences' research.

#### Research Productivity Criteria

Research productivity is defined as meeting the following criteria **over a 4-year period**<sup>1</sup>

[scaled pro-rata depending on full-time/part-time contract]:

- Assistant Professors should score minimum of 5 points
- Associate Professors should score minimum of 7 points
- Professor in/Professor of/Research Professors should score minimum of 10 points
- The inclusion of Fellow Emeritus will be decided on a case-by-case basis by the School, with approval by the Dean. Fellow Emeritus will be equivalent to .2 FTE.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Research metrics will generally be calculated over a four-year window. However, this period will be extended in relation to approved HR practices and policies (including for example, carer's, adoptive, maternity and parental leave) and other extenuating circumstance at the discretion of the Dean. HR policy regarding leave: [www.tcd.ie/hr/az/](http://www.tcd.ie/hr/az/)

<sup>2</sup> Either a tick-box will be created in the RSS to denote the type of FTE of a Fellow Emeritus, or an exception will be facilitated in the RSS to be made at the School level to accommodate this requirement.



Scoring is under the following categories:

1. Publications:

Co-authoring international peer-reviewed journal	1 POINT
Co-authoring national peer-reviewed journal	0.5 POINTS
Co-authoring a book chapter	0.5 POINTS
Co-authoring an international report of international significance	1 POINT
Co-authoring a national report in the national significance	0.5 POINTS
Co-authoring a book	5 POINTS
Evidence of Public Patient Engagement (PPI); For example, co-authored by public research stakeholders, including patients, members of the public, public or professional service providers, policy makers, civil and civic society organisations and other external partners.	0.3 POINTS

**Note 1.1:** The expectation is that  $\geq 2$  publications within a 4-year period should be as first or last author. This does not affect the score.

**Note 1.2:** International collaboration is encouraged.

**Note 1.3:** The following may be substituted **once in a 4-year period:**

- a) 1 x clinical trial protocol, named on protocol as co-investigator or sponsor, may count as 1 x research paper.
- b) 3 posters with published meeting abstracts at conferences may count as 1 x research paper (meeting abstracts must have a URL or DOI).
- c) 2 Oral Presentations at conferences may count as 1 x research paper (oral presentations must have a URL or DOI).



**2. Grants:**

For 1 major or 3 minor grants submitted or awarded within a 4-year period, totalling >€100K to applicant as PI or Co-PI.	0.5 POINTS
For each >100K awarded as either as PI or Co-PI.	1 POINT (additional to the 0.5 POINTS)
Named collaborator on grant awarded (major or minor).	0.3 POINTS
Evidence of Public Patient Engagement (PPI) For example - grant proposal awarded (major or minor) is co-created with public research stakeholders including patients, members of the public, public or professional service providers, policy makers, civil and civic society organisations or other external partners.	0.3 POINTS

**Note 2.1:** For the purposes of FRM, major grant is defined as >100K, minor grant is defined as <100K

**3. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY:**

Submission of Patent Corporation Treaty (PCT)	0.5 POINTS
Patent Granted	1 POINTS
Licencing of patent	2 POINTS

**4. RESEARCH SUPERVISION (MAXIMUM 3 POINTS TOTAL):**

PhD student to completion (Primary or co supervisor)	2 POINTS
Research Masters student to completion	0.5 POINTS



**5. NATIONAL & INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION: (MAXIMUM 3 POINTS TOTAL):**

Member of Organising Committee for a national conference	0.5 POINTS
Member of Organising Committee for an international conference	1 POINT
Editorial Board membership of international journal	1 POINT
Editorial Board membership of national journal	0.5 POINTS
Role as Editor in Chief of a journal	2 POINTS
Editor of a book	1 POINT
Invited speaker at national conference	0.5 POINTS
Invited speaker at international conference	1 POINT
Invited reviewer for at least 5x papers for well-respected journals in the discipline	0.5 POINTS
Invited reviewer for 5x grant applications reviewed	0.5 POINTS
National public leadership role	1 POINT

**Note 5.1:** Examples of National Public Leadership Role - Chair of a learned society; membership of International or national working group where involvement results in output such as policy document, consensus document, advisory document, accreditation panel output, forum/discussion group moderator/chair (online or at meeting/group); Invited Member of Scientific Advisory Board for industry or a University or an Editorial Member of journal; Evidence of patient, industrial, regulatory/governmental/professional body/association and/or public involvement is expected as appropriate to discipline.

---

Prof Mary McCarron  
Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences  
Date: 20th September 2018