

Joyce Olivier

From: Bettie de Beer
Sent: 12 February 2018 17:47
Subject: Screening requirements for Rating Applications: 2018



GMSA Communique

Screening requirements for rating applications: Closing date 28 Feb 2018

Dear Designated Authority (DA)

In line with the re-defined mandate of Reviews and Evaluation (RE) GMSA will this year be responsible for the technical **screening** of 2018 rating applications.

When submitting a rating application, both the applicant and DA **declare** that the following have been addressed:

1. **Eligibility** criteria (of special importance are "permanently appointed vs contract appointments", and in terms of application type "special re-evaluations")
2. (Correctness) of compulsory **attachments** (i.e. the self-selected "Best (Five) Research Outputs in the Last 8 years)
3. Correctness of **content** of application (i.e. even if someone else has captured the data, the applicant declares that he/she had reviewed it, and takes personal responsibility for it) and
4. Institutional **pre-screening** to ensure that the above have been verified and that the necessary **supportive information** required (e.g. motivations for eligibility and application types) have been provided.

In RE's experience, the following sections in the application need **special attention** when pre-screening of rating applications is done by DAs:

Note: reference to numbered documents (see legend at the bottom of the document) refer to the following NRF Web-link where they can be found <http://www.nrf.ac.za/rating>

1. **Eligibility (appointment type and application type)**

- a) **Contract employees (primary position)** (see Documents 7 and 8): Ensure correctness (including an **end date**) of section in application form entitled "**Career Profile**" w.r.t. the following instruction (Document 17) : "*The **current contract** must still be **valid** at the closing date of the call and institutions need to motivate the **institutional benefits** in terms of capacity building and/or student postgraduate training as well as the **institutional commitment** in terms of future support to enable the applicant to retain his/her association. They must provide some commitment that the association will **still be in place two years after the rating becomes valid**. Applications from researchers in these categories will be screened for validity of the claims before being processed according to the NRF Evaluation and Rating Eligibility Criteria) which must correspond with your selected eligibility type under the 'Application Information' screen (e.g. Permanent/fulltime, Contract (other) etc.). Note: Should you hold more than one current contract position then additional information in the section "Application Information" will need to be completed."*
- b) Check that a **suitable** motivation has been provided for **Special Re-evaluations** (if applicable)

Please note that “Supported” is **not** a credible motivation. DAs need to address the **criteria** (institutional benefits/post-graduate student training/commitment to retain institutional association in future (contract appointees) and reason why current rating is no longer in sync with the standing of the applicant (special re-evaluations)). Applications will **not be processed** if inadequate information to judge the validity of the claims is provided.

2. Research Specialisations:

See Document 11, section entitled “Research Expertise”. This information forms a key source of information for the Specialist Committee to i) decide on the appropriateness of the primary panel, and ii) find peer reviewers (see Document 14). DAs should check whether the information provided in this section is comprehensive enough to guide the Specialist Committees.

3. Institutional recommended rating for Y category and P nominations:

Rating	Age requirements (as at closing date, 28 Feb 2018)	Year PhD obtained
P-rating	Up to 36 years of age is the norm	2012
Y-rating	40 years (or younger)	2012

(see Document 9 for more information)

4. Referencing style

See Document 11. The **Harvard Method** of referencing should be used, e.g. Langa, A.A., Singh A.B. and Botha A.C.

5. Attachments:

Check whether the self-selected Best (Five) Research Outputs in the Last 8 Years (including those sent via Filesend when outputs are larger than 4MB) **embedded** in the application are:

- (i) **Appropriate** (see Document 11 for research output types judged to be of importance in the different fields);
- (ii) **Can be opened** (PDF is the most appropriate format; some applicants send/attach a URL that refers to a publisher’s website with a request to buy the document – this is **not** acceptable);
- (iii) **Correspond** to the information listed in the section Best (Five) Research Outputs in the Last 8 Years in the **application**.

The Instructions Document (17) specifically states: *(Please note: **No other attachments may be added under the attachments section except copies of the five best outputs. If the title of the research outputs and the uploaded outputs do not correspond, your application will be rejected.**)*

6. Own Contribution – multiple authors

Please check that the applicant’s “own contribution” fields for all research outputs where multiple authors are involved are completed as per the guidelines (Document 11):

- a) Examples have been provided: “conceptualised idea for research, lead author writing up of article and project leader/budget owner”, but these are only examples to **guide** applicants on the type of information they should provide in this section. Reviewers need to have this information as this is an **evaluation of an individual researcher**.
- b) A percentage (%) of the applicant’s contribution can also be included in the **narrative**.
- c) Please do not cut and paste these examples for all your outputs.

We trust that adherence to these few pointers will ensure that applications of good quality will be submitted and limit the number of rejected applications.

Legend:

<http://www.nrf.ac.za/rating>