

Personal Research Plan (PRP) 2018

This document is intended for your own planning, School research planning and ultimately the University's research planning and REF preparation. Unlike appraisal documentation, it will be shared with relevant staff, including the head of your research group, Heads of Department, the DRaKE and the Head of School. As part of your meeting, review and discuss your research profile, progress against previous PRP and the current PRP.

Name:	
Job Title:	
Appraiser:	
Date of meeting:	

Research Profile

Please attach the "Research Profile" from Sussex Direct for reference on activity to date.

*Additions and amendments to the research profile (**do not include publications here but enter them on SRO**):*

Research Statement

Please summarise your research in 144 characters max.

Publications

Publications under review

Publications in preparation

Publications planned, long term publication strategy

--

Please list all **additional eligible** publications for REF 2020, i.e. publications that we do not yet have on our lists or that do not have 100-word significance statements.

(REF eligible: published after 31-12-2013 and fulfilling open access criteria)

Full reference	Open access (gold/green/none [†])	Full text deposit in time (yes/no [†])	Citations in Scopus	Citations in Google Scholar
100 word significance statement.				
James Author and Alan Example, How to record a REF eligible paper, <i>Journal of Examples</i> 3:1-10 (2015).	Gold	Yes	4	10
100-word statement on significance (use the star guidance below to relate to, concentrate on evidence-based additional information on significance)				

REF star rating guidance:

From the general guidance:

The criteria for assessing the quality of outputs were ‘originality, significance and rigour’.

- Four star Quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour
- Three star Quality that is internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour but which falls short of the highest standards of excellence.
- Two star Quality that is recognised internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.
- One star Quality that is recognised nationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.
- Unclassified Quality that falls below the standard of nationally recognised work. Or work which does not meet the published definition of research for the purposes of this assessment.

Originality will be understood as the extent to which the output introduces a new way of

* if not open access, has an exception been recorded and the reasons documented? What were the reasons? See [Study Direct](#) and [YouTube](#) for requirements

† if not deposited, has an exception been recorded and the reasons documented? What were the reasons? See [Study Direct](#) and [YouTube](#) for requirements

thinking about a subject, or is distinctive or transformative compared with previous work in an academic field.

Significance will be understood as the extent to which the work has exerted, or is likely to exert, an influence on an academic field or practical applications.

Rigour will be understood as the extent to which the purpose of the work is clearly articulated, an appropriate methodology for the research area has been adopted, and compelling evidence presented to show that the purpose has been achieved.

From Panel B guidance:

1. In assessing work as being **four star** (quality that is world leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour), sub-panels will expect to see evidence of, or potential for, some of the following types of characteristics:

- agenda-setting
- research that is leading or at the forefront of the research area
- great novelty in developing new thinking, new techniques or novel results
- major influence on a research theme or field
- developing new paradigms or fundamental new concepts for research
- major changes in policy or practice
- major influence on processes, production and management
- major influence on user engagement.

2. In assessing work as being **three star** (quality that is internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour but which falls short of the highest standards of excellence), sub-panels will expect to see evidence of, or potential for, some of the following types of characteristics:

- makes important contributions to the field at an international standard
- contributes important knowledge, ideas and techniques which are likely to have a lasting influence, but are not necessarily leading to fundamental new concepts
- significant changes to policies or practices
- significant influence on processes, production and management
- significant influence on user engagement.

3. In assessing work as being **two star** (quality that is recognised internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour), sub-panels will expect to see evidence of, or potential for, some of the following types of characteristics:

- provides useful knowledge and influences the field
- involves incremental advances, which might include new knowledge which conforms with existing ideas and paradigms, or model calculations using established techniques or approaches
- influence on policy or practice
- influence on processes, production and management
- influence on user engagement.

4. In assessing work as being **one star** (quality that is recognised nationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour), sub-panels will expect to see evidence of, or potential for, some of the following types of characteristics:

- useful but unlikely to have more than a minor influence in the field
- minor influence on policy or practice

- minor influence on processes, production and management
- minor influence on user engagement.

5. Research will be graded as '**unclassified**' if it falls below the quality levels described above or does not meet the definition of research used for the REF.

Research Funding

All faculty members are expected to achieve the following level of **external grant win per annum**:

- Lecturer: >100K
- Senior Lecturer: >150K
- Reader: > 200K
- Professor: > 300K

Research grant applications in preparation or firmly planned (indicate deadlines/ planned time of submission)

Annual plans for research grant applications/ research funding

Please make your plans SMART, i.e.:

Specific – states exactly what is to achieve

Measurable – includes a quality or quantity measure

Agreed – by the appraiser and the appraisee

Realistic – can be challenging but must be achievable

Timebound – with a clear end date or timescale

Please also provide as much as possible regarding target funding body, funding call etc.

Impact

(HEFCE definition of IMPACT: "... impact is defined as an effect on, change or benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life, beyond academia".) More information about Impact is available at <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/staff/research/impact/toolkit>

Who are the stakeholders/beneficiaries of your research?

How will they benefit from your research?

What are you doing to enable these benefits?

Professional engagement

Current research related engagements (Funder review panels, proposal review for funders, editorship, conference organisation...)

Planned engagement

PhD students

Please list topics for future PhD projects and plans how to attract top students

Equipment

Please list all equipment purchased for research in the last year

