

PBRF Consultation on:

- **Guidelines for tertiary education organisations participating in Quality Evaluation 2026**
- **Guidelines for the Quality Evaluation 2026 assessment process**
- **Draft Audit Methodology for the Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF) Quality Evaluation 2026**

Due: Friday 22 September

Link to survey: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/9HBB32>

Questions 1-5 pertain to demographic information

Proposed changes to the TEO Guidelines only

Q.6 Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce the use of Australian and New Zealand Standard Research Classification (ANZSRC) codes in the Field of Research in the Evaluation Portfolio (EP)? [see p.58]

TEU Response
<p>In general, TEU supports the change from the inclusion of a free text field to, instead, using the ANZSRC codes in relation to Field of Research information.</p> <p>However, we think the following factors need to be considered:</p> <p>[1] We recommend including the ANZSRC codes as an Appendix (or at least include a hyperlink within the Guidelines to the list of codes)</p> <p>[2] The current proposal allows for “up to four six-digit ANZSRC codes” (p.58) to be selected when identifying one’s Field of Research information. However, there may be cases where a researcher’s field(s) of research exceed four relative to the degree of nuance at the level of the six-digit codes. We recommend either outlining the rationale for limiting the number of codes to four, or refraining from limiting the number of codes a researcher can select.</p> <p>[3] If the number of codes is to remain limited, we recommend also including an ‘other’ free text field to accommodate anomalous fields of research.</p>

Q.7 Do you have any comments on the proposal to add an EP Language field, allowing participating staff members to indicate if any languages other than English are used in any of the ERE Outputs included in the EP? [see pp.58-59]

TEU Response

TEU supports the proposal to include an EP Language field.

Q.8 Do you have any comments on the proposal to update the description of “Software” as a Research Output type? [\[see pp.145-146\]](#)

TEU Response
<p>It is not clear why “databases of references or material for supporting research programmes of individual researchers” have been excluded from the description of “software.”</p> <p>We recommend clarification is provided relative to [1] whether these types of databases/material are included in a different ‘research output type’ and [2] the distinction is between these databases and “curated databases.”</p>

TEO Guidelines – general questions

Q.9 Do you have any comments related to the presentation of the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework (pp.32-35) in the TEO Guidelines?

TEU Response
<p>See our response to Q.13.</p>

Q.10 Do you have any comments related to the presentation of the EP submission options (pp.37-49) in the TEO Guidelines?

TEU Response
<p>See our response to Q.13.</p>

Q.11 Do you have any comments related to the presentation of the new design of Evidence Portfolios (pp.50-59) in the TEO Guidelines?

TEU Response
<p>See our response to Q.13.</p>

Q.12 Do you have any comments related to the presentation of the Examples of Research Excellence (EREs) and Contribution to the Research Environment (CREs) (pp.60-78) in the TEO Guidelines?

TEU Response
See our response to Q.13.

Q.13 Do you have any other comments related to the clarity of changes in the TEO Guidelines reflecting the in-principle decisions that TEC has made?

TEU Response
<p>In general, the presentation of material throughout the Guidelines is dense and convoluted. This takes away from the clear and concise information needed to inform TEOs and submitters of the complex processes and factors involved in the Quality Evaluation.</p> <p>Presenting such material in a more distilled and simple way will also help achieve the aim of improving the PBRF so it is more inclusive.</p>

Assessment Guidelines

Q.14 Do you have any comments regarding the Key Dates timeline presented in the overview sections of both the TEO Guidelines and Assessment Guidelines? [\[see p.10\]](#)

TEU Response
The Key Dates timeline provides a useful overview.

Q.15 Do you have any comments related to the presentation of the stages of the assessment process (pp.40-47) in the Assessment Guidelines?

TEU Response
<p>See our response to Q.13.</p> <p>Also, p.41 states that "A diagram of the assessment process is included at the end of this section." However, there does not appear to be such a diagram. If the diagram on p.9 is the diagram being referred to, then clarification/correction is required on this point.</p>

Q.16 Do you have any other comments related to the clarity of changes in the Assessment Guidelines reflecting the in-principle decisions that TEC has made?

TEU Response
No comment.

TEC Consultation – Audit Methodology

Q.17 Do you have any comments on the draft audit methodology developed with our TEO auditing partner Deloitte?

TEU Response
No comment.