

PPI Research Procedures

Research policy

1. Our research is based on facts and analysis. This means we avoid giving public opinion on issues for which there is no recognised fact base or analysis.
2. We do not recommend specific policy options, but fairly consider options from a range of perspectives.
3. Our outputs and commentary are politically neutral and independent of any 'lobbying' perspective.
4. We do not criticise any proposal or other organisation but can present facts to put another side to the argument.
5. Our research aims to be of high quality, written in an accessible style and to a publication standard and in the PPI's style. We have communications guidelines which provides detailed guidance on the language, style and format to be followed in our publications. This ensures our outputs have a consistent style and format.
6. The copyright and intellectual property of each output remains with us. The authors of the output are credited in the output but all references to the research should site the author and Pensions Policy Institute as the sources.
7. Where permission is given, contributors to the research are listed, usually in the back of a research output.
8. A Research Plan is drawn up by the Deputy Director in conjunction with the Director and put to the Board at least annually for input and comment.
9. PPI Supporters and Governors are provided with an opportunity to contribute ideas to our research plan.
10. Our research plan is drawn up with a preference for long-term fundamental issues but with flexibility to include smaller or shorter-term issues. The shorter-term issues are chosen to fit with the policy making agenda rather than newsworthy items.
11. Our aim is to have a balanced portfolio of research projects. Some projects may be more fundamental in nature, others may be more relevant to immediate policy considerations.

Research criteria

When considering whether to take on or develop a new research project we consider the following criteria:

1. **Remit:** Does the research question fit within our remit both in terms of topic (later life provision) and nature (can an independent/evidence-based approach be adopted?)
2. **Relevance:** Is the research question relevant to policy makers, our supporters and other stakeholders?
3. **Added Value:** Has anyone else already looked at the research question. If so, what value can we add?
4. **Feasibility:** Do we have the data/capacity in-house needed to undertake the research? If not, can we buy-in capacity or form partnerships? Should we look to build this capacity in-house in the future?

5. **Funding:** What is the likely source of any sponsorship for the research? Are we comfortable with this as a source of funding and understand the possible risks of being associated with any such source?
6. **Risk:** In addition to sources of funding, are there any risks to our reputation from undertaking (or not undertaking) this research?
7. All sponsors of our research must agree that the research will be published, although we will seek to be flexible on the timing of publication.

Research review process

1. Major pieces of research are reviewed by at least 2 people in addition to Senior Management prior to publication. This peer review is an important part of our quality assurance processes. Reviewers would normally comprise at least 2 Trustees. Sometimes Governors or other subject matter experts are also asked to review.
2. When the research is sponsored, the Sponsor(s) is / are given the opportunity to review outputs prior to publication.
3. Reviewers make comments on a draft output in their personal capacity. The author(s) review comments and take these on board where appropriate. Authors maintain editorial right and decision making. There is a disclaimer *The author(s) takes responsibility for any remaining errors and omissions.*
4. Where permission is given, Reviewers are named as giving input in the relevant output.
5. The final editorial decisions are the responsibility of the PPI Director.
6. Concerns relating to any aspect of the research project, for example, if an issue has not been dealt with appropriately in a report, should initially be raised with the lead researcher, or to the Deputy Director if the concern relates to the lead researcher, who will seek to assess and address the issue(s).
7. If a Reviewer or Sponsor feels that there is a significant issue not being dealt with appropriately or they are dissatisfied with any decision, they should raise the issue with the PPI Director. If the matter is not concluded following this discussion, they have the right to appeal to the PPI Chair of Trustees.
8. The PPI project team will inform Reviewers of the expected time commitment and timing of reviews when inviting them to participate. The PPI project lead will inform Reviewers of changes to expected timing and input requirements in good time.
9. Reviewers are asked to respect the confidentiality of PPI research (up to embargo date) and to refer any external enquiries to the Project Lead or the Deputy Director in the Project Lead's absence.

Research policy when working in partnership or when sponsored by another organisation

1. Our research policy and practice remains fundamentally the same when working in partnership with other organisations. Any work which is credited to us must meet the requirements of our research policy and should ideally be consistent with the research policies of all partners.
2. The copyright to all materials produced during the course of the research project (e.g., outputs, presentations) are assigned to the PPI. However, we will acknowledge in writing in all such research outputs the role of the Sponsor in funding the research.

3. Intellectual property rights in the research outputs (and any other materials produced for this project by the PPI) are assigned to the PPI, although the Sponsor for this project is granted a licence to use the materials.
4. All sponsors and other third-parties are given the opportunity to comment on how external work is to be represented in PPI publications through early sharing of drafts.
5. Where sponsors or third-parties have different objectives or different opinions – for example working with a lobbying organisation – alternative methods of presentation (such as separate publications or press notices) should be considered to ensure all PPI objectives are met.
6. To clarify the joint-working process, a partnership plan will be agreed in advance for each partnership arrangement, covering as a minimum;
 - Ownership of research and copyright / intellectual property rights
 - Work program
 - Sharing of drafts
 - Confidentiality
 - Disclaimers and acknowledgements
 - Publication permissions
 - Press handling and timing of announcements

The dissemination of PPI research

1. Management and the Project Lead develops the dissemination plan for each PPI output.
2. We do not provide hard copies of research outputs unless at the request of the Sponsor. The pdf of the research is uploaded on the PPI website and typically circulated to all the contacts on the PPI's database.
3. Partners and sponsors are requested to use links to the PPI website if they wish to publicise the work on their own sites.
4. Senior Management should decide whether there is a need for any accompanying press releases or press briefings and should consider whether selected journalists should receive advance embargoed copies of the research.
5. Governors / trustees may or may not agree with the substance of each output but are asked to avoid criticising the PPI itself publicly. If Governors are disappointed with the quality of the PPI research, or disagree with the approach of the PPI, they are requested to raise the issue with the PPI Director or the PPI Chair of Trustees.