Excellence in Research for Australia 2015 Update
Introduction

There have been several changes to the Submission Guidelines for ERA 2015. However, the **ERA objectives are unchanged:**

1. Establish an evaluation framework that gives government, industry, business and the wider community assurance of the excellence of research conducted in Australian higher education institutions
2. Provide a national stocktake of discipline level areas of research strength and areas where there is opportunity for development in Australian higher education institutions
3. Identify excellence across the full spectrum of research performance
4. Identify emerging research areas and opportunities for further development and
5. Allow for comparisons of research in Australia, nationally and internationally, for all discipline areas.
# ERA 2015 Reference Periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data type</th>
<th>Reference period</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research outputs</td>
<td>1 Jan 2008-31 Dec 2013</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research income</td>
<td>1 Jan 2011-31 Dec 2013</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied measures</td>
<td>1 Jan 2011-31 Dec 2013</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem measures</td>
<td>1 Jan 2011-31 Dec 2013</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff census date: 31 March 2014
High Level Changes

- Gender Data
- Open Access
- Submission Stage 0
- Treatment of Revisions, Reprints and Multiple Editions
- Digital Storage of Research Outputs Nominated for Peer Review
- ERA Submission Publisher ID
- ERA Submission Conference ID
- Publication Association for Staff Employed < 0.4 FTE
- New Category of Non-Traditional Research Outputs
- Nomination of Research Outputs for Peer Review
- Peer Review Reporting
Key Documents

The following documents will be released as part of the ERA 2015 reporting:

• ERA Journal List
  o Unlike other years, this will be released after the evaluation, and will include a full list of journals where ERA-eligible publications have been submitted.

• ERA Conference List
  o This will be released after the evaluation, and will include a full list of conferences where ERA-eligible publications have been submitted.
Conference Submission List

Conference Series e.g.
Australian Software Engineering Conference

Conference Proceeding e.g.
Proceedings of the 21st Australian Software Engineering Conference

Conference Publication e.g.
The significance of learning style with respect to achievement, in first year programming students.
Publisher Submission list

- ERA 2012 requirement - each institution chose the name for publishers for books and book chapters
- Large degree of variation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomson Reuters Lawbook Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson LawBook Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson Lawbook Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson Reuters Lawbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson Law Book Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson Lawbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson Reuters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawbook Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawbook Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Reuters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomsom Reuters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Publisher Submission List was constructed by the ERA Team from ERA 2012 data
- ‘Other’ category available
Staff Eligibility Rule for less than 0.4 FTE

For staff who are employed at less than 0.4 FTE to be eligible to be submitted they must have **at least one eligible research output associated** with the submitting institution. If this criteria is met, all their research outputs regardless of affiliation are eligible.

However, the ARC recognises there may be instances where a staff member does not meet the publication association due to significant career interruptions because of personal circumstances. In such circumstances, institutions may write to the ARC to explain why the staff member should be included in the institution’s submission.
Research Report for an External Body

A written research report commissioned or solicited by an external body such as a government department or private company.

The new category was created following a review of ERA 2012. It recognises that for many disciplines, submitting research reports would be better represented in this new category instead of under the subcategory Original Creative Works which was used for ERA 2012.

To be eligible to be submitted, a research report must:

• Meet the definition of research
• Not be eligible to be submitted as a traditional research output and
• Have been made publicly available during the reference period for research outputs.
Research Report for an External Body cont’d

There are the following subcategories for research reports:

- **Public Sector** - A research report that has been undertaken for an Australian, state, territory, local, foreign or international government body or organisation
- **Industry** - A research report that has been undertaken for a company, industry organisation, industry peak body, or an employer/employee association
- **Not-For-Profit** - A research report that has been undertaken for a body or organisation operating in the not-for-profit sector
- **Other**

In general, the following types of outputs will be ineligible:

- Submissions to public inquiries and consultations, including government or parliamentary inquiries
- Policy blogs or online commentaries/articles
- Briefing notes.

Portfolios are eligible for submission for the research report subcategory only for the fields of research in which other NTRO types can be submitted.
Research Report for an External Body cont’d

Research Reports may be submitted for both peer review disciplines and citation disciplines.

For peer review disciplines:
• Research reports will be evaluated in the same manner as other NTROs and will form part of the peer review sample for NTROs.

For citation disciplines:
• Information about the reports will be available to the ERA reviewers as part of the publication profile
• Information will also appear in the volume and activity reporting for the relevant unit of evaluation
• If the institution chooses, reference to research reports can also be made in the relevant explanatory statements
• However, the reports will not form part of the citation analysis for these disciplines.
Nomination of Outputs for ERA Peer Review

In the peer review disciplines, universities are required to provide a 30% sample of the research outputs in the 4 digit unit of evaluation for ERA peer review.

For ERA 2015:
• The sample should be drawn from a representative sample of the eligible researchers within the unit of evaluation
• The sample must include 30% of apportioned outputs (rounded up to the nearest integer) for each of the following output types in the unit of evaluation:
  • Books
  • Book Chapters
  • Journal Articles
  • Conference Papers
  • Non Traditional Research Outputs
• There is no minimum threshold for the 30% sample of research output types. For example, if only one NTRO is submitted within a unit of evaluation, that NTRO must be nominated for peer review.
Peer Review ‘Ratings’

• Peer reviewers do not rate a unit of evaluation against the ERA rating scale – that is the role of the Committee, taking account of all indicators and reviewer reports.

For ERA 2015:

• It will be required that all ERA reviewers in peer review disciplines report on the ‘proportions’ of peer reviewed outputs on a broad scale of ‘quality’ - from ‘lowest’ to ‘highest’ quality
• These quality judgments will be reported to universities with the dashboard for each assessed UoE, together with a discipline average.
Peer Review Reports – Criteria and Quality Distribution

• Peer reviewers develop their reports to the RECs based on two criteria: Approach and Contribution
• The reviewers will assign a percentage (which will sum to 100%) of research outputs, which reviewer judges to be in a particular quality tier. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 1 – Lowest Quality</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
<th>Tier 4 – Highest Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The quality distribution in this scale should align with the responses given for the criteria of Approach and Contribution
Reporting the Peer Review Outcomes

This new report will provide universities with more detail for each peer reviewed unit of evaluation about:

• What the quality profile of the outputs is judged to be by individual reviewers
• How the judgments of all reviewers for this UoE align with judgments for all reviewers more broadly in the discipline

So what will it look like…..?
Example Feedback

% of reviewed output in each Tier by Reviewer and Discipline Average

Tier 1 | Tier 2 | Tier 3 | Tier 4 - Highest Quality

Reviewer1 | Reviewer2 | Reviewer3 | Reviewer4 | Reviewer5 | Reviewer6 | Reviewer7 | Reviewer8 | Reviewer9

Discipline Average
Thank you