Public Consultation for ERA 2015

• The Draft ERA 2015 Submission Documents closed for public consultation on 14 February 2014:
  • *Draft ERA 2015 Submission Guidelines*
  • *Draft ERA-SEER 2015 Business Rules and Verification*
  • *Draft ERA-SEER 2015 Technical Specifications*
  • *Draft ERA 2015 Discipline Matrix*
  • *Draft ERA-SEER 2015 Technology Pack.*

• Consultation on the Draft ERA 2015 Journal and Conference Lists is open until 14 March 2014.

Summary of key proposed changes to ERA 2015

• Reintroducing conference list (no ranking)
• Book publisher list (for data streamlining and collection only)
• New research output type: Research Report for an External Body
• Gender data (not for evaluation)
• Open access repository (not for evaluation)
• Peer review research outputs must be in ERA repository
• Staff eligibility for 0.4 FTE or less (publication association required)
• Conference citation trial (selected FoRs only)
• Peer review dashboard
Journal and Conference Consultation Interface (JACCI)

• Conference and journal list consultation opened in February
• All participants must be registered
• The conference list will be available to all disciplines
• Up to 3 FoR codes can be assigned to each conference name
• **No Rankings!!!**
• Must be academic/scholarly/peer reviewed conferences
Conference 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.

Web: arc.gov.au
Email: era@arc.gov.au
Publisher list

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thomson Reuters Lawbook Co.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>

- Standard publisher name list is currently being constructed by the ERA team from ERA 2012 data
- ERA 2015 - propose to use a list of valid publisher names for the submission of books and book chapters
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.

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 published or made publicly available during the reference period for research outputs.
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:

- be employed as ‘research only’ or ‘teaching and research’
- have at least one eligible research output associated with the submitting institution.
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.

It is proposed for ERA 2015 to:

• require that all ERA reviewers in peer review disciplines to report on the ‘proportions’ peer reviewed outputs broad scale ‘quality’ rating from ‘lowest’ to ‘highest’ quality and
• report these quality judgments to universities with the dashboard for each assessed UoE, together with a discipline average.
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

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