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Objectives of ERA

- Establish an evaluation framework that gives government, industry, business and the wider community assurance of the excellence of research conducted in Australia’s institutions;

- Provide a national stocktake of discipline-level areas of research strength and areas where there is opportunity for development in Australia’s higher education institutions;

- Identify excellence across the full spectrum of research performance;

- Identify emerging research areas and opportunities for further development;

- Allow for comparison of Australia’s research nationally and internationally for all discipline areas.
General ERA Principles

1. Unit of Evaluation is the four-digit ANZSARC Field of Research code (ie. 157 possible Units of Evaluation); evaluation occurs at the two-digit level too

2. Evaluation by Research Evaluation Committees in discipline clusters; Eight Clusters in total

3. There is a minimum level of output to be considered ‘research active’ for evaluation in ERA

4. Evaluations informed by a ‘dashboard’ of discipline-specific indicators

5. Some peer review of outputs accessed through institutional repositories in some Clusters
The ERA Clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Physical, Chemical &amp; Earth Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 2</td>
<td>Humanities and Creative Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 3</td>
<td>Engineering and Environmental Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 4</td>
<td>Social, Behavioural and Economic Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 5</td>
<td>Mathematics, Information and Computing Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 6</td>
<td>Biological and Biotechnological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 7</td>
<td>Biomedical and Clinical Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 8</td>
<td>Public and Allied Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ERA Unit of Evaluation

- The **baseline** - the Discipline in an institution = Four-digit Field of Research Code (ANZSRC) eg., **1903** Journalism and Professional Writing
- The **higher perspective** – the division in an institution = Two-digit Field of Research Code (ANZSRC) eg., **19** Studies in Creative Arts and Writing
- The ERA Unit is **not** the department nor the individual researcher
ERA Process Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics Profile 1</th>
<th>Metrics Profile 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metrics Profile 3</td>
<td>Metrics Profile 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrics Profile 5</td>
<td>Metrics Profile 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer Review (if included)

Note - There are no weightings

Research Evaluation Committee

Final report
A quick history of ERA

- Consultation 2008–2010
- Trial for 2009
- ERA – the future
Consultation – 2008 -2010

• Metrics methodology – expert committees
• Discipline-specific indicators
• Ranked journals and conferences
• Advice from the Research Evaluation Committees and peer reviewers who participated in the trial
• Sector feedback
Why the ERA Trial in 2009?

• Testing the methodologies
• Two clusters were selected for trial
  ➢ PCE - metrics based
  ➢ HCA - combination of metrics and peer review
• Trial RECs formed
  – HCA chaired by Professor Graeme Turner from the University of Queensland (22 members)
  – PCE chaired by Professor Mark von Itzstein from Griffith University (17 members)
Summary of the 2009 Trial Submissions

• **Cluster 1** (Physical, Chemical and Earth Sciences)
  – 39 out of 41 institutions submitted data
  – Just over 40,000 research outputs were submitted

• **Cluster 2** (Humanities and Creative Arts)
  – All 41 institutions submitted data
  – Just over 47,000 research outputs were submitted including 7,000 creative works
Indicators for 2009 Trial

• Volume and Activity
  – Profiles showing research outputs and staffing

• Citation Analysis (PCE)
  – Relative Citation Impact (RCI) against world and Australian institution benchmarks.

• Peer Review (HCA)

• Ranked Journals

• Research Income
  – Broken down into categories and profiled against field average benchmarks using full-time equivalent (FTE) staff numbers

• Applied
  – Patents sealed & Commercialisation income
What was reported from the Trial?

- **Institution reports** (only to each institution):
  - Ratings for each assessable Unit of Evaluation, plus Committee comments
  - Feedback to institutions about their submission, repositories, data integrity etc.

- **National report** on the ARC website
The interpretation of the Rating Scale for the 2009 Trial – HCA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>The Unit of Evaluation profile is characterised by evidence of <strong>outstanding performance</strong> presented by the suite of indicators used for evaluation. The research outputs demonstrate the highest standards of quality and scholarly impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>The Unit of Evaluation profile is characterised by evidence of <strong>excellent performance</strong> presented by the suite of indicators used for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>The Unit of Evaluation profile is characterised by evidence of <strong>above average performance</strong> presented by the suite of indicators used for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>The Unit of Evaluation profile is characterised by evidence of <strong>average performance</strong> presented by the suite of indicators used for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>The Unit of Evaluation profile is characterised by evidence of <strong>below average performance</strong> presented by the suite of indicators used for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Rating Scale for the 2009 Trial

• A rating of 2 was at average performance
• A rating of 3 was above average performance
• There were no bell curves or quotas for ratings for the Trial
• The rating scale has been changed for 2010 – more information on that later
Some general issues from the Trial

- Data integrity and validation
  - No FTE data
  - No information about authors, or partial author lists
  - No Background Statement or incomplete
  - Incomplete Research Statements
  - Duplication of some output data
  - Incorrect EID tagging of outputs

- Does the output really meet the ERA definition of research?

- Repository access and access to non-repository items for peer review
Addressing the issues from the Trial

• ‘Soft close’ for submission to allow time to correct errors in 2010
• Sneak peek – plans for an early SEER Dashboard
• Portfolios – eg non-traditional outputs, with attached research statement
• Apportionment – outputs apportioned by institutions into FoR codes up to 100%
• Peer review – institutions able to nominate preferred FoR in which output is to be reviewed
• Research statements will remain at 250 words
ERA – The future
ERA – What’s ahead?

• Submission Guidelines and Technical Specifications were released in December 2009
• The full list of ranked journals and conferences is out now
• ERA Submissions open 1 June 2010
• Full ERA process commencing in 2010 – all eight clusters evaluated simultaneously
• ARC has to:
  ➢ Work with institutions on repositories
  ➢ Set up eight committees and peer reviewers
  ➢ Do further system development (SEER)
ERA – How do we start?

- Ascertain eligibility of data types eg., outputs, researchers
- Collecting all the data for the one schema
- Tagging of journal articles with EIDs with the service provided by Scopus
- Selecting peer review items for those disciplines that have peer review as an indicator + Repositories
- Preparing research statements
- Making the case – background statements
Data Types

• Traditional Research Outputs
• Non-Traditional Outputs
• Research Staff
• Research Income (Categories)
• Esteem
• Applied
• Supporting information - statements
Low Volume Threshold for HCA

• For disciplines where peer review is used:
  – ERA Trial: was 20 or more outputs
  – ERA commencing in 2010: threshold raised to 30 outputs

• In cases of low volume at the four-digit level, analysis can still occur at the two-digit level if it reaches the threshold.

• Note books weighted 5:1 for threshold calculation, but not weighted for evaluation
How do researchers in journalism prepare for the ERA submission

• Check the integrity of the data you gather on your research outputs
• Work with your research office when considering the FoR apportionment for your outputs
• Consider the best works for peer review – select for the discipline
How do researchers in journalism prepare for the ERA submission

• Consider the best FoR where the peer review item should be evaluated
• Is this really research? The definition in ERA. Examples from the trial
• Consider the research component of the research output carefully, and write a clear case in the research statement to accompany the output in the repository
How do researchers in journalism prepare for the ERA submission

• Consider using the **portfolio model** – combining a range of smaller works.

• A portfolio is a group of individual works submitted separately which together constitute a **single** non-traditional research output.

• An journalism example was included in sample xml files released in December 2009
How do researchers in journalism prepare for the ERA submission

• Write a **good background statement** – it sets the context for the RECs, for discipline specific practices. Use the early “Dashboard” to help inform your case.

• Work towards a **good quality copy** of your peer review item in the repository, or access to multiple copies of your non-repository items. For books that can be scanning the first chapter, but we may ask for the book in its entirety later so be ready
How do researchers in journalism prepare for the ERA submission

• Your Research Office may want to tag your research outputs with an institutional code or a research theme. It is up to the institution to use these tags, they are not mandatory and not used in evaluation.

• Why use the tags? Some examples
# The New Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Unit of Evaluation profile is characterised by evidence of outstanding performance <strong>well above world standard</strong> presented by the suite of indicators used for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Unit of Evaluation profile is characterised by evidence of performance <strong>above world standard</strong> presented by the suite of indicators used for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Unit of Evaluation profile is characterised by evidence of average performance <strong>at world standard</strong> presented by the suite of indicators used for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Unit of Evaluation profile is characterised by evidence of performance <strong>below world standard</strong> presented by the suite of indicators used for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Unit of Evaluation profile is characterised by evidence of performance <strong>well below world standard</strong> presented by the suite of indicators used for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Not assessed due to low volume. The number of research outputs does not meet the volume threshold standard for evaluation in ERA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation – some questions

• What would a REC in HCA assess to arrive at a rating?
• How will FTE and the background statements used?
• How does ERA assess individuals in the evaluations?
• We have no citations so how do we assess world average for my discipline?
Evaluation – some questions

• What does the Dashboard look like?
• How is peer review undertaken?
• How are different disciplines assessed?
• How important are ranked journals and conferences?
• How is esteem indicators used?
• How important are repositories when undertaking peer review?
Peer Review

• Peer review is an example of an indicator used for specific disciplines
• In 2010 peer review is identified as an indicator for HCA, SBE, parts of EE and MIC
• Peer review is one “indicator” on the Dashboard
• Institutions identify 20% of outputs for the peer review pool
• REC Members undertake expert review of the Dashboard including peer review of research outputs.
• Peer Reviewers only evaluate research quality based on peer review outputs, and their reports go back to REC Members
Mythbusting - Ranked Outlets

• Only one of a number of indicators on the “Dashboard”
• Ranked Journals required for development of discipline-specific benchmarks for citation analysis
• Ranked conference essential for IT, Engineering & Built Environment
• Note discipline-specific practices in publishing
Esteem Indicators

• Consultation on esteem was undertaken
• There is a limited list of esteem indicators addressed in Submission Guidelines for the ERA process commencing in 2010
• It is shown as a metric profile – no information on individuals
Repositories

- Peer Review requires access to range of research outputs via Institutional Repositories or non-repository items.
- For Creative Works, you need a Research Statement.
- Portfolios – the sum of creative works, you also need a Research Statement.
- Multiple copies of research outputs if a non-repository item. Also new arrangements for books.
- Trial was very useful to identify key issues and the ARC is working with institutions to improve repository access for 2010.
What’s next for you?

• Help your university prepare data on eligible research outputs, esteem information, research income, applied indicators
• Support the institution’s efforts in the peer review process by helping to select the best research outputs for the discipline
• Consider what should be in research statements to outline the research component of peer review items
• Assist with crafting of 2-digit background statements that provide essential context for the disciplines
Further information?

- www.arc.gov.au/era
- Email: era@arc.gov.au
- Hotline: 02 6287 6755