

#50

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, September 14, 2020 1:53:05 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, September 14, 2020 2:09:33 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:16:28  
**IP Address:** 109.157.1.116

---

## Page 1: Personal Details

**Q1**

Your name

Sam Illingworth

**Q2**

Your organisation (leave blank if not applicable)

University of Western Australia

**Q3**

Are you making this submission on behalf of your organisation?

**This submission reflects my personal views and not those of my organisation****Q4**

Email address

sam.illingworth@uwa.edu.au

**Q5**

What best describes your interest in making a submission?

**I am a researcher at an Australian university****Q6**

Submissions may be made public unless you request otherwise.

**Respondent skipped this question****Q7**

What form of submission do you wish to make?

**Provide my responses through the online survey**

## Page 2: Upload Response

**Q8** Respondent skipped this question

Please upload your submission.

---

Page 3: ERA and/or EI choice

**Q9** I only want to answer questions on EI

Please indicate whether you wish to answer questions on ERA and/or EI.

---

Page 4: ERA Policy /1

**Q10** Respondent skipped this question

To what extent is ERA meeting its objectives to:

---

**Q11** Respondent skipped this question

The ERA objectives are appropriate for meeting the future needs of its stakeholders.

---

Page 5: ERA Policy /2

**Q12** Respondent skipped this question

What impact has ERA had on:

---

**Q13** Respondent skipped this question

How do you, or your organisation use ERA outcomes?

---

**Q14** Respondent skipped this question

ERA outcomes are valuable to you or your organisation.

---

**Q15** Respondent skipped this question

How else could ERA outcomes be used?

---

Page 6: ERA Methodology /1

**Q16** Respondent skipped this question

The current methodology meets the objectives of ERA.

---

**Q17** Respondent skipped this question

What are the strengths and/or weaknesses of the overall ERA methodology?

---

**Q18**

Respondent skipped this question

Does the discipline-specific approach for evaluating research quality (citation analysis or peer review for specific disciplines) continue to enable robust and comparable evaluation across all disciplines?

---

**Q19**

Respondent skipped this question

The citation analysis methodology for evaluating the quality of research is appropriate.

---

**Q20**

Respondent skipped this question

What are the strengths and/or weaknesses of the citation analysis methodology?

---

**Q21**

Respondent skipped this question

Can the citation analysis methodology be modified to improve the evaluation process while still adhering to the ERA Indicator Principles?

---

**Q22**

Respondent skipped this question

The peer review methodology for evaluating the quality of research is appropriate.

---

**Q23**

Respondent skipped this question

What are the strengths and/or weaknesses of the peer review methodology?

---

**Q24**

Respondent skipped this question

Can the peer review methodology be modified to improve the evaluation process while still adhering to the ERA Indicator Principles?

---

Page 7: ERA Methodology /2

**Q25**

Respondent skipped this question

The volume and activity indicators are still relevant to ERA.

---

**Q26**

Respondent skipped this question

The publishing profile indicator is still relevant to ERA.

---

**Q27**

Respondent skipped this question

The research income indicators are still relevant to ERA.

---

**Q28**

Respondent skipped this question

The applied measures are still relevant to ERA.

---

Page 8: ERA Methodology /3

**Q29**

Respondent skipped this question

The five-band ERA rating scale is suitable for assessing research excellence.

---

**Q30**

Respondent skipped this question

Noting that 90% of units of evaluation assessed in ERA 2018 are now at or above world standard, does the rating scale need to be modified to identify research excellence?

---

**Q31**

Respondent skipped this question

The ERA low volume threshold is appropriate.

---

**Q32**

Respondent skipped this question

Are there ways in which the low volume threshold could be modified to improve the evaluation process?

---

**Q33**

Respondent skipped this question

What is the more appropriate method for universities to claim research outputs—staff census date or by-line?

---

**Q34**

Respondent skipped this question

What are the limitations of a census date approach?

---

**Q35**

Respondent skipped this question

Would a by-line approach address these limitations?

---

**Q36**

Respondent skipped this question

What are the limitations of a by-line approach?

---

**Q37**

Respondent skipped this question

ERA adequately captures and evaluates interdisciplinary research.

---

**Q38**

Respondent skipped this question

If you disagreed with the previous statement, how could interdisciplinary research best be accommodated?

---

Page 9: ERA Methodology /4

**Q39**

Respondent skipped this question

My institution would meet ERA low volume threshold in Indigenous studies at:

---

**Q40**

Respondent skipped this question

In ERA, the best approach for evaluating Indigenous Studies is (choose one):

---

**Q41**

Respondent skipped this question

What would be the advantages and/or disadvantages of your preferred approach for evaluating Indigenous studies in ERA?

---

Page 10: ERA Process /1

**Q42**

Respondent skipped this question

ERA should move to an annual collection of data from universities.

---

**Q43**

Respondent skipped this question

What would be the advantages and/or disadvantages of an annual data collection.

---

**Q44**

Respondent skipped this question

In future ERA rounds, should the volume of outputs submitted for each unit of evaluation be published?

---

**Q45**

Respondent skipped this question

In future ERA rounds, research outputs should be published with their assignment to specific disciplines following completion of the round.

---

**Q46**

Respondent skipped this question

What would be the advantages and/or disadvantages of publishing research outputs with their assignment to specific disciplines?

---

**Q47**

Respondent skipped this question

What other data do you think the ARC should publish following an ERA round? (Note - in ERA 2018 metadata included: Research output title, Research output type, reference year, outlet, publisher, ISBN, ERA round, and Institution)

---

Page 11: EI Policy /1

**Q48**

Considering that EI is a new assessment, to what extent is EI meeting its objectives to:

encourage greater collaboration between universities and research end-users, such as industry, by assessing engagement and impact?

Comment:

**A moderate amount**

Whilst the goals are commendable, it is unsure to what extent they are being met, and also what 'good' collaboration looks like.

provide clarity to the Government and the Australian public about how their investments in university research translate into tangible benefits beyond academia?

Comment:

**A moderate amount**

It is not clear how people that are not au fait with academia would have easy access to this information and / or be able to critique this impact.

identify institutional processes and infrastructure that enable research engagement?

Comment:

**A moderate amount**

What is meant be 'research engagement'? This is quite a broad term that would benefit from clearer defintions.

promote greater support for the translation of research impact within institutions for the benefit of Australia beyond academia?

Comment:

**A moderate amount**

This is very beneficial, but how do people outside of academia have access to the EI reports and their development? This is a critical step that is either missing or not properly signposted.

identify the ways in which institutions currently translate research into impact?

Comment:

**A moderate amount**

Again, not sure how this is being effectively communicated outside of higher education institutes.

---

Page 12: EI Policy /2

**Q49**

The EI objectives are appropriate for the future needs of its stakeholders.

**Agree,**

Please explain your answer.:

These objectives are commendable, but more transparency is needed for how they have been developed. Who decided these were needed?

---

**Q50**

What impact has EI had on:

Other sectors outside of academia?

**Very little**

**Q51**

**Respondent skipped this question**

How do you, or your organisation, use EI outcomes?

**Q52**

**Neither agree nor disagree**

The EI outcomes are valuable to you or your organisation.

**Q53**

How else could EI outcomes be used?

As a conversation starter for communities outside of academia to see if these outcomes are what is required to help reconnect with academia.

Page 13: EI Policy /3

**Q54**

The current Engagement definition is appropriate.

**Disagree,**

If you don't agree, what are your suggested amendments to the Engagement definition?:

It needs to be clearer that this mutually beneficial exchange is truly two-way.

**Q55**

**Agree**

The current Impact definition is appropriate.

**Q56**

**Agree**

The current end-user definition is appropriate.

**Q57**

**Respondent skipped this question**

Are there any end-user categories excluded in the current definition of research end-user that you think should be included? Please explain your answer.

**Q58**

**No**

Are there other key terms that need to be formally defined?

Page 14: EI Methodology /1

**Q59****Yes**

Are the two-digit Field of Research codes the most appropriate method to define units of assessment for Engagement and Impact?

**Q60****No**

Are there other ways to classify units of assessment in EI, for example SEO codes?

**Q61****Respondent skipped this question**

Should there be more or fewer units of assessment per university?

**Q62****Strongly disagree**

The EI low-volume threshold should continue to be based on the number of research outputs submitted for ERA.

**Q63**

If you disagree, how should eligibility for assessment in EI be determined?

By the quality of the impact and engagement. Not all impact and engagement should be tied to ERA outputs. Excellent EI can be created independently of ERA research outputs, and the current methodology disadvantages those researchers conducting excellent EI that is not tied to ERA research.

**Q64****Neither agree nor disagree**

The low-volume threshold is set at the appropriate level.

Page 15: EI Methodology /2

**Q65**

Overall, the engagement indicator suite for the assessment of research engagement is suitable.

**Strongly disagree,**

Please explain your answer.:

These are all to do with money. What about the value of engaging with communities? How will this be measured? Engagement and impact exists beyond dollars in the bank. These indicators are fine, but more is needed, especially with regards to qualitative feedback from the communities and end-users that have been positively impacted by the EI.

**Q66****Agree**

The cash support from research end-users using HERDC data is appropriate for the assessment of research engagement.



**Q67****Agree**

The research commercialisation income is appropriate for the assessment of research engagement.

---

**Q68****Yes**

Are there additional metrics that would be appropriate across many or all disciplines?

---

**Q69****No**

Are there alternative metrics that would be appropriate across many or all disciplines?

---

**Q70**

Should any of the current engagement metrics be redesigned?

**Yes,**

If you answered 'Yes', which ones and how?:  
There needs to be qualitative testimonies from those communities and end-users that have been positively benefited. Also projects that make a significant impact to policy at the local / state / national level should also be ranked highly and there should be a methodology through which this can be captured.

---

**Q71**

The co-supervision of HDR students should be made an engagement indicator in future rounds of EI.

**Strongly disagree,**

Please explain your answer.:  
This is ERA related.

---

**Q72**

In your opinion, are any of the ERA applied measures appropriate indicators of research engagement in EI?

Patents

**Yes**

Research commercialisation income

**No**

Registered designs

**Yes**

Plant breeder's rights

**Yes**

NHMRC endorsed guidelines

**Yes**


---

Page 16: EI Methodology /3

**Q73**

The narrative approach is suitable for describing and assessing research engagement with end-users.

**Disagree,**

Please explain your answer.:  
It doesn't rank as highly as the metrics. How will this be rated? This is very unclear at the moment.

---

**Q74****Respondent skipped this question**

If you disagree with the narrative approach, what alternative approach could be used to replace the narrative? If you are suggesting indicators, please be specific.

**Q75****Disagree,**

One engagement submission per broad discipline is sufficient for capturing the research engagement within that discipline.

Please explain your answer.:

Many EI are complex and have multiple narratives.

**Q76****Agree**

The engagement narrative needs to be longer.

**Q77****Agree**

Additional evidence is needed within the narrative.

Page 17: EI Methodology /4

**Q78****Disagree**

The narrative approach is suitable for describing and assessing Impact.

**Q79****Respondent skipped this question**

If you disagree with the narrative approach, what alternative approach could be used to replace the narrative? Please explain your answer. If you are suggesting indicators, please be specific.

**Q80****Disagree**

One impact study per broad discipline is sufficient for capturing the research impact within that discipline.

**Q81****Agree**

The impact narrative needs to be longer.

**Q82****Agree**

There is need for additional evidence to be provided within the impact narrative.

**Q83****No**

In your opinion, are there quantitative indicators that could be used to measure the impact of research outside of academia?

**Q84****Respondent skipped this question**

If you answered 'yes' to the previous question, please name and describe the quantitative indicator/s, and the disciplines for which they are relevant.

---

Page 18: EI Methodology /5

**Q85****Disagree**

The narrative approach is suitable for describing and assessing approach to impact.

**Q86****Respondent skipped this question**

If you disagree with the narrative approach, what alternative approach could be used to replace the narrative? Please explain your answer. If you are suggesting indicators, please be specific.

**Q87****Disagree**

One approach to impact narrative per broad discipline is sufficient for capturing the activities within that discipline.

**Q88****Agree**

The approach to impact narrative needs to be longer.

**Q89****Agree**

There is a need for additional evidence to be provided.

**Q90****Yes**

Would there be benefit in combining engagement and approach to impact?

---

Page 19: EI Methodology /6

**Q91****Agree**

The engagement rating scale is suitable for assessing research engagement.

**Q92****Agree**

The descriptors for the engagement rating scale are suitable.

---

**Q93****Agree**

The impact rating scale is suitable for assessing impact.

---

**Q94****Agree**

The descriptors for the impact rating scale are suitable.

---

**Q95****Agree**

The approach to impact rating scale is suitable for assessing approach to impact.

---

**Q96****Agree**

The descriptions for the approach to impact rating scale are suitable.

---

---

Page 20: EI Methodology /7

**Q97****Yes**

Should EI continue to include an interdisciplinary impact study in addition to the two-digit Field of Research impact studies?

---

**Q98****Yes**

Should the EI low volume threshold be applied to the unit of assessment for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander research in EI 2024 with the option to opt in if threshold is not met?

---

**Q99****Yes**

Should the unit of assessment for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander research include engagement in the next round of EI?

---

---

Page 21: Overarching Issues Common to ERA and EI

**Q100****Respondent skipped this question**

How often should ERA occur?

---

**Q101**

Respondent skipped this question

What impact would a longer assessment cycle (i.e. greater than three years) have on the value of ERA results, particularly in the intervening years?

---

Page 22: Overarching Issues Common to ERA and EI

**Q102**

Every five years

How often should the EI assessment occur?

---

**Q103**

Respondent skipped this question

What impact would a longer assessment cycle (i.e. greater than three years) have on the value of EI results, particularly in the intervening years?

---

Page 23: Overarching Issues Common to both ERA and EI

**Q104**

Strongly agree

ERA and EI should be combined into the one assessment.

---

**Q105**

Respondent skipped this question

What would be the advantages and/or disadvantages of ERA and EI being combined into the one assessment.

---

**Q106**

No

Are there other ways to streamline the processes to reduce the cost to universities of participating in ERA and EI?

---

Page 24: Overarching Issues Common to Both ERA and EI

**Q107**

Respondent skipped this question

In your view, what data sources could ERA utilise?

---

**Q108**

Respondent skipped this question

In your view, what are the most time consuming elements of the ERA submission?

---

**Q109**

Respondent skipped this question

Are there efficiencies that could be introduced?

---

Page 25: Overarching Issues Common to Both ERA and EI

<b>Q110</b>	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
In your view, what are the most time consuming elements of the EI submission?	

---

<b>Q111</b>	<b>No</b>
Are there efficiencies that could be introduced?	

---

---

Page 26: Overarching Issues Common to Both ERA and EI

<b>Q112</b>	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
ORCID iDs should be mandatory for ERA.	

---

<b>Q113</b>	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
What are the advantages and/or disadvantages of mandatory ORCID iDs?	

---

<b>Q114</b>	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
The automatic harvesting of output data using ORCID iDs would streamline a university's submission process.	

---

<b>Q115</b>	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
What are the advantages and/or disadvantages of automatic harvesting of output data using ORCID iDs?	

---

<b>Q116</b>	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
DOIs should be mandatory for ERA.	

---

<b>Q117</b>	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
What are the advantages and/or disadvantages of mandatory DOIs?	

---

---

Page 27: Overarching Issues Common to Both ERA and EI

<b>Q118</b>	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
Are there other ways to collect data to reduce the cost and burden to universities of participating in ERA and EI whilst maintaining the robustness of the ERA and EI process?	

---

<b>Q119</b>	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
What are the advantages and/or disadvantages?	

---

Page 28: Additional Comments

**Q120**

Respondent skipped this question

Please provide any additional comments:

---