

#47

INCOMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, September 09, 2020 4:43:55 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, September 10, 2020 7:03:33 PM  
**Time Spent:** Over a day  
**IP Address:** 27.32.249.55

---

## Page 1: Personal Details

## Q1

Your name

Natalie Mast

## Q2

Your organisation (leave blank if not applicable)

N Mast Consulting

## 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

natalie.mast@nmastconsulting.com

## Q5

What best describes your interest in making a submission?

Other, Please describe.:

I am a consultant to the Higher Education Sector

## 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 ERA**

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

---

Page 4: ERA Policy /1

**Q10**

To what extent is ERA meeting its objectives to:

Continue to develop and maintain an evaluation framework that gives government, industry, business and the wider community assurance of the excellence of research conducted in Australian higher education institutions.

Comment:

Provide a national stocktake of discipline level areas of research strength and areas where there is opportunity for development in Australian higher education institutions.

Comment:

Identify excellence across the full spectrum of research performance.

Comment:

**A small amount**

Overall the improvement in ERA results (fields rated 3 and above) since 2010 appears too good to be true. The ability to game submissions has very likely inflated ratings. Also, there is little accounting for the size of research groups: Particularly in some STEM related subjects, a minimum threshold of 50 publications over a six-year period is too small to be able to demonstrate true excellence. Further, by relying on a census date rather than by-line, the ERA does not accurately depict the research actually carried out in an institution or even in the country.

**Not at all**

In relation to peer review fields, the ratings appear in a black box. Having overseen two submissions at UWA (2015 & 2018) while I was able to explain to academics in a bibliometric field of research why I believed they had received a 4 rather than a 5, and suggest what areas to focus on for the 2018 exercise (they followed this advice and received the expected 5), the information provided by the ARC in relation to peer review fields is so limited that I could not explain why a group didn't receive the 5 they expected in 2015, or how to improve for 2018. This issue was exacerbated by the fact that peer reviewers were contacting individuals in the group expressing their shock at the rating. It would be much for useful if a justification of a rating was provided for peer review fields and it was clear what expectations were in relation to gaining a 4 or 5.

**A small amount**

3) As more universities have moved into the 4/5 range, true excellence is overshadowed. There has been a massive increase in global output over the last decade and I am not certain that benchmarking to the RCI is enough of an indicator to denote excellence (benchmarking national income doesn't seem useful in highlighting international excellence either). The lack of accountability in the peer review fields also questions the ability of highlight excellence in those fields.

Identify emerging research areas and opportunities for further development.

Comment:

**A small amount**

In addition to my response to Q2, it's possible that the time lag issue makes it more difficult to determine emerging areas/areas of opportunity. Also, I would argue that most universities are focused with creating the best possible submission. So, during the preparations (possibly more so than when analysing the results), there are discussions on areas of weakness needing to be shored up (get new staff/ remove under-performing staff mostly in relation to the next round); noting which areas are believed to have gained strength and those that aren't as strong as the previous exercise. I am not convinced that there is much of a "let's build strength in new areas" attitude resulting from the ERA specifically.

Allow for comparisons of research in Australia, nationally and internationally, for all discipline areas.

Comment:

**A small amount**

For the bibliometric fields and a number of peer review fields including (computer science, economics, political science, business, education) I can get a much better picture at the FoR and, possibly more usefully, at the Web of Science subject matter level, at an institutional, national and international level using Clarivate Analytics' Incites, than I get from the ERA. While not perfect, the citation data in Incites is rich and varied and I can break it down annually with no effort, so I can see how an institution, or Australia, is tracking. I am also able to quickly identify leading institutions, both in Australia and overseas and create a benchmarking cohort.

**Q11**

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

**Strongly disagree,**

If you disagreed with the above statement, please explain your answer.:

The ERA is a massive exercise that costs universities a great deal of money (extra staff are employed/seconded for over a year just to run the exercise). I note that while the ARC surveyed universities as to the cost (FTE) of the 2015 exercise, the results were never published in full. The lack of transparency over the cost of the exercise is offensive. There are no funds attached to the ERA, so it is a large-scale endeavour with increasingly less return on investment as we aren't really learning anything new with each iteration, other than highlighting possible grade inflation and how well universities are playing the game. Following the 2015 exercise, ARC representatives in the post-exercise roadshow noted that the benefits of the ERA were "reputational". However, having been the victim of an attempted ranking of ERA results by The Australian newspaper, my view was the ERA actually caused UWA harm. While not opposed to the swap in citation providers for the 2018 exercise (as a taxpayer I applaud the fact each exercise tenders for a provider to ensure value for money), and noting the switch for UWA was not arduous, greater clarity should have been provided as to what the switch meant in terms of the breadth of publications added to determine the RCI. At this stage, my view is that the RCI is calculated using too many papers from low-level journals and it is likely that Australia's research performance is over-inflated. Following 2018 ERA I began to fear that in some cases the exercise is actually hindering improvement in some fields. In relation to bibliometric fields, given the profile of the ERA in the higher education sector, I think that when results return a higher than expected (deserved) score, it makes it far more difficult to convince staff in a research field that they are not performing at a high enough standard. How do you push for improvement when a field, which by any other measure is declining, improves in the ERA? I also note that while the ERA has a high profile amongst researchers, outside of the sector (and the ARC), nobody seems to know about it or pay any attention to it, so in terms of external stakeholders, I think the ERA would have to be viewed as a failure. For example, I don't believe it has been a catalyst for business engagement.

**Q12**

What impact has ERA had on:

the Australian university research sector as a whole

Significant costs with little to no return. System gamed as institutions optimise submissions. Not a true reflection of the country's research profile.

individual universities

Significant costs with little to no return. Development of skills in optimisation within research support teams. I wouldn't be surprised if the number of adjunct/hon appointments across Australia has fallen as a proportion of research active staff.

researchers

For those researchers who have to assist with the submission, it's a huge impost. FoR coding can only be partially automated and there is a very heavy load involved in coding papers. The way the ERA has been set up, there is a disincentive to split papers among fields (as citations are apportioned). While I understand the issues with multiple counting, if the exercise were viewed on a field by field basis, there'd be no problem with counting publications more than once. This could lead to a greater degree of automation.

Other?

There have been significant costs for the Commonwealth. I think that a similar level of knowledge could have been obtained using HERDC and HERD data in conjunction with bibliometrics (noting some peer review fields would not be sufficiently covered), without having to involve institutions or requiring a light touch. A positive note: I believe the ERA has led to greater competition and focus among citation providers. As a result, there is a greater coverage of Australian journals in indices and the meta data is then available globally, thereby increasing the reach of Australian data (note I am not sure this expansion was a good thing for the ERA itself). Also, I believe the citation providers are more receptive to ideas put forth by Australian universities in terms of product improvement.

**Q13**

How do you, or your organisation use ERA outcomes?

I'd argue this has changed over time. Nowadays:

The ERA doesn't really provide new information anymore. So, when the results come out, there's a bit of benchmarking, maybe some firefighting if an area has performed poorly (mostly this is clear at the time of submission so there aren't too many surprises).

There is usually a well done to areas that got a 5 or improved, and some internal reporting (some institutions may report summary results in annual reports, noting the ERA only occurs every 3 years).

**Q14****Disagree**

ERA outcomes are valuable to you or your organisation.

---

**Q15**

How else could ERA outcomes be used?

I am assuming this is actually in reference to ERA and not EI.

If the ERA process were improved it could be used to influence funding. I am not really sure what the point of the exercise is at the moment. Institutions don't get much out of it, the results certainly aren't worth the cost.

The Commonwealth could get similar results much faster and more effectively by commissioning a third party to use existing data resources to develop reports without needing a large ERA team.

---

Page 6: ERA Methodology /1

**Q16**

The current methodology meets the objectives of ERA.

**Strongly disagree,**

Please explain your answer.:

I disagree with using a census date rather than an institutional by-line. Research can be imported by the hiring of researchers and hidden by removing researchers from the payroll/adjunct appointments prior to census date. Also, by apportioning citations amongst FoRs, rather than counting all citations in each FoR, the ERA doesn't gain a true profile of the output in each FoR as institutions will optimise their submissions by limiting a publication to only one FoR (except for those publications deemed to exceed the citation requirements, particularly in the 1st and 5th centiles).

---

**Q17**

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

Strengths

**It includes all outputs not a highlighted selection of best works. Also, unlike the REF, collaboration between colleagues in an institution isn't discouraged.**

Weaknesses

**The peer review process is opaque and arbitrary.**

---

**Q18**

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?

No. There is no clarity provided by peer-review panels. Unlike metric based fields, in peer review fields it is impossible to determine why a particular rating was received.

Peer review panels should provide reports justifying their rating.

---

**Q19**

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

**Agree,**

Please explain your answer.:

Citation analysis is quick, relatively reliable and can be standardised.

**Q20**

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

Strengths

**Relatively reliable and transparent (at least compared to peer review process).**

Weaknesses

**Easy to manipulate by moving publications around.  
The breadth of publications used to determine the RCI is probably too wide.**

**Q21**

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

**Yes,**

If you answered 'Yes', please describe how the methodology could be improved.:

22) The ERA should be run using a window of time and limited to publications with an institution's byline. These publications should be determined by the citation provider. FoR distribution should be carried out by the citation provider using journal FoRs, and keywords/abstracts etc for journals with only 2-digit codes assigned by the ARC. Citations should not be apportioned, at least at the four-digit level.

**Q22**

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

**Strongly disagree,**

Please explain your answer.:

This is an expensive, time-consuming exercise which produces unreliable results and offers no path for improvement. Also, the submission is optimised. The 30% selection is not random, it is taken from the top, so unless panels account for the fact that they are viewing the "best" of an institution's offering in a field (and we don't know how the panels actually deliberate), the ratings (noting they are already below the results of metric fields) are inflated.

**Q23**

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

Strengths

**A process for AHSS was developed that took into account different publication processes.**

Weaknesses

**time in preparing submission; lack of faith in results.**



**Q24**

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

**Yes,**

If you answer 'Yes', please describe how the peer review methodology could be improved.:

24) It's a long time since the RQF and early days of the ERA and publication practices have changed (for example there has been a significant decline in peer-reviewed conference papers). Additionally, indexing of AHSS journals has expanded considerably. A number of peer review fields could now be assessed using citation metrics, such as old FoR codes, 08, 13, 14 and 15. If peer review is to continue, a table, similar to the centiles table provided in metrics assessed FoRs, should be provided, showing how the output was rated. A three or five-point scale should be established, and each nominated publication classified, with summary results for each scale provided. The selection of publications for peer-review should be randomised. Institutions should provide a list of all the publications in the field and an algorithm should be run by the ARC to nominate the 30% for peer review. This will prevent the cherry-picking of the "best" publications by institutions.

---

Page 7: ERA Methodology /2

**Q25**

The volume and activity indicators are still relevant to ERA.

**Neither agree nor disagree,**

Please explain your answer.:

Because of the way the data is collected and submitted in SEER the generation of the volume and activity indicator data is not burdensome for institutions. I do take issue with the fact the information isn't publicly available at an institutional level when the ERA results are released. Publicly available data on institutions is limited to a rating for each assessed FoR. The size of the research cohort involved in an FoR, the volume of publications and income used to determine that rating, isn't available, so from a potential collaborator's point of view, all 5s appear of equal value, even if one institution achieved that rating with 50 publications with 3 researchers while another had 250 publications with 12 researchers. From a taxpayer point of view, the data provided to the public isn't "a wealth of information", it's very limited summary data that doesn't allow for informed decision making. From an institutional point of view, the removal of access to SEER (at least in 2015, I am not sure when/if it closed after the 2018 exercise) was a burden requiring screenshots so that data wasn't lost. Also, not being able to extract SEER data easily is a problem.

---

**Q26**

The publishing profile indicator is still relevant to ERA.

**Neither agree nor disagree,**

Please explain your answer.:

I assume the publishing profile is of greater value to the peer review panels. Again, I have issues with this data not being publicly released at an institutional level.

**Q27**

The research income indicators are still relevant to ERA.

**Agree,**

Please explain your answer.:

The research income generated by researchers working in a particular field is of value to the ERA. I do wonder if categories 1 and 4 data should be provided back to researchers with the FoR codes used in the application, rather than allowing institutions to distribute the income among FoRs. I also wonder how influential Cats 2-3 is in the decision-making process, or with the data should be limited to Cats 1-4. One issue with the current income indicators is the fact the inability to deal with negative income creates an unnecessary burden for administrators who often need to manipulate income levels to meet the requirements that the total income in a category per annum is within 5% of the reported HERDC figure. Negative income should be reported. If displaying negative income is a problem for either the panels or the public release, the figure should be rounded by SEER to zero.

**Q28**

The applied measures are still relevant to ERA.

Patents

Comment:

**Disagree**

Applied measures should be part of the EI not ERA exercise.

Research commercialisation income

Comment:

**Disagree**

Applied measures should be part of the EI not ERA exercise.

Registered designs

Comment:

**Disagree**

Applied measures should be part of the EI not ERA exercise.

Plant breeder's rights

Comment:

**Disagree**

Applied measures should be part of the EI not ERA exercise.

NHMRC endorsed guidelines

Comment:

**Disagree**

Applied measures should be part of the EI not ERA exercise.

**Q29**

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

**Disagree,**

Please explain your answer.:

A matrix accounting for the size of a research group and the scale of research output needs to be included.

**Q30**

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?

**Yes,**

If you answered 'Yes', please explain how the rating scale can be modified to identify research excellence.:

There are two basic options here: 1) A scale within a scale, i.e. 5.1 to 5.5 to determine between levels of research excellence. 2) Keep the existing scale but redefining world standard. I think discussions need to be held in regards to whether or not a global benchmark is what measure we want to use to define research excellence. An analysis should be undertaken by a metrics provider exploring the theory that as the global research sector expands there are a lot of papers in low-quality journals generating low levels of citations and bringing down the RCI. If this is the case there are a number of options available that would allow for a more appropriate RCI, for example: 1) Use journal impact factor like scores to exclude low-level journals 2) Create a benchmarking cohort of 15 to 20 countries to determine a "world standard".

**Q31**

The ERA low volume threshold is appropriate.

**Disagree,**

Please explain your answer.:

The threshold volumes, particularly at the 2 digit level is too low. The expectation of only 50 publications over a period of six years is too low to denote research excellence.

**Q32**

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

Yes, thresholds should be tailored to individual FoRs, particularly at the 2-digit level.

**Q33**

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

**By-line,**

Please explain your answer.:

The ERA is supposed to measure research activities carried out in Australian universities over a six-year window. The census date approach allows for the importing of quality research produced at other institutions either in Australia or from overseas. The census date also allows universities with an opportunity to remove under-performing staff so they are not part of a submission. The changes to eligible staff in 2018 also lead to the inclusion of what could be defined as incidental researchers. PhD students simultaneously employed could now be included, even though this was not the original intent of the exercise. Likewise, professional staff included in a publication now need to be counted. The ERA staff data should be limited to those whose employment contract includes an expectation of research.

**Q34**

What are the limitations of a census date approach?

By relying on a census date rather than by-line, the ERA does not accurately depict the research actually carried out in an institution or even in the country.

Using a census date also negatively impacts on the ability to use metrics providers to automatically determine outputs for metrics based fields, thereby removing a significant burden from institutions.

**Q35**

Would a by-line approach address these limitations?

**Yes,**

Please explain your answer.:

Only publications produced at an institution would be counted.

**Q36**

What are the limitations of a by-line approach?

The publications of staff no longer attached to the institution would be counted.

Staff counts for FoRs wouldn't necessarily match the numbers involved in publications.

Investigation of staff numbers reported annually to the Dept of Education and the inclusion of FoRs in that data might be a (relatively) easy fix to this problem.

**Q37**

ERA adequately captures and evaluates interdisciplinary research.

**Strongly disagree,**

Please explain your answer.:

I think it is easier to capture interdisciplinary research in peer-review fields. The apportionment of citations in metrics-based fields discourages splitting FoRs and thus obscures our view of interdisciplinary research.

**Q38**

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

Allow publications in multiple FoRs without apportioning citations.

---

Page 9: ERA Methodology /4

**Q39**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

**Q40**

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

**For Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander studies by combining low volume disciplines into single Units of Evaluation**

---

**Q41**

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

Advantages

**We'd have a view of indigenous studies.**

Disadvantages

**I think publications only tangentially linked to indigenous studies could be included, particularly from the medical sciences.**

---

Page 10: ERA Process /1

**Q42**

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

**Neither agree nor disagree,**

Please explain your answer.:

There are pros and cons to this method. I think an annual collection of data would work if overall the ERA was more automated, particularly for metrics-based fields. If the process were annualised, I also think that existing data collections should be utilised: i.e: Income for Cat 1: FoRs used for applications should be supplied to institutions staff census data provided to the Dept of education should have FoRs assigned to it. There'd need to be a reconciliation prior to submission. For example, when staff select their FoRs they provide information on their disciplines. However, FoRs for publications are attached to journals. It is possible that a researcher identifies as an engineer their output is predominately in physics. In the two exercises I oversaw, we didn't allow self-selected FoRs for researchers. Rather, following the assignment of FoRs to publications, an algorithm was run to assign FoRs according to the profile of a researcher's publications. Perhaps SEER could be used to distribute FoRs to researchers (noting that for researchers with no research produced over the period an additional assignment of FoRs will be required).

**Q43**

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

Advantages

**Spread out the work required for an ERA submission.**

**Q44**

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

**Yes,**

Please explain your answer.:

As noted previously, I believe that clarity needs to be provided in terms of the scale of an institution's research in an FoR. We need to be able to distinguish an FoR rated 5 based on the work of half a dozen researchers from a large scale group of 20 or more researchers also gaining a 5.

**Q45**

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

**Disagree,**

Please explain your answer.:

I don't see the value in this data being released. Just because data is available doesn't mean it is necessarily useful. Most of the metadata is available via other sources. I am not convinced that the general public or industry gain any benefit from this data. The only really interesting thing do discover with the data is to see how different universities are coding the same papers. There are legitimate reasons for choosing one FoR over another, for example, to ensure minimum thresholds are met.

**Q46**

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

Advantages

**Working out the level of collaboration among Australian institutions; figuring out how different institutions code the same paper.**

Disadvantages

**Not sure this is worth the effort required. What's the value?**

**Q47**

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)

I don't understand the value of publishing this data. But as an analyst, I'd like the DOI provided. I'd be interested in finding out 1) how much output without a by-line is submitted by each institution and 2) How much by-lined output is missing from each institution. There's probably a research article in that analysis.

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 small amount**

Due to the retrospective nature of EI, I am not sure how much it has driven new collaborations. The fact that it is so case study driven also means exposure to the exercise is limited. But, I assume some researchers who have been involved are thinking of new projects that they could potentially turn into case studies.

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

Comment:

**A small amount**

Case studies won't provide the Government with anything other than a handful of examples. This exercise doesn't provide a real view of collaboration/ engagement with industry.

Page 12: EI Policy /2

**Q49**

**Respondent skipped this question**

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

**Q50**

Respondent skipped this question

What impact has EI had on:

**Q51**

Respondent skipped this question

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

**Q52**

Respondent skipped this question

The EI outcomes are valuable to you or your organisation.

**Q53**

Respondent skipped this question

How else could EI outcomes be used?

Page 13: EI Policy /3

**Q54**

Respondent skipped this question

The current Engagement definition is appropriate.

**Q55**

Respondent skipped this question

The current Impact definition is appropriate.

**Q56**

Respondent skipped this question

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**

Respondent skipped this question

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

Page 14: EI Methodology /1

**Q59**

Respondent skipped this question

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



**Q60**

Respondent skipped this question

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**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

**Q63**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

**Q64**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

---

Page 15: EI Methodology /2

**Q65**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

**Q66**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

**Q67**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

**Q68**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

**Q69**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

**Q70**

Respondent skipped this question

Should any of the current engagement metrics be redesigned?

---

**Q71**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

**Q72**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

Page 16: EI Methodology /3

**Q73**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

**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**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

**Q76**

Respondent skipped this question

The engagement narrative needs to be longer.

---

**Q77**

Respondent skipped this question

Additional evidence is needed within the narrative.

---

Page 17: EI Methodology /4

**Q78**

Respondent skipped this question

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**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

**Q81**

Respondent skipped this question

The impact narrative needs to be longer.

---

**Q82**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

**Q83**

Respondent skipped this question

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**

Respondent skipped this question

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**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

**Q88**

Respondent skipped this question

The approach to impact narrative needs to be longer.

---

**Q89**

Respondent skipped this question

There is a need for additional evidence to be provided.

---

**Q90**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

Page 19: EI Methodology /6

**Q91**

Respondent skipped this question

The engagement rating scale is suitable for assessing research engagement.

---

**Q92**

Respondent skipped this question

The descriptors for the engagement rating scale are suitable.

---

**Q93**

Respondent skipped this question

The impact rating scale is suitable for assessing impact.

---

**Q94**

Respondent skipped this question

The descriptors for the impact rating scale are suitable.

---

**Q95**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

**Q96**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

Page 20: EI Methodology /7

**Q97**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

**Q98**

Respondent skipped this question

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**

Respondent skipped this question

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**

Respondent skipped this question

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**

Respondent skipped this question

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**

Respondent skipped this question

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

**Q110**

Respondent skipped this question

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

---

**Q111**

Respondent skipped this question

Are there efficiencies that could be introduced?

---

Page 26: Overarching Issues Common to Both ERA and EI

**Q112**

Respondent skipped this question

ORCID iDs should be mandatory for ERA.

---

**Q113**

Respondent skipped this question

What are the advantages and/or disadvantages of mandatory ORCID iDs?

---

**Q114**

Respondent skipped this question

The automatic harvesting of output data using ORCID iDs would streamline a university's submission process.

---

**Q115**

Respondent skipped this question

What are the advantages and/or disadvantages of automatic harvesting of output data using ORCID iDs?

---

**Q116**

Respondent skipped this question

DOIs should be mandatory for ERA.

---

**Q117**

Respondent skipped this question

What are the advantages and/or disadvantages of mandatory DOIs?

---

Page 27: Overarching Issues Common to Both ERA and EI

**Q118**

Respondent skipped this question

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?

---

**Q119**

Respondent skipped this question

What are the advantages and/or disadvantages?

---

Page 28: Additional Comments

**Q120**

Respondent skipped this question

Please provide any additional comments:

---