

#180

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, October 12, 2020 9:48:02 AM
Last Modified: Monday, October 12, 2020 7:09:15 PM
Time Spent: 09:21:12
IP Address: 129.180.80.253

Page 1: Personal Details

Q1

Your name

Incomplete submission University Response Geoffrey Hart

Q2

Your organisation (leave blank if not applicable)

University of New England

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

ghart4@une.edu.au

Q5

I work at an Australian university

What best describes your interest in making a submission?

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Submissions may be made public unless you request otherwise.

Q7

Provide my responses through the online survey

What form of submission do you wish to make?

Page 2: Upload Response

Q8

Respondent skipped this question

Please upload your submission.

Page 3: ERA and/or EI choice

Q9

I want to answer questions on both ERA and EI

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:

Identify emerging research areas and opportunities for further development.

Comment:

A moderate amount

The reliance on a metrics assessment makes the associated disciplines easy for universities to game, and the lack of transparency in the decisions on peer-assessed disciplines makes it impossible to have faith in the processes behind their scores - the lack of development to address these two problems represent a failure to assure Australia of research quality.

A large amount

While this method can provide a broad idea of areas of strength, it also encourages concentration of research outputs into assessed areas, potentially obscuring emergent disciplines. Similarly, as a lagging measure, ERA does not so much report the current state of research, but where research was 3-8 years past, limiting its use for identifying development opportunities.

A large amount

While ERA is broadly useful for this purpose, there is still an implicit bias towards older/more established publishing methods and publishing houses. There is potential that truly excellent research is being missed because it is happening outside of indexed journals.

A small amount

The current method of assessment encourages concentration of research outputs in already assessed disciplines. The inherently lagging nature of the assessment means that ERA is a poor indicator for identifying emerging research. To identify emerging areas, it would perhaps be better to report small clusters of highly cited research in previously unassessed areas.

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

Comment:

A small amount

Without indicators of size of research areas, it is hard to meaningfully compare research through ERA. Similarly, it is of very little use in comparing universities internationally, due to the lack a shared international framework to classify research. External databases such as Scopus and Web of Science are more useful for international comparisons due to the standardised was of treating data across nations. For peer assessed disciplines, it is particularly hard to have confidence in the use of scores for international comparisons (at world standard etc.) because of the lack of transparency on the decision making for allotting ERA scores.

Q11

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

Agree,

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

While the objectives are appropriate, the current approach needs improvement to meet the objectives effectively. Universities have certainly gotten better at reporting their research, whether this translates to improvement in research is much more debatable.

Page 5: ERA Policy /2

Q12

What impact has ERA had on:

the Australian university research sector as a whole

ERA has had a chilling effect on reporting research until there is a critical mass, for fear of a poor ERA rating. This discourages risk and innovation, and encourages the whole sector to focus simply on what has been proven to work.

individual universities

Universities are now incentivised to report their output deceptively for good ERA ratings, and to cut research activity in areas that have underperformed in the past, rather than based on current activity or other forms of merit. This narrows the scope of research potential by forcing universities to focus on certain discrete areas of research that are likely to produce a good rating.

researchers

Researchers now have the burden to perform their research based on alignment with ERA scores and potential to have a positive impact, rather than what following what has the most promise.

Q13

How do you, or your organisation use ERA outcomes?

As a university under restructure, ERA outcomes may potentially be used to prioritise the disestablishment of areas of research and/or teaching in my organisation. ERA performance is now used as a KPI of certain high-level staff. ERA outcomes are also a key piece of my university's marketing.

Q14

ERA outcomes are valuable to you or your organisation.

Agree,

Do you have any suggestions for enhancing ERA's value to you/your organisation?:

More ability to articulate the nuance of research excellence would be helpful. The current model is immediately used by the media to create league tables, which leads to incredibly reductive discourse on which university is better, rather than recognising achievement.

Q15

How else could ERA outcomes be used?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 6: ERA Methodology /1

Q16

The current methodology meets the objectives of ERA.

Neither agree nor disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

The current methodology is creating relatively positive outcomes for citation-assessed disciplines, but appears to be failing peer-assessed disciplines.

Q17

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

Strengths

Relatively comprehensive, citation-assessment methodology puts all institutions on relatively even playing field, UoA size recognises small research groups creating excellent research.

Weaknesses

Prone to gaming, lack of transparency on panels undermines confidence.

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, the peer-review approach appears to be delivering poor results, not in line with the citation disciplines. Citation disciplines largely have improved, while peer-assessed disciplines are stagnating. This implies that the peer-assessment approach is not objective, or the citation assessment is being gamed, both, or that peer-assessed disciplines are simply creating worse research (unlikely).

Q19

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

Disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

Without an indication of whether a citation is positive or negative, it has no bearing on the actual quality. Rather, it is simply an indicator of academic engagement with the piece research.

Q20

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

Strengths

Relatively level playing field across institutions, relatively transparent.

Weaknesses

Easy to game, may perversely reward bad research because it is controversial (thus receiving more citations), fails to recognise good research in monographs and conference papers.

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.:

Perhaps. If a method can be devised to determine whether a citation is positive or negative, it may reveal much more meaningful data on quality.

Q22

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

Agree,

Please explain your answer.:

I do agree that it is appropriate, but the process needs to be completely transparent in order to create faith in the results.

Q23

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

Strengths

Probably the only way to fairly represent disciplines that aren't in the citation-heavy fields of research.

Weaknesses

Opaque process on decision making undermines credibility, larger universities are favoured by their high representation on assessment panels.

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.:

The decision making process needs to be made transparent to create faith in the results.

Q25

The volume and activity indicators are still relevant to ERA.

Agree,

Please explain your answer.:

If ERA remains an assessment of excellence, these indicators are still appropriate unless the definition of excellence has changed.

Q26

The publishing profile indicator is still relevant to ERA.

Agree,

Please explain your answer.:

The publishing profile is useful, but perhaps prejudices the assessment towards the publishing practices that the panels (usually very established researchers) are familiar with. This may be unfairly disadvantage genuinely excellent research in new journals.

Q27

The research income indicators are still relevant to ERA.

Disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

Funding is not so much an indicator of research quality, but rather an indicator of past research funding.

Q28

The applied measures are still relevant to ERA.

Patents

Comment:

Neither agree nor disagree

While patents registered suggest research, they do not indicate quality in any way.

Research commercialisation income

Comment:

Agree

Implicitly, people paying for the outcome of research implies a level of quality.

Registered designs

Comment:

Neither agree nor disagree

While registered designs suggest research, they do not indicate quality in any way.

Plant breeder's rights

Comment:

Neither agree nor disagree

-

NHMRC endorsed guidelines

Comment:

Strongly Agree

NHMRC endorsed guidelines imply that research is of a sufficient quality to be endorsed by a research funding body.

Page 8: ERA Methodology /3

Q29

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

Agree,

Please explain your answer.:

If utilised fairly, the rating scale is appropriate.

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?

No,

If you answered 'Yes', please explain how the rating scale can be modified to identify research excellence.:
Perhaps an indicator of UoE size may be more illustrative of differences. Raising the top rating raises questions of equability for smaller universities.

Q31

The ERA low volume threshold is appropriate.

Strongly agree,

Please explain your answer.:
The current low-volume threshold is appropriate for indicating a sufficient basic quantum of research intensity to demonstrate quality. To raise the threshold creates iniquity for smaller research groups.

Q32

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

A different threshold to represent emergent areas of research may provide opportunity to identify new areas of research that should be supported.

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.:
Census date allows universities to poach high-achieving researchers to boost their ERA ratings, by-line gives a good indicator of where the research actually took place.

Q34

What are the limitations of a census date approach?

Census date allows universities to poach high-achieving researchers to boost their ERA ratings. It is more an indicator of research capacity than the research done at an institution.

Q35

Would a by-line approach address these limitations?

Yes,

Please explain your answer.:
To some extent - it will indicate the research done somewhere, but not the current capacity.

Q36

What are the limitations of a by-line approach?

By-line approach will further push the nature of ERA into the retrospective space, showing where research happened, rather than is happening.

Q37

ERA adequately captures and evaluates interdisciplinary research.

Disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

If excellent research is interdisciplinary, it can be spread across a number of FoRs, but if it is bad, it can easily be concentrated in one FoR to lessen its impact. This leads to a myopic view of the quality of interdisciplinary research.

Q38

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

Perhaps a method of assessing interdisciplinary research that isn't tied to the FoR codes - focusing on the excellence, rather than the artificial coding system we report it in.

Page 9: ERA Methodology /4

Q39

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

Two-digit
Comment:

No

I am not sure - this task would require a level of re-coding research that has not been undertaken.

Four-digit
Comment:

No

I am not sure - this task would require a level of re-coding research that has not been undertaken.

Q40

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

Using established ERA methodology – low volume threshold applied to all broad and specific disciplines for Indigenous Studies

Q41

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

Advantages

By evaluating it in the same way as other disciplines, it treats this research as being as important as other fields, and creates pressure for universities to actually invest in indigenous research.

Disadvantages

This will make the research that does happen less visible than is desirable.

Page 10: ERA Process /1

Q42

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

Strongly agree,

Please explain your answer.:

ERA already lags too far behind the time of the research being created to be meaningful. It needs to be streamlined and annualised, allowing intelligent decisions to be made based on current data.

Q43

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

Advantages

This will introduce agility into the decision making processes around research.

Disadvantages

If not designed well, this could create an unreasonable labour burden, or blind spots in coverage that may unfairly disadvantage some institutions.

Q44

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

Yes,

Please explain your answer.:

This will create a much clearer idea of the intensity of research activity at universities. Transparency is desirable for the public to have faith in research practice and funding.

Q45

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

Agree,

Please explain your answer.:

Transparency is desirable for the public to have faith in research practice and funding.

Q46

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

Advantages

This will expose gaming of the system when it happens.

Disadvantages

This may unfaily expose researchers to scrutiny for research classification desicions that are made to fit the ERA spefications, rather than by the researcher.

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)

Full submitted output information. The public has a right to know the full details of research.

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

I am not aware of any research with end-user as a direct result of EI. The existence of EI encourages researchers to engage with end-users, but not necessarily in a meaningful way. EI encourages us to find what we have done well already, not to do better in future.

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

The non-comprehensive approach to impact naturally means that only a portion of research is even considered. It may be useful for creating 'good-news stories', but does not give anywhere near a comprehensive review of research impacts.

identify institutional processes and infrastructure that enable research engagement?

Comment:

A large amount

This process makes apparent the pain points for enabling engagement.

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

Comment:

A moderate amount

This process encourages those already creating translational research to keep doing what they are, but not much beyond that.

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

Comment:

A moderate amount

The impact case studies make apparent how much data needs to be recorded at every stage of research in order to understand the process, but does little to actually elucidate methods of translation, due to small sample size.

Page 12: EI Policy /2

Q49

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

Agree,

Please explain your answer.:

The objective are appropriate, but the execution does not meaningfully meet the objectives.

Q50

What impact has EI had on:

the Australian university research sector as a whole

Created a sector-wide administrative burden to demonstrate a new expectation of the sector without previously putting into place any mechanisms to support this agenda.

Individual Universities

Created a large central administrative burden without articulating any particular benefit to performing the exercise.

Researchers

EI has created the expectation that researchers should be engaging with and impacting upon the world outside of academia, without stating any kind of pathway to this objective.

Other sectors outside of academia?

As far as I can tell, EI has had nil impact outside of academia.

Q51

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

We do not use them.

Q52

The EI outcomes are valuable to you or your organisation.

Disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

While our EI outcomes are a good talking point for some of our marketing, they are not fundamentally useful.

Q53

How else could EI outcomes be used?

If the government wants to encourage Engagement and Impact, EI needs to be designed with some concrete goal in mind. "EI" is too nebulous, there needs to be a clear outcome. If say, the outcome is a register of universities good at translational research in each FoR and pathways for end-users to engage with them, that needs to be stated first, then the exercise be designed around that goal, rather than the nebulous, meaningless exercise in waffling that EI currently is.

Page 13: EI Policy /3

Q54

Agree

The current Engagement definition is appropriate.

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

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

No,

Please explain your answer.:

Recognising that EI is about measuring effect outside of academia, it would be more appropriate to classify by the industry it is having an effect upon. FoRs for contributing research should also be stated, but the view should be around the effect, then traced back to the research.

Q60

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

Yes,

Please explain your answer.:

SEO, or some other measure of where the engagement/impact takes place is more appropriate than the field of research to understand the effect on end-users.

Q61

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

More units of assessment,

How many, and why?:

For this to be of any kind of use, there needs to be a comprehensive measure of the work in the field, not just a single story per FoR. While this would be hugely labour-intensive, it is the only way the data at the end will be meaningful. Either do it properly, or don't do it.

Alternatively, it may make more sense to do this exercise as a self-selecting process of awarding universities 'engaged' or 'impactful' status for an FoR as a status symbol that enhances the institution's ERA outcomes. This removes the burden of labour on universities that will receive a poor outcome, and flags to end-users which universities may be good to work with.

Q62**Neither agree or 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?

The entire approach needs to be re-thought before determining thresholds.

Q64

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

Neither agree nor disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

The entire approach needs to be re-thought before determining thresholds.

Page 15: EI Methodology /2

Q65

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

Disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

These measures are too narrow, and advantage STEM disciplines.

Q66

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

Agree,

Please explain your answer.:

This should also be expanded to include in-kind support from end-users, to better understand engagement with low-funded end-users.

Q67

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

Agree,

Please explain your answer.:

Paying to use the research implies a pretty direct engagement with an end-user.

Q68

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

No,

If you answered 'Yes', please outline the metrics. If you answered 'No', please explain your answer.:

No particular metrics spring to mind.

Q69

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

No

Q70

Should any of the current engagement metrics be redesigned?

No

Q71

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

Strongly agree,

Please explain your answer.:

This measure indicates a clear activity of engagement with end-users, also expands scope outside of just highly-funded industries.

Q72

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

Patents

Comment:

No response

While this indicator may imply intent, it does not necessarily demonstrate engagement.

Research commercialisation income

Comment:

Yes

This measure infers engagement with end-users.

Registered designs

Comment:

No

While this indicator may imply intent, it does not necessarily demonstrate engagement.

Plant breeder's rights

Comment:

No

While this indicator may imply intent, it does not necessarily demonstrate engagement.

NHMRC endorsed guidelines

Comment:

Yes

This measure infers engagement with end-users.

Page 16: EI Methodology /3

Q73

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

Agree,

Please explain your answer.:

This is a useful tool for areas that aren't easily articulated by other measures.

Q74

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.

Respondent skipped this question

Q75

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

Agree,

Please explain your answer.:

I think this works for the same reasons that the narrative in the ERA submission work.

Q76

The engagement narrative needs to be longer.

Disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

The current length seems sufficient.

Q77

Additional evidence is needed within the narrative.

Neither agree nor disagree,

If you agree, what evidence should be provided?:

Evidence in the measures should be clearly linked to the narrative, and any additional evidence should be articulated if necessary.

Page 17: EI Methodology /4

Q78

The narrative approach is suitable for describing and assessing Impact.

Strongly disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

One narrative per FoR is ludicrously reductive, essentially presenting one researcher's work as the representative for the entire UoE. With this small sampling, the case could just as easily represent 50% of the research being conducted in a UoE, as 1% of the research, and the public have no way of knowing.

Q79

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.

I don't see a clear useful alternative, but the current approach creates a huge burden of work for a nearly meaningless outcome.

Q80

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

Disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

If we are to use case studies, there should be multiple submissions per FoR, determined by the FTE and position level of the researchers in the UoA.

Q81

The impact narrative needs to be longer.

Disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

The current length is appropriate.

Q82

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

Agree,

If you answered 'Yes', what evidence should be provided?:

There should be the opportunity, but not requirement.

Q83

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

No,

Please explain your answer.:

This space is not yet mature enough to have useful indicators.

Q84

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

Respondent skipped this question

Page 18: EI Methodology /5

Q85

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

Agree,

Please explain your answer.:

If approach to impact is required, I cannot see a better way to articulate this.

Q86

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.

Respondent skipped this question

Q87

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

Neither agree nor disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

There should be a matching approach narrative for each impact narrative.

Q88

The approach to impact narrative needs to be longer.

Disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

The current length is appropriate.

Q89

There is a need for additional evidence to be provided.

Neither agree nor disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

There should be the opportunity to provide more evidence, but not the requirement.

Q90

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

No,

Please explain your answer.:

Engagement represents researcher activity, whereas approach to impact represents the university's activity. Pairing these doesn't make sense.

Page 19: EI Methodology /6

Q91

The engagement rating scale is suitable for assessing research engagement.

Neither agree nor disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

If you must put a rating on it, this scale is as good as any.

Q92

The descriptors for the engagement rating scale are suitable.

Neither agree nor disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

If you must put a rating on it, this scale is as good as any.

Q93

The impact rating scale is suitable for assessing impact.

Neither agree nor disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

If you must put a rating on it, this scale is as good as any.

Q94

The descriptors for the impact rating scale are suitable.

Neither agree nor disagree,

Please explain answer.:

If you must put a rating on it, this scale is as good as any.

Q95

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

Neither agree nor disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

If you must put a rating on it, this scale is as good as any.

Q96

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

Neither agree nor disagree,

Please explain your answer.:

If you must put a rating on it, this scale is as good as any.

Page 20: EI Methodology /7
Q97

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

Yes,

Please explain your answer.:

There will always be a component of research that doesn't easily fit into the standard FoR schema, and this research should have the opportunity to be recognised.

Q98

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?

Yes,

Please explain your answer.:

While treating Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander research the same way as other research areas is ideal, we must recognise that this is an emerging field in many universities, and giving it visibility may encourage more research activity.

Q99

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

Yes,

Please explain your answer.:

Treating Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander research the same way as other research areas is desirable in order for it to be taken as seriously as other fields.

Page 21: Overarching Issues Common to ERA and EI
Q100

How often should ERA occur?

Other (please specify and explain your answer).:

Annual. ERA in its current form is far too retrospective to provide meaningful data on the current state of research in Australia. If we want data we can make decisions with, it must be annual. Streamlining ERA to enable this will make it a meaningful exercise.

Q101

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?

ERA is barely relevant as it is - looking at research that was published 2-8 years previous. It judges the past of a university, rather than the current state. Expanding the cycle will just make it more meaningless.

Page 22: Overarching Issues Common to ERA and EI

<p>Q102</p> <p>How often should the EI assessment occur?</p>	<p>Other (please specify and explain your answer):</p> <p>Where possible, annualise the collection of data. If we are to continue having the case studies, they may as well be every 5 years to allow the creation of higher quality submissions.</p>
---	---

<p>Q103</p> <p>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?</p> <p>A longer cycle would allow institutions to better measure the success of their efforts in EI.</p>
--

Page 23: Overarching Issues Common to both ERA and EI

<p>Q104</p> <p>ERA and EI should be combined into the one assessment.</p>	<p>Disagree,</p> <p>Please explain your answer.:</p> <p>Engagement should be folded into ERA, and Impact should be separate, and ideally completely redesigned to provide meaningful data.</p>
--	---

<p>Q105</p> <p>What would be the advantages and/or disadvantages of ERA and EI being combined into the one assessment.</p> <p>Advantages</p> <p>Disadvantages</p>	<p>Single dataset on research performance in one place.</p> <p>Huge crunch around assessment, like the mess of doing ERA/EI 2018 simultaneously.</p>
--	--

<p>Q106</p> <p>Are there other ways to streamline the processes to reduce the cost to universities of participating in ERA and EI?</p>	<p>No,</p> <p>Please explain your answer.:</p> <p>These exercises need to be redesigned with a clear purpose behind them before worrying about streamlining.</p>
---	---

Page 24: Overarching Issues Common to Both ERA and EI

<p>Q107</p> <p>In your view, what data sources could ERA utilise?</p> <p>There are no apparent sources that are comprehensive enough for the task.</p>

<p>Q108</p> <p>In your view, what are the most time consuming elements of the ERA submission?</p> <p>Data validation, error-checking and creating the submission file.</p>

Q109	Yes,
Are there efficiencies that could be introduced?	Please describe.: A single universal system for all universities to model submissions on (rather than creating our own systems) would significantly decrease the overall labour burden, and put all universities on a level playing field as far as modelling capability is concerned.

Page 25: Overarching Issues Common to Both ERA and EI

Q110

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

Writing the narratives.

Q111**No**

Are there efficiencies that could be introduced?

Page 26: Overarching Issues Common to Both ERA and EI

Q112

ORCID iDs should be mandatory for ERA.

Agree,

Please explain your answer.:

ORCID should be the agreed upon industry standard for consistency across the sector.

Q113

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

Advantages

Clean, consistently formatted data, ready for submission.

Disadvantages

Full coverage not guaranteed, still requires diligence on part of researchers

Q114

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

Agree,

Please explain your answer.:

While this would streamline the process, pushing the academic community to full coverage would be difficult.

Q115

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

Advantages

Clean, consistently formatted data, ready for submission.

Disadvantages

Dirty data, users with multiple ORCIDs creating duplication.

Q116

DOIs should be mandatory for ERA.

Strongly agree,

Please explain your answer.:

DOIs are the standard for persistently recording digital objects, and provide a good source for verification of research outputs.

Q117

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

Advantages

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Digital_object_identifier#Features_and_benefits

Disadvantages

NTROs are not as likely to have DOIs, potentially disadvantaging them.

Page 27: Overarching Issues Common to Both ERA and EI

Q118

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?

Yes,

Please explain your answer.:

A national level repository for all research outputs which harvests from institutional repositories would drastically reduce the burden. Submission data could be prepared by the system, enriched by citation providers, then verified/corrected/enriched by universities, removing the majority of the technical burden of submission creation. This would mean that submission would require input from subject matter experts alone, rather than with a large component of technical staff replicating work across the nation.

Q119

What are the advantages and/or disadvantages?

Advantages

Lower national labour cost, harder to game, consistent approach for all universities, transparency of process.

Disadvantages

Requires vision and national level funding to be brought to fruition.

Page 28: Additional Comments

Q120

Please provide any additional comments:

Respondent skipped this question