



Australian Government

Australian Research Council

**Excellence in Research
for Australia (ERA) Initiative**

**Making a Submission in Response to
the *Indicators Consultation Paper***

September 2009

INDICATORS CONSULTATION PAPER
EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH FOR AUSTRALIA (ERA)

How to Make a Submission

This document contains notes to assist organisations prepare a submission, as well as the conditions for making a submission. Additionally it contains a submissions pro-forma that should be used for making a submission to the consultation paper on the ERA initiative.

How do I make a submission?

Submissions can be emailed, faxed or posted to the ARC.

Only one submission can be made by each invited organisation.

Please provide your responses to the issues in the relevant spaces on the pro-forma.

If you choose not to respond to some of the issues, do not delete the issue box, just leave the response area blank or enter 'Nil Response'.

If you have any comments on areas not addressed in this pro-forma please enter them in the space provided at the end of your submission.

Will my submission be published?

A report analysing the submissions may be prepared by the ARC, in which case submissions or parts of submissions may be included in the report. Organisations may request not to have their details made public.

You should be aware that the ARC may be required to release the details of any submission (or parts of it) by the operation of law (for example, if required to do so by Parliament). The ARC can, therefore, give no undertakings that your submission (or parts of it) will never be made publicly available. If you have any concerns about this, the ARC suggests that you obtain your own legal advice.

Other conditions of making a submission

The ARC will neither consider nor publish any submission that, in the ARC's opinion, contains material that is or may be defamatory, insulting or otherwise inappropriate.

The ARC may include a statement to the effect that the ARC does not necessarily agree with the submission (or part of the submission) and the views expressed in it are those of the author. A statement of this type may accompany any submission or part thereof that the ARC makes publicly available or includes in any report.

The ARC will not treat any information in any submission as confidential to any person.

Other conditions of making a submission are described elsewhere in these notes and in the pro-forma for making a submission.

The ARC may use, reproduce and adapt any submission in whole or in part for any purpose described in these notes or the pro-forma (the "**ARC's Rights**"). Each individual and organisation making a submission must ensure that the ARC's Rights are not in conflict with (or that all relevant consents have been obtained in relation to) any right of any person,

including copyright, moral rights (as defined in the *Copyright Act 1968*) and any right to control the use or disclosure of information.

Where do I send my response?

Email submissions can be sent to era@arc.gov.au

Fax submissions can be sent to **(02) 6287 6601**.

A signed hard copy of the submission should also be sent to:

**The Submissions Officer
Research Excellence Branch
Australian Research Council
GPO Box 2702
CANBERRA ACT 2601**

The closing date for all submissions is **Friday 25 September 2009**.

If you have any questions regarding the pro-forma or any other aspect of making a submission, please contact the Research Excellence Branch at era@arc.gov.au.

**EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH FOR AUSTRALIA (ERA) INITIATIVE:
INDICATORS CONSULTATION PAPER**

Submission Cover Page

Organisation Name (if applicable)	Council of Deans of Nursing and Midwifery (Australia & New Zealand)				
Address	School of Nursing, Deakin University, 221 Burwood Highway				
City	Burwood	State	Victoria	Postcode	3125

Name of Contact Person	Professor Patrick Crookes				
Position	Chair, Council of Deans of Nursing and Midwifery				
Phone	+61 2 4221 3174	Email	Patrick_crookes@uow.edu.au		

Does the individual consent to having its submission identified in a report on the outcomes of this submission process to be prepared by the ARC, which could be made publicly available on the ARC's website? (Y/N)Y	Y
---	---

Name of Authorising Person	Professor Patrick Crookes				
Position	Chair, Council of Deans of Nursing and Midwifery				
Phone	+61 2 4221 3174	Email	Patrick_crookes@uow.edu.au		
Signature					

Please ensure that all details on this page are completed.

Issues for Response

The ARC is seeking feedback from the sector on the issues raised in the Consultation Paper. These issues are highlighted in the pink boxes in the Consultation Paper and listed below.

Discipline-specific Indicators

1. Please provide comments regarding the collection and verification of data for any of the specified indicator categories for the full ERA evaluations from an institutional perspective.

RESPONSE:

Inclusion of ‘standards’ (for safe, reliable and effective products, services and systems) and ‘guidelines’ (NHMRC-endorsed clinical practice guidelines) are important additions of research-based policy outputs for Cluster 8 disciplines, particularly ‘Nursing’ (and including Midwifery) and ‘Health Services’ (as well as Cluster 7).

2. Please identify any discipline(s) where the proposed use of ranked conferences or citation analysis is likely to not be supported by a broad consensus in the discipline(s). Please provide a short justification for adding or removing the discipline(s) in the indicator category.

RESPONSE:

Ranked conferences (with peer-reviewed full-text papers) are not applicable for FoR codes 1110 and 1117. Citation analysis is supported for ‘Nursing’ and ‘... Health Services’ as a limited but not ideal measure of the importance and impact of published research in these disciplines.

Repository statistics (download rates) for articles could also be considered a measure, as downloads potentially reflect impact on a professional / practice community who are consumers of the work and apply the work in practice, but who are not necessarily authors who may subsequently cite the paper (and add to citation rates).

3. For applied indicators, as well as peer review indicator categories, please identify any discipline(s) in the Matrix for each Cluster where there is likely to be broad consensus that the proposed use of the indicator is not useful or valid.

RESPONSE:

Agree with the 'nationally endorsed guidelines' indicator for FoR codes 1110 and 1117. The 'patents' indicator will have very little application to these disciplines, and could be deleted as it will provide minimal differentiation for ranking of research group submissions.

4. For the peer review indicator, please comment on: any additional output type(s) which could be included in this category, including a short justification for their inclusion; and any issues which significantly impact on the tagging of outputs for peer review.

RESPONSE:

The 'peer review' indicator is not necessary for FoR codes 1110 and 1117.

5. Are there specific publishing behaviours which may affect the attribution of publications to the most relevant FoR code using the ERA journal FoR assignments? How would you suggest that the ERA approach might overcome this issue to ensure that research outputs are correctly attributed to the correct FoR code?

A 4-digit FoR code lacks precision. Midwifery is now commonly acknowledged as a separate health discipline to Nursing (with separate qualifications for initial practice and separate authorisation registers, and commonly separate journals). For ERA, at the 4-digit level 'Midwifery' is classified under the 'Nursing' code in the Australian & New Zealand Standard Research Classification; ANZSRC, 2008, and is not delineated until the 6-digit level, i.e. '111006 Midwifery'). Use of 6-digit codes would therefore be appropriate to identify outputs and development of the two separate disciplines.

Proposed inclusion of Esteem Indicators

6. Please provide comments regarding the collection and verification of data for any of the specified indicator categories for the full ERA evaluations from an institutional perspective.

RESPONSE:

No comment.

7. Please provide comments regarding specified roles articulated in any of the indicator categories.

RESPONSE:

The recommended indicators are narrow and located at the highly productive pole of a possible continuum. They may therefore provide very little differentiation for ranking of research groups. There was an opportunity to include a range of relevant indicators with lower prestige but still important identifiers of researcher 'standing' (e.g. editorial board of international journal), but these were dismissed by the ARC.

The 'learned academies' identified have no relevance of applicability for esteemed researchers from 'Nursing' or '... Health Services'. These disciplines have their own academies or colleges, but these are not included, and the ARC has provided no justification for this decision. If the list of academies is not expanded, then this indicator should be excluded from Cluster 8.

Recipient of a 'fellowship' is not included as an indicator for Cluster 8, but this award could be considered equivalent to a Category 1 research grant.

The attempt to 'measure' these activities is not convincing (noted in earlier ERA documents, but measurement not stated in this document), and this material could be better reported as a narrative only for ranking purposes.

8. What titles should be included as prestigious works of reference? Please note that the list should be restricted to a small number of works (maximum 10 per discipline) representing the highest scholarly standards.

RESPONSE:

Not listed as an indicator for Cluster 8.

9. Please provide comments on the suggested list of statutory committees.

RESPONSE:

State government statutory committees are not identified in the document. Much of this type of work by researchers in the 'Nursing' or '... Health Services' disciplines are with the relevant State-based Health Departments. Given that the Commonwealth has not yet taken responsibility for hospital and area health services, relevant State-based statutory committees should be included in this indicator.

10. Please provide comments on the suggested method for counting nationally competitive research fellowships and Australia Council grants and fellowships.

RESPONSE:

This indicator is not listed for Cluster 8, and appears to be mostly irrelevant for these disciplines.

Proposed Creative Arts Research Outputs that includes Esteem Indicators

11. Please provide comment on the proposed revision to the creative arts research outputs that allows the inclusion of some esteem information directly connected to the research output.

RESPONSE:

Not applicable for Cluster 8.