



Australian Government

Department of Education, Science and Training

Research Quality Framework

Response to *The Research Quality Framework – Draft Submission Specifications*

Council of Deans of Nursing and Midwifery
(Australia & New Zealand)

August 2007

RESEARCH QUALITY FRAMEWORK: Submission Specifications 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 should be used for making a submission to the consultation process on the draft RQF Submission Specifications.

Using the proforma

The sections in the pro-forma correspond to the numbered chapters in the draft Specifications. Please provide your responses to the questions in the relevant spaces on the pro-forma.

If you choose not to answer some questions, please do not delete the questions, just leave them 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

RESEARCH QUALITY FRAMEWORK (RQF)

Response to the Draft Submission Specifications

Section 1: Objectives of the RQF

No questions.

Section 2: Eligibility

Eligible Researchers

Question 1

Do the eligibility criteria in the draft Specifications fairly reflect the researchers who should be included in Research Groups for assessment in the first RQF round? If not, how do you believe the criteria could be broadened to reflect the inclusion of other researchers? Under what specific circumstances should eligibility be broadened?

Your response

Yes

Exemption for Level A Researchers

Question 2

The draft Specifications say that Level A researchers are only eligible for inclusion if the researcher is a chief investigator, or equivalent, on an Australian competitive grant, or an international peer-reviewed competitive grant. Do you think this is an appropriate eligibility criteria? If not, please specify an alternative eligibility criteria.

Your response

Appropriate

Institution Affiliates

Question 3

The Recommended RQF stated that adjunct, conjoint, honorary and emeritus researchers should not be eligible for inclusion in a Research Group, although their contribution may be highlighted in the context statement. Reflecting this statement, the RQF Specifications state that only researchers who are employed by a Table A or B higher education provider (HEP) should be eligible for inclusion in the RQF. This means that HEPs can not include adjunct, emeritus and/or honorary researchers. Do you support this restriction? If not, how do you believe the criteria could be amended, while ensuring that honorary researchers are not included inappropriately?

Your response

The provision for inclusion of adjunct, conjoint, honorary and emeritus researchers outputs in the context statement is sufficient



Other Assessed Researchers

Question 4

The Specifications allow 'Other Assessed Researchers' to submit fewer than four 'best' outputs. Is the definition of an 'Other Assessed Researcher' clear and understandable? Do you support this approach? Please specify any other categories that should be included.

Your response

The criteria for inclusion in the category "Other assessed researchers" is clear

Researchers in Multiple Research Groups

Question 5

Assessed researchers have been restricted to being members of a maximum of two Research Groups. Where a researcher is in two Research Groups the researcher must nominate four different 'best' research outputs for each Research Group. This means that researchers are required to nominate eight different 'best' research outputs.

Do you support the ability for researchers to belong to more than one Research Group? Do you support the restriction to two Research Groups? If so, do you believe there should be any additional restrictions?

Your response

The requirement that a researcher in two research groups must nominate 4 different best outputs is appropriate. Claiming a capacity to be a sufficient contributor such that they are judged in 2 groups suggests the researcher to be at a level where 8 best outputs in total is a reasonable expectation.

Section 3: Research Groups

Nomination of Home Panel

Question 6

Research Groups will be able to nominate their preferred "Home Panel", rather than automatically being allocated to the Group on the basis of the Group's RFCD codes. Do you support this approach?

Your response

Yes, researchers are in the best position to nominate the Home Panel that fits their predominant area of expertise

Research Groups

Question 7

Do you support the basis for allowing the submission of Research Groups with fewer than five members? Please specify any further reasons that you consider should be included.

Your response

Yes

--

Section 4: RQF Submissions

The Context Statement

Question 8

Is sufficient guidance given on how to prepare the descriptive component of the Context Statement and on what can be included? Please specify any additional information, if any, that would be useful.

Your response

The planned release of exemplars of Context Statements will be helpful. Planned release of Panel-specific Requirements will also assist

Question 9

If a researcher is in two Research Groups, how do you envisage you would disaggregate research income and HDR students over the entire assessment period? Please specify any restrictions or options that may assist with the process of reporting this information at a Research Group level (e.g., pro-rating).

Your response

Pro-rata would seem to be the most appropriate approach to this allocation

Question 10

The Recommended RQF said that Research Groups should detail their international peer reviewed research grant income. The RQF Specifications stipulate that this must be disaggregated from HERDC category 3 research income, in line with the draft 2008 HERDC Specifications, for all 6 years of the assessment period. Do you support this approach? Are there any restrictions or options that may assist with the process of reporting this information at a Research Group level?

Your response

Yes. International scrutiny of a funding submission may differ from that of ACG reviewers and should be reported separately

Body of Work

Question 11

The Specifications have detailed requirements for the Body of Work, particularly regarding instances where researchers are in two Research Groups. Do you support this approach for managing researchers in multiple Research Groups? If not, specify what alternative approach you recommend.

Your response

Yes

Section 5: Quality and Impact

The Impact Statement

Question 12

What additional information, if any, would be useful for drafting the Impact Statement?

Your response

Exemplars of Impact Statements would assist

Question 13

What additional information, if any, would be useful to explain the Impact ratings?

Your response

Sufficient information is provided

Question 14

Do the Specifications allow for Research Groups to claim and substantiate impact effectively? If not, specify how the Specifications could be amended.

Your response

Yes

Question 15

Do you support the proposed approach for applying for an exemption from Impact assessment?

Your response

Yes-

Section 6: Metrics

Question 16

Does the section on metrics make it sufficiently clear that DEST will be responsible for undertaking the metrics analysis process (including applying ranked outlets and calculating citation counts). Do you support this approach?

Your response

Yes as long as DEST fully utilises the expertise of various groups in informing the analysis. EG the journal ranking exercise results commissioned by the Council of Deans of Nursing and Midwifery should be drawn on by DEST when considering outputs from these disciplines

OTHER COMMENTS

Do you have any other suggestions about aspects of the Specifications? Please cross-reference your comments to sections in the Specifications.