



Australian Government
**Department of Education,
Science and Training**

Research Quality Framework

Assessing the quality and impact
of research in Australia

RQF Submission Specifications

**RESEARCH QUALITY FRAMEWORK:
Assessing the quality and impact of
research in Australia**

RQF SUBMISSION SPECIFICATIONS

September 2007

© Commonwealth of Australia 2007

ISBN 0 642 77678 4 (Electronic Version)

This work is subject to the laws of copyright. You may download, display, print and reproduce this material in unaltered form only (retaining this notice) for your personal, non-commercial use or use within your organisation. All other rights are reserved. Requests and inquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be addressed to: Commonwealth Copyright Administration, Copyright Law Branch, Attorney-General's Department, Robert Garran Offices, National Circuit, Barton ACT 2600, Fax: 02 6250 5989, or submitted via the copyright request form on the website <http://www.ag.gov.au/cca>. Requests and inquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be copied to: The Branch Manager, Research Quality Branch (Loc 530), Department of Education, Science and Training, GPO Box 9880, Canberra ACT 2600.

CONTENTS

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| 1. | OBJECTIVES OF THE RQF SUBMISSION SPECIFICATIONS..... | 1 |
| 1.1 | Purpose of the Specifications | 1 |
| 1.2 | Structure of the Specifications | 2 |
| 1.3 | Purpose of the Research Quality Framework | 2 |
| 1.4 | Use of Information from the RQF..... | 2 |
| 1.5 | The Assessment Process | 3 |
| 1.6 | Definition of Research..... | 3 |
| 1.7 | Definition of Quality and Impact..... | 4 |
| 1.7.1 | Research Quality | 4 |
| 1.7.2 | Research Impact | 5 |
| 2. | ELIGIBILITY | 6 |
| 2.1 | Eligible Researchers | 6 |
| 2.1.1 | Eligibility Clarifications..... | 6 |
| 2.1.2 | Exemption from the <i>in situ</i> Criterion | 7 |
| 2.1.3 | Level A Researchers..... | 7 |
| 2.1.4 | Institution Affiliates..... | 7 |
| 2.2 | Assessed Researchers | 8 |
| 2.2.1 | Other Assessed Researchers..... | 8 |
| 2.2.1.1 | Early Career Researchers..... | 9 |
| 2.2.1.2 | Researchers with Significant Career Interruptions..... | 9 |
| 2.2.1.3 | Indigenous Researchers..... | 9 |
| 2.2.2 | Researchers in Two Research Groups..... | 9 |
| 3. | RESEARCH GROUPS | 10 |
| 3.1 | Research Group Size | 10 |
| 3.2 | Small Research Groups..... | 10 |
| 3.2.1 | Disciplinary Practice | 10 |
| 3.2.2 | Emerging Research Group or Practice | 10 |
| 3.3 | Cross-institutional Research Groups..... | 11 |
| 3.4 | Inclusion of Researchers in Two Research Groups..... | 11 |
| 3.5 | Nomination of Home Panel | 11 |
| 3.6 | RFCD and SEO Codes for Research Groups | 12 |
| 4. | RQF SUBMISSIONS | 13 |
| 4.1 | Institution Responsibilities..... | 13 |
| 4.1.1 | Certification | 13 |
| 4.2 | Institution Submissions..... | 13 |
| 4.2.1 | Stage 1: Expression of Intent to Submit..... | 13 |
| 4.2.2 | Stage 2: Institution Submission | 14 |
| 4.3 | The Evidence Portfolio | 14 |
| 4.3.1 | Overview | 14 |
| 4.3.2 | Components of the Evidence Portfolio | 15 |
| 4.3.3 | The Context Statement..... | 16 |
| 4.3.3.1 | Descriptive Component..... | 16 |
| 4.3.3.2 | Researcher information | 18 |
| 4.3.4 | Format for the Context Statement..... | 18 |
| 4.3.5 | Four 'Best' Research Outputs..... | 18 |
| 4.3.5.1 | Information to be Provided for Each Research Output | 19 |
| 4.3.6 | Acceptable Research Outputs | 19 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| 4.3.6.1 | Acceptable Forms of Research Outputs | 19 |
| 4.3.6.2 | Date of Publication | 20 |
| 4.3.6.3 | Published Version | 22 |
| 4.3.6.4 | Co-authorship | 22 |
| 4.3.6.5 | 'Best' Output Justifications | 22 |
| 4.3.6.6 | Accessibility of Four 'Best' Outputs | 22 |
| 4.3.6.7 | Managing Copyright Restrictions | 23 |
| 4.3.6.8 | Sensitivity: Confidential or Sensitive Outputs | 24 |
| 4.3.6.9 | Managing Physical, Technical or Legal Limitations | 25 |
| 4.3.7 | Body of Work for Researchers in the Research Group | 25 |
| 4.3.7.1 | Research Outputs that must be fully-reported | 26 |
| 4.3.7.2 | Other Research Outputs that may be reported | 26 |
| 4.3.7.3 | Body of Work where a Researcher is in Two Research Groups | 26 |
| 5. | QUALITY AND IMPACT | 27 |
| 5.1 | Quality Scale | 27 |
| 5.2 | Impact Statement | 28 |
| 5.2.1 | Overview | 28 |
| 5.2.2 | Conditions for Impact Assessment | 29 |
| 5.2.3 | Basis and Timeframe for Impact Assessment | 29 |
| 5.2.4 | Older Research Included for Impact Assessment | 29 |
| 5.2.5 | Statement of claims | 30 |
| 5.2.6 | Case Studies | 30 |
| 5.2.7 | End-User details | 30 |
| 5.2.8 | Impact Scale | 31 |
| 5.3 | Explaining Impact for the Purposes of the RQF | 32 |
| 5.3.1 | Domains of Research Impact | 32 |
| 5.3.2 | Linking the Impact Claimed to the Research of the Group | 33 |
| 5.3.3 | Interpreting the Ratings | 34 |
| 5.4 | Exemption from Impact Assessment | 36 |
| 6. | METRICS | 37 |
| 6.1 | Ranked Outlets | 37 |
| 6.2 | Citation Data | 38 |
| 6.2.1 | Citations Per Publication | 38 |
| 6.2.2 | Centile Distribution of the Research Group's Output | 38 |
| 7. | OTHER MATTERS | 39 |
| 7.1 | Certification of the Institution Submission | 39 |
| 7.2 | Incomplete, False or Misleading Information | 40 |
| 7.3 | Privacy Complaints and Advice | 41 |
| 7.4 | Freedom of Information | 41 |
| 7.5 | Intellectual Property | 41 |
| 7.6 | Contact Details | 42 |
| 7.7 | Acceptable Research Outputs | 42 |
| 7.8 | Managing Copyright in Research Outputs | 43 |
| 7.8.1 | Agreements Allowing the Use of Outputs for the RQF | 44 |
| 7.8.2 | Copyright Checklist for the Use of Outputs for the RQF | 44 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| A: PANEL-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE | 46 |
| 1. BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES | 47 |
| 2. PHYSICAL, CHEMICAL AND EARTH SCIENCES | 52 |
| 3. ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY | 57 |
| 4. MATHEMATICAL AND INFORMATION SCIENCES AND TECHNOLOGY | 62 |
| 5. AGRICULTURAL, VETERINARY, FOOD AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES | 67 |
| 6. CLINICAL SCIENCES AND CLINICAL PHYSIOLOGY | 72 |
| 7. PUBLIC HEALTH AND HEALTH SERVICES | 77 |
| 8. PSYCHOLOGY, PSYCHIATRY, NEUROLOGICAL, BEHAVIOURAL AND COGNITIVE SCIENCES | 82 |
| 9. SOCIAL SCIENCES AND POLITICS | 87 |
| 10. ECONOMICS, COMMERCE AND MANAGEMENT | 92 |
| 11. LAW, EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES | 97 |
| 12. HUMANITIES | 103 |
| 13. CREATIVE ARTS, DESIGN AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT | 108 |
| B: RQF ASSESSMENT PANELS BY RFCD CODES | 115 |
| C: LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | 116 |

RQF TIMETABLE

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| 28 September 2007 | Applications due for exemption from the <i>in situ</i> criterion |
| 26 October 2007 | Notification of decisions on applications for exemption from the <i>in situ</i> criterion |
| 31 January 2008 | Expressions of Intent to Submit due |
| 1 March 2008 | RQF Information Management System opens for submissions |
| 30 April 2008 | RQF Information Management System closes for submissions Vice-Chancellor's certification received |
| 7 May 2008 | Hard-copy Vice-Chancellor's certification received |
| May-June 2008 | Validation of submissions and evidence portfolios Assignment of evidence portfolios to Panels Distribution of metrics analysis to Panels |
| July-August 2008 | Assessment Phase |
| September 2008 | Panels finalise Quality and Impact scores for Research Groups Moderation Panel undertakes quality assurance |
| November 2008 | Minister announces outcomes of the RQF |
| January 2009 | RQF Evaluation commences |

1. OBJECTIVES OF THE RQF SUBMISSION SPECIFICATIONS

1.1 Purpose of the Specifications

The purpose of the Research Quality Framework (RQF) *Submission Specifications* is to provide an overview of, and specify the content and data requirements for, submissions that are part of the 2008 RQF, as well as to provide panel-specific guidance for Research Groups when compiling their evidence portfolios. It also provides guidance to eligible higher education providers (henceforth 'institutions') on policy and practical matters in preparing submissions.

Institutions are Table A providers and Table B providers, as defined in the *Higher Education Support Act 2003* ('HESA'). This includes all campuses, in Australia and overseas, of an institution.

These Specifications should be read in combination with the *RQF Technical Specifications*, which is available on the RQF website. The *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors* will be released prior to the commencement of the submission process. Additional explanatory material may be provided by DEST from time to time during the process.

These Specifications are informed by advice from both the Expert Advisory Group (EAG)¹ and the Development Advisory Group (DAG)² as provided to the Australian Government. Input has been provided through extensive consultations with the sector, including with nominated sector representatives who participated in RQF Discipline Workshops, with Assessment Panel Chairs, discipline groups and with the RQF Reference Committee.

DEST will use the information submitted by institutions for the purposes of conducting the RQF assessment process and to produce ratings for Research Quality and Research Impact for each Research Group. The final ratings will be published. This data will also be used to inform other analyses conducted by DEST.

¹ Expert Advisory Group, *Research Quality Framework: Assessing the Quality and Impact Of Research in Australia – Final Advice on the Preferred Model*, Commonwealth of Australia, 2005 (available at http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/research_sector/policies_issues_reviews/key_issues/research_quality_framework/documents/rqf_preferred_model/Final_Advice_Paper_pdf.htm).

² Development Advisory Group, *Research Quality Framework: Assessing the Quality and Impact of Research in Australia – The Recommended RQF*, Commonwealth of Australia, 2006 (available at http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/research_sector/policies_issues_reviews/key_issues/research_quality_framework/documents/the_recommended_RQF_pdf.htm).

1.2 Structure of the Specifications

The Specifications include the following information:

- o eligibility requirements for researchers;
- o requirements for Research Groups;
- o requirements for RQF Submissions;
- o requirements for metrics; and
- o guidance specific to panels.

Additional information is provided separately in:

- o *RQF Technical Specifications*; and
- o *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

1.3 Purpose of the Research Quality Framework

The primary purpose of the RQF is to establish an assessment framework that provides government, industry, business and the wider community with the assurance that the research conducted in Australian institutions has been rigorously assessed through internationally recognised processes.

The RQF aims to deliver a comprehensive assessment of the quality and impact of research conducted by Research Groups within the Australian higher education sector. The RQF is intended to allow Research Groups to be benchmarked both nationally and internationally for all discipline areas.

The RQF is also underpinned by the desire to promote a vibrant research culture, encourage researchers to undertake high quality research and make research available to the Government, the higher education sector, industry and the wider community.

1.4 Use of Information from the RQF

The Government has stated that data from the RQF will be used in the allocation of the Institutional Grants Scheme (IGS) and a significant proportion of the Research Training Scheme (RTS) from 2009. Allocations will be in the form of grants made under HESA Part 2-3. More specifically, the grants will be for the purposes specified in items 7 (for the IGS) and 8 (for the RTS) of the table in HESA subsection 41-10(1).

This means that DEST will use the Quality and Impact ratings and other data obtained through the RQF (and other sources) to provide the Minister for Education, Science and Training with information to determine the allocation of grants under the IGS and the RTS. The methods by which RQF data will be used in the calculation of IGS and RTS grants will be specified in the *Other Grants Guidelines* (made by the Minister under subsection 238-10(1) of HESA).

The Minister may use Quality and Impact ratings and other data obtained through the RQF (and other sources) for the determination of allocation mechanisms for other grants to institutions.

1.5 The Assessment Process

Expert review is central to the RQF. The RQF will conduct expert review through Assessment Panels and Advisors. There are 13 Assessment Panels based on Research Fields, Courses and Disciplines codes (RFCD).³ Each Panel has 12 members and includes a Chair, a minimum of three members of international standing and a minimum of three research end-users. The Panel Members for the RQF will be listed on the RQF website.⁴

While Panel Members will draw on appropriate quantitative indicators to support their professional assessment of each Research Group's evidence portfolio, expert review remains paramount. Advisors who are not members of an Assessment Panel may be used as required to provide advice on the quality and impact of one or more evidence portfolio(s) or part of an evidence portfolio. These Advisors will be selected by Panel Chairs with advice from the Panel Members.

Further detail on the assessment process will be provided in the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors* which will be released prior to the commencement of the submission process.

1.6 Definition of Research

For the purposes of the RQF, original research is defined as the creation of new knowledge and/or the use of existing knowledge in a new and creative way so as to generate new concepts, methodologies and understandings. This could include synthesis and analysis of previous research to the extent that it is new and creative.

This definition of research is consistent with a broad notion of research and experimental development (R&D) as comprising 'creative work undertaken on a systematic basis in order to increase the stock of knowledge, including knowledge of humanity, culture and society, and the use of this stock of knowledge to devise applications'.⁵

This definition is the same as the definition of research used in the draft *2008 Higher Education Research Data Collection Specifications for the Collection of 2007 Data*,⁶ and broadly similar to definition of research used in the 2008 United Kingdom Research Assessment Exercise (RAE)⁷ and the 2006 New Zealand Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF).⁸

³ All references to RFCD and SEO codes should be read with reference to: ABS (1998), *Australian Standard Research Classification (ASRC)*, Cat. No. 1297.0, ABS, Canberra.

⁴ www.dest.gov.au/research/rqf

⁵ OECD (2002), *Frascati Manual: Proposed Standard Practice for Surveys on Research and Experimental Development*, OECD, Paris.

⁶ http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/research_sector/online_forms_services/higher_education_research_data_collection.htm

⁷ <http://www.rae.ac.uk/>

⁸ <http://www.tec.govt.nz/templates/standard.aspx?id=588>

The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) further classifies R&D into four types of activity:

- o pure basic research;
- o strategic basic research;
- o applied research including new ways of achieving specific and predetermined objectives such as clinical practice; and
- o experimental development including creative work and performance insofar as they are directly related to original basic and applied research.⁹

This definition of research should be used by institutions when determining the acceptability of Research Outputs. Further information on determining the acceptability of Research Outputs is at section 4.3.6.

1.7 Definition of Quality and Impact

The RQF focuses on both Research Quality and Research Impact, which will be judged on the basis of assessments of evidence portfolios.

1.7.1 Research Quality

'Research Quality' refers to the quality of original research including its intrinsic merit and *academic* impact (as opposed to Research Impact which refers to the impact of the research on the broader community).

Academic impact relates to the recognition of the originality of the research by peers and its effect on the development of the same or related discipline areas within the community of peers.

The overall Quality rating will be derived from assessment of the following aspects of the evidence portfolio:

- o the Context Statement;
- o review of the 'best' four Research Outputs nominated by each researcher in the Research Group;
- o the body of work for all researchers in the Research Group; and
- o associated metrics.

Further detail on these aspects of the evidence portfolio is at section 4.3.

Further detail on the assessment of Research Quality will be included in the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

⁹ ABS (1998), *Australian Standard Research Classification (ASRC)*, Cat. No. 1297.0, ABS, Canberra.

1.7.2 Research Impact

'Research Impact' refers to the impact or use of original research *outside* the academic peer community. Dissemination of this research therefore may occur via means other than traditional peer-reviewed literature. Impact refers to the extent to which research has led successfully to social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefits for the wider community, or an element of the community. None of these take precedence over the other.

It is recognised that, while high quality research often leads to significant impact, there is frequently a significant time-lag between the conduct of the research and the impact. The RQF therefore allows for the impact of the Research Group to be based on original research published in the six years prior to the 'assessment period' (1 January 2001 to 31 December 2006), provided that it can be shown to have a relationship to the Research Outputs included in the Research Group's evidence portfolio.

The overall Impact rating will be derived from the assessment of the Impact Statement.

Further detail on the Impact Statement is at section 5.2.

Further detail on the assessment of Research Impact will be included in the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

2. ELIGIBILITY

2.1 Eligible Researchers

'Eligible researchers' are the researchers who may be considered by an institution for inclusion in a Research Group as an 'assessed researcher'. A Research Group consists only of assessed researchers. Further requirements for inclusion in a Research Group are outlined in section 2.2.

For the purposes of this section, all terms are defined in accordance with the 2007 Higher Education Staff Data Collection,¹⁰ unless otherwise specified.

To be eligible, a researcher must meet the following Criteria:

1. be employed in a Table A or B higher education provider as research-only academic staff OR teaching and research academic staff; and
2. be employed as Level A or above on the Staff Census Date (31 March 2007); and
3. be employed as at least 0.40 full-time equivalent (FTE) on the Staff Census Date (31 March 2007); and
4. be employed on the Staff Census Date (31 March 2007), either:
 - a. in a tenured position or on a contract of three years or longer; or
 - b. *in situ* on the same contract at the relevant institution for three months or longer prior to the Staff Census Date (i.e., beginning on or before 1 January 2007); or
 - c. on a contract of less than three years and not *in situ* but claim and receive an exemption from the *in situ* Criterion (section 2.1.2).

Staff who do not meet the above Criteria are not eligible. They therefore may not be included as an assessed researcher in a Research Group.

2.1.1 Eligibility Clarifications

Researchers who are employed by an eligible institution, but who work or are based overseas, including at an overseas campus of an eligible institution, are eligible subject to satisfying the 'eligible researcher' criteria.

A researcher who is on leave (paid or unpaid) on the Staff Census Date may be regarded as 'employed' (therefore meeting Criterion 3) provided that the researcher's employment agreement requires the researcher to return to their normal duties within one year of the commencement of leave. Detail on the format in which this information must be provided is specified in the *RQF Technical Specifications*.

¹⁰ http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/higher_education/publications_resources/statistics/chessn.htm

A researcher who is on leave and employed by another eligible institution may be included in both institutions, subject to satisfying the 'eligible researcher' criteria, as long as they satisfy the requirements for researchers in two Research Groups (section 2.2.2), and as long as their total FTE does not exceed 1.0.

2.1.2 Exemption from the *in situ* Criterion

Institutions must apply to DEST on behalf of a researcher to meet Criterion 4c above, that is, where the researcher's contract commenced less than three months prior to the Staff Census Date. The application must satisfy DEST that the staff movement was part of a long-term strategic decision or falls within the normal employment practice of the institution, rather than a short-term movement.

All applications to meet this Criterion must come from the institution's Research Office (or equivalent), on the form provided to institutions. The form must be delivered to the RQF contact addresses at section 7.6 by 5pm AEST, Friday 28 September 2007.

DEST will consider all applications seeking an exemption from the *in situ* Criterion. Decisions will be finalised and notified to institutions by Friday 26 October 2007.

2.1.3 Level A Researchers

'Level A researchers' are eligible to be included at the institution's discretion provided they meet the Criteria in section 2.1.

Institutions are not required to include Level As when reporting information on eligible researchers (see section 4.2.2).

2.1.4 Institution Affiliates

'Institution Affiliates' are researchers including, but not limited to:

- o adjunct appointees;
- o Emeritus Professors;
- o honorary appointees;
- o visiting appointees; and
- o researchers in organisations who are affiliated with, but not employed by, an eligible institution.

Institution Affiliates are not eligible researchers for the purposes of the RQF as they do not meet Criterion 4 above.

The contribution of Institution Affiliates to the Research Group's Research Quality or Impact may be highlighted, respectively, in a Research Group's Context Statement and Impact Statement (sections 4.3.3 and 5.2).

2.2 Assessed Researchers

'Assessed researchers' are researchers who are included in a Research Group. An assessed researcher must first meet the requirements to be an eligible researcher (section 2.1). Assessed researchers must also either:

- o have generated at least four acceptable Research Outputs within the assessment period; or
- o fit an exemption category as an 'Other Assessed Researcher'.

2.2.1 Other Assessed Researchers

'Other Assessed Researchers' are exempt from the requirement to have generated a minimum of four Research Outputs over the assessment period. Other Assessed Researchers are required to have generated at least two acceptable Research Outputs over the assessment period. Other Assessed Researchers may therefore submit a minimum of two 'best' Research Outputs.

Other Assessed Researchers are:

- o Early Career Researchers (ECRs); and/or
- o Researchers who have had significant career interruptions; and/or
- o Indigenous Researchers.

Institutions are not required to apply for an exemption for Other Assessed Researchers. Institutions are required to identify Other Assessed Researchers in the Research Group's evidence portfolio. The institution is responsible for determining the applicability of the criteria outlined above to an eligible researcher.

For ECRs, the evidence portfolio must include a short statement (50 words per researcher) in the field labelled 'Early Career Researcher Exemption Justification' outlining why they meet the exemption.

For researchers who have had significant career interruptions, the evidence portfolio must include a short statement (50 words per researcher) in the field labelled 'Researcher Career Interruption Justification' outlining why they meet the exemption.

Indigenous researchers are not required to provide a short statement.

Institutions are not required to claim an exemption for assessed researchers where they have generated four 'best' Research Outputs, although these researchers may be highlighted in a Research Group's Context Statement.

2.2.1.1 EARLY CAREER RESEARCHERS

'Early Career Researchers' (ECRs) are researchers who have been identified by their employing institution as an ECR, and on or after 31 March 2002 (i.e., five years before the Staff Census Date) had either:

- o successfully completed their first research doctorate (or equivalent) and had not been employed prior to 31 March 2002 as a Level A or above research-only or teaching and research academic staff; or
- o been employed for the first time as a research-only or teaching and research academic staff member or equivalent in another institution or research institute, and had not completed a research doctorate (or equivalent).

2.2.1.2 RESEARCHERS WITH SIGNIFICANT CAREER INTERRUPTIONS

'Researchers with significant career interruptions' are researchers whose capacity to undertake research during the assessment period was interrupted due to:

- o significant parenting and/or carer responsibilities; and/or
- o significant illness or other significant misfortune; and/or
- o time employed outside the higher education sector (e.g., in business, industry, or the community).

2.2.1.3 INDIGENOUS RESEARCHERS

'Indigenous Researchers' are researchers who:

- o are of Australian Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent; and
- o identify as an Australian Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander; and
- o are accepted as an Australian Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander in the community in which they live or have lived.

2.2.2 Researchers in Two Research Groups

Where an assessed researcher is in two Research Groups (section 3.3), the researcher must nominate four different 'best' Research Outputs for each Research Group of which they are a member. The researcher must therefore nominate eight different 'best' Research Outputs if they are in two Research Groups.

Where an Other Assessed Researcher (section 2.2.1) is in two Research Groups, the researcher must nominate at least two 'best' Research Outputs in each Research Group of which they are a member. The researcher must therefore nominate at least four different 'best' Research Outputs if they are in two Research Groups.

Further information on compiling the body of work where a researcher is in two Research Groups is outlined in section 4.3.7 and 4.3.7.3.

3. RESEARCH GROUPS

The unit of assessment in the RQF is the Research Group. The institution is responsible for nominating Research Groups for assessment.

3.1 Research Group Size

Research Groups must include a minimum of five assessed researchers (numbers not FTE) unless they meet one or both of the exemptions below.

3.2 Small Research Groups

'Small Research Groups' are Groups that do not have five or more researchers. Where a Research Group does not have five or more researchers, it must include a short statement (50 words per Research Group) in the field labelled 'Small Group Exemption Justification'. This statement may refer to one or both of the following reasons:

- o disciplinary practice; and/or
- o emerging research group or practice.

Researchers in a small Research Group are not precluded from claiming exemptions against the researcher eligibility criteria (section 2.1).

The Quality and Impact ratings of the Research Group will be published notwithstanding the Research Group's size. The size of the Research Group may, indirectly or by implication, lead to a loss of anonymity for individual researchers.

The institution is responsible for determining the applicability of either or both of these exemptions to a Research Group.

3.2.1 Disciplinary Practice

There may be cases in which the normal practice of the discipline does not generally involve the formation of a Research Group of five or more researchers. Where this applies, the institution is required to provide a small group exemption justification.

3.2.2 Emerging Research Group or Practice

There may be cases in which the Research Group is emerging or where the activity of the Research Group is in an emerging area of research which has not yet built sufficient critical mass for the formation of a Research Group of five or more researchers. Where this applies, the institution is required to provide a small group exemption justification.

3.3 Cross-institutional Research Groups

An institution (the 'Home Institution') may submit a cross-institutional Research Group which includes eligible researchers who are not employed by the Home Institution, with the agreement of the employing institution.

A cross-institutional Research Group will be treated in the same way as any other Research Group. Therefore, the Home Institution is responsible for creating and submitting the Research Group.

It is the responsibility of the institution in which the researcher is employed ('Employing Institution') to ensure that a researcher's FTE and other eligibility requirements are reported correctly to the Research Group's Home Institution.

It is the responsibility of the Home Institution to ensure that other information associated with the researcher (including the researcher's four 'best' outputs and contribution to the body of work) is correct and to correct any identified errors for a researcher following a request from DEST as a condition of submitting the researcher; otherwise the researcher will not be considered an eligible researcher.

The Quality and Impact ratings for a cross-institutional Research Group will be attributed to the Home Institution, although all other Employing Institutions will be publicly reported as associated with the Research Group. Institutions are required to identify other Employing Institution(s) that are associated with a cross-institutional Research Group.

It is the responsibility of the institutions involved to determine the conditions governing the relationship between the institutions, including the distribution of any financial or in-kind outcomes resulting from this relationship.

3.4 Inclusion of Researchers in Two Research Groups

A researcher may be counted in two Research Groups provided the researcher's total FTE across both Research Groups does not exceed 1.00. These Research Groups may be in the same institution or in different institutions. The researcher's FTE for any Research Group must be at least 0.40 FTE regardless of whether the two Research Groups are in different institutions. This FTE requirement therefore means that a researcher cannot be in more than two Research Groups.

Additional requirements apply to the submission of the four 'best' outputs and the composition of the body of work when a researcher is in two Research Groups.

3.5 Nomination of Home Panel

The 'Home Panel' is responsible for managing the assessment process for Research Groups. In the case of cross-disciplinary research, the Home Panel is responsible for managing the assessment process with relevant secondary Panel(s).

Institutions may nominate relevant secondary Panel(s) for a Research Group. In the case of cross-disciplinary research (i.e., where the Research Group has listed an RFCD code with a weighting of 25 per cent or greater that refers to a Panel other than its preferred Home Panel), the institution is required to nominate relevant secondary Panel(s) for the Research Group.

Each Panel Chair has the discretion to move a Research Group to another Home Panel, where it is considered to be the most appropriate to assess the Research Group, subject to agreement from the relevant Panel Chairs.

Where a Panel Chair moves a Research Group to another Home Panel, the Panel-Specific Guidance of the Panel to which the Research Group has been reassigned will apply.

Where a secondary Panel(s) is identified for the Research Group, the institution must take into account the Panel-Specific Guidance of the secondary Panel(s). This includes taking account of the Research Outputs that all relevant Panels require for inclusion in the body of work and which will be used to derive metrics. Further detail on this process will be provided in the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

3.6 RFCD and SEO Codes for Research Groups

Institutions must define the focus of a Research Group's research activities under discipline-level (minimum 4-digit) RFCD and group-level (minimum 4-digit) Socio-Economic Objective (SEO) codes. Up to three separate 4- or 6-digit RFCD and 4- or 6-digit SEO codes may be nominated for a Research Group as a percentage share, with a minimum 34 per cent share for the Research Group's primary code and a minimum 20 per cent share for the Research Group's secondary codes.

The *RQF Technical Specifications* provide for the collection of codes with six digits. Where 4-digit codes are submitted they will be padded with zeroes by DEST and recorded as 6-digit codes. For example, an RFCD code sent as 3101 (Architecture and Urban Environment) will be stored as 310100. Codes submitted using six digits (e.g., 310105 for History of the Built Environment) will be recorded as sent.

If it is not possible to reflect accurately the Research Group's activities using discipline-level RFCD codes, the Research Group must use the 'other' discipline level code (e.g., 2799 for Other Biological Sciences).

If it is not possible to reflect accurately the Research Group's activities using group-level SEO codes, the Research Group must use either a 4-digit subdivision code (e.g., 6700 for Manufacturing) or the 'other' group-level code (e.g., 7299 for Other Economic Issues).

Research Groups should also use the Context Statement to further explain the focus of their activities (section 4.3.3).

4. RQF SUBMISSIONS

4.1 Institution Responsibilities

Subject to the requirements outlined in these Specifications, it is the responsibility of each institution to nominate which researchers are to be included as assessed researchers in Research Groups.

4.1.1 Certification

The institution is responsible for collecting, validating and transmitting all information in each evidence portfolio by the due date for each stage of the Submission process and for certifying that all the reported information and statements of claims are accurate.

The Vice-Chancellor, or institutional equivalent, is required to provide a signed Certification Statement for the Institution Submission. No part of the Institution Submission is eligible for assessment without a signed Certification Statement. Further information on the requirements for certification is provided in section 7.1.

4.2 Institution Submissions

The institution must provide information in two stages:

- o Stage 1: Expression of Intent to Submit (EIS); and
- o Stage 2: Institution Submission.

4.2.1 Stage 1: Expression of Intent to Submit

The institution must provide an EIS. The EIS includes only provisional information to indicate to DEST the likely distribution of work across disciplines and Panels.

The EIS must comprise the following information for each intended Research Group:

- o Name;
- o RFCD Codes (up to three minimum 4-digit codes);
- o Indicative Home Panel;
- o Indication of any cross-disciplinarity (between Panels); and
- o Estimated number of assessed researchers.

As the EIS includes only provisional information, a Certification Statement is not required.

The institution must provide a completed EIS to DEST by 5pm AEDT, Thursday 31 January 2008.

4.2.2 Stage 2: Institution Submission

The institution must provide an Institution Submission which includes:

- a. the evidence portfolio for each Research Group (section 4.3); and
- b. eligible researcher information.

Detail on the format in which this data must be provided is specified in the *RQF Technical Specifications*.

(a) Evidence Portfolio for Each Research Group

The institution must report the names of submitted Research Groups. Each Research Group should have an evidence portfolio compiled in accordance with the specifications outlined in section 4.3.

(b) Eligible Researcher Information

The institution must report the number and FTE of eligible Level B and above researchers, as defined at section 2.1.

The institution must report the number of eligible Level B and above researchers, as defined at section 2.1, by gender and Indigenous status.

The institution is not required to report the number and FTE of eligible Level A researchers. This information will be derived from assessed researcher data.

This information will be used by DEST for statistical purposes only. For privacy reasons, gender and Indigenous status information required for eligible researchers will not be displayed to Panel Members and Advisors, and will not be reported at any aggregation less than institutional level.

4.3 The Evidence Portfolio

4.3.1 Overview

The institution must submit the following identifying information for each Research Group:

- a. Research Group Name;
- b. up to three (minimum 4-digit) RFCD codes;
- c. up to three (minimum 4-digit) SEO codes;
- d. Home Panel and (if relevant) secondary Panel(s);
- e. small group justification(s) if required (section 3.2); and
- f. Other Assessed Researcher justification(s) if required (section 2.2.1).

Further information on these requirements is outlined in section 4.3.2.

The evidence portfolio for the Research Group must comprise:

- a. the Context Statement;
- b. links to the 'best' Research Outputs for each assessed researcher in the Research Group where available in the repository, or other summary evidence of each Output where they are not;
- c. a list of all the fully-reported Research Outputs published during the assessment period for each assessed researcher in the Research Group;
- d. a list of any other Research Outputs published during the assessment period for each assessed researcher in the Research Group; and
- e. the Impact Statement (unless exempt under section 5.4).

Research Outputs that must be fully-reported and other Research Outputs that may be reported are defined in section 4.3.7. Fully-reported Research Outputs will be used for the development of one or more metrics for those disciplines where it is appropriate (section 6).

4.3.2 Components of the Evidence Portfolio

(a) Research Group Name

The institution must provide a name for each Research Group that is unique within an institution. For cross-institutional Research Groups, the name must be unique within the institutions involved.

(b) Up to three (minimum 4-digit) RFCD codes

The focus of the Research Group's research activities must be defined under discipline-level RFCD codes. The Research Group may nominate up to three separate RFCD codes, with a minimum 34 per cent share for its primary code and a minimum 20 per cent share for its secondary codes. The total for the RFCD codes must add up to 100 per cent.

If it is not possible to reflect accurately the Research Group's activities using discipline-level codes, the Research Group must use a division-level code (i.e., the 2-digit code), but ensure that four digits are entered in the Submission (e.g., 2700 for Biological Sciences).

(c) Up to three (minimum 4-digit) SEO codes

The focus of the Research Group's research activities must be defined under group-level SEO codes. The Research Group may nominate up to three separate SEO codes, with a minimum 34 per cent share for its primary code and a minimum 20 per cent share for its secondary codes. The total for the SEO codes must add up to 100 per cent.

If it is not possible to reflect accurately the Research Group's activities using group-level SEO codes, the Research Group must use either a subdivision code (e.g., 6700 for Manufacturing) or the 'other' group-level code (e.g., 7299 for Other Economic Issues).

(d) Home Panel and (if relevant) secondary Panel(s)

The institution must nominate a preferred Home Panel for each Research Group and any relevant secondary Panel(s). In the case of cross-disciplinary research (i.e., where the Research Group has listed an RFCD code with a weighting of 25 per cent or greater that refers to another Panel), the institution must nominate relevant secondary Panel(s) for the Research Group. Home Panels must consult any secondary Panel(s) nominated by the Research Group during the assessment process. Panel Chairs may move the Research Group to the Panel that is considered to be the most appropriate to assess the Research Group.

(e) Small group justification, where the Research Group has fewer than five researchers

See section 3.1 for further information.

(f) Other Assessed Researcher justification(s), where the Research Group includes Other Assessed Researchers

See section 2.2.1 for further information.

4.3.3 The Context Statement

The Context Statement allows the Research Group to inform Panel Members and Advisors of the Research Group's objectives, including the extent of any cross-disciplinary and national/international cross-institutional research and the standing of its researchers in its discipline. It assists with explaining the research environment and allows Research Groups to demonstrate how the research environment has contributed to the Research Group's quality.

The Context Statement comprises:

1. a Descriptive Component; and
2. Researcher Information.

4.3.3.1 DESCRIPTIVE COMPONENT

In making a case for the quality of its research, institutions may include information for each Research Group relevant to the assessment period under headings such as those outlined below, as considered appropriate by the institution, in the descriptive component of each Research Group's Context Statement:

- a. Statement of history, strategic focus and research objectives of the Group;
- b. Summary of main achievements of the Group;
- c. Extent of cohesion and collaboration, where it has occurred, within the Research Group;
- d. Collaborative research within the institution and the broader research environment (including the involvement of Institution Affiliates) and/or with researchers at other institutions or agencies (both within Australia and overseas);

- e. Support for ECRs and HDR Students, including how they have contributed to the research environment of the Research Group and how they have collaborated or assisted with the production of Research Outputs submitted by researchers in the Research Group;
- f. Esteem Factors; and
- g. Research Income, including HERDC Categories 1-4 Research Income and other income that supports the Research Group.

REPORTING RESEARCH INCOME

Categories 1-4 Research Income

Institutions may report research income for a Research Group received or awarded, in line with the definitions of categories 1-4 in the *Higher Education Research Data Collection Specifications*.

It is up to the institution to determine what Research Income will be included for each Research Group's Context Statement as long as the research income was received or awarded in the assessment period.

Institutions are not required to pro-rate or apportion research income between researchers where researchers other than those in the Research Group were recipients of research income.

The location of the researcher at the time of receiving or being awarded the research income does not affect the inclusion of the income, provided it was either received or awarded within the Assessment Period. This means that research income awarded or received while the researcher was not employed in an eligible institution is acceptable, provided the researcher meets the eligibility criteria.

Other Income that Supports the Research Group

Institutions may also include other income awarded or received that supports the Research Group but which does not comply with the definition of research, where it is considered useful for informing the quality assessment of the Research Group.

This may include income awarded from Australian Government, state and territory sources and from industry, private sector or community sources. Income may be reported in this category where it was received or awarded for a specific purpose related to an individual researcher in the Research Group or the Research Group as a whole. Further detail on income that supports the Research Group is provided in the Panel-Specific Guidance.

4.3.3.2 RESEARCHER INFORMATION

The following information is required for each researcher in the Research Group:

- Name;
- FTE (relevant to each Research Group);
- Researcher employment level;
- 'Best' Research Outputs;
- Other Assessed Researcher Status (if applicable);
- The researcher's fully-reported component of the body of work; and
- The researcher's other outputs in their body of work.

Detail on the format in which this data and the other data required for each researcher in the Research Group must be provided is specified in the *RQF Technical Specifications*.

4.3.4 Format for the Context Statement

The descriptive component of the Context Statement must be submitted in Portable Document Format (PDF). It should not exceed five pages, including tables and figures and must comply with the following format:

- A4 paper size;
- text in single column black type;
- 11 point font (references may be reproduced in at least 10 point font);
- at least a 2 cm margin on all edges;
- at least single line spacing; and
- contain no embedded links.

A highly legible font type should be used such as Arial, Courier, Helvetica, Times New Roman or Verdana. Variants such as mathematical typesetting languages may also be used.

Information may be presented in Tables and/or Figures. The Context Statement must not include any material for which the institution does not hold the copyright.

Additional information is outlined in the Panel-Specific Guidance and in the *RQF Technical Specifications*.

4.3.5 Four 'Best' Research Outputs

The evidence portfolio must include links to the four 'best' Research Outputs for each assessed researcher in the Research Group. It is up to the institution to determine, using whatever means it deems appropriate, what constitutes a 'best' Research Output.

4.3.5.1 INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED FOR EACH RESEARCH OUTPUT

The Research Group must provide the following information for each assessed researcher's 'best' Research Output:

1. Research Output type;
2. Full title of the output;
3. Full title of outlet in which the output appeared;
4. Nominating author;
5. All named authors, listed in the order in which they appear;
6. Year Published;
7. Year Available (if different from above);
8. 'Best' output justification;
9. Location in the institution's RQF repository (i.e., URL) or availability (if not in the institution's RQF repository); and
10. ISSN, ISBN or equivalent (if available).

Detail on the format in which this data must be provided is further specified in the *RQF Technical Specifications*.

Research Outputs submitted for a Quality rating are attributed to the Research Group to which the assessed researcher belongs at the Staff Census Date, notwithstanding where the researcher was employed at the time of publication.

The Research Group may provide additional publication information as appropriate to the discipline and the kind of Research Output. The form in which additional information should be provided is outlined in the *RQF Technical Specifications*.

4.3.6 Acceptable Research Outputs

For a Research Output to be included in the list of four 'best' Research Outputs and/or the body of work, it must meet the following eligibility criteria:

1. it must be research (as defined in section 1.6);
2. it must have been produced in an acceptable form (as defined in section 4.3.6.1);
3. it must have been published in the assessment period (as defined in section 4.3.6.2); and
4. it must be the published version (as defined in section 4.3.6.3).

4.3.6.1 ACCEPTABLE FORMS OF RESEARCH OUTPUTS

Acceptable forms of Research Outputs include 'traditional' and 'non-traditional' outputs, multi-authored outputs and outputs which may have contributions from Institution Affiliates, external collaborators or HDR students. Theses that have been submitted for HDR assessment are not acceptable Research Outputs. An indicative list of acceptable Research Output forms is outlined at section 7.7. This list is not designed to be exhaustive. Further detail on acceptable Research Outputs, as well as those outputs which may be included in the body of work, is provided in the Panel-Specific Guidance.

The location of the researcher at the time of publication does not affect the acceptability of a Research Output, provided the output was published within the Assessment Period and the researcher meets the eligibility criteria. This means that Research Outputs generated while the researcher was not employed in an eligible institution are acceptable.

4.3.6.2 DATE OF PUBLICATION

For a Research Output to be eligible for submission in the RQF, the Research Output must have been published or brought into the public domain (e.g., through exhibition or performance) within the assessment period. Institutions must be able to demonstrate that the Research Output has been published.

(a) The Date of Publication Rule

Publication of the Research Output must have occurred within the Assessment Period (i.e., between 1 January 2001 and 31 December 2006 (inclusive)). Outputs from 2000 and earlier are not eligible to be included as one of the 'best' four outputs.

The years of publication of a Research Output must appear on the output and/or in the information to be provided for each Research Output (section 4.3.5.1).

Where the actual date of publication differs from the listed date of publication, this variance should be explained. This explanation is only required for the four 'best' outputs and research outputs that must be 'fully reported' (section 4.3.7.1), not the other outputs listed in the body of work (section 4.3.7.2).

(b) Date of Publication Definition for Non-Traditional and Confidential Outputs

The Panel-Specific Guidance details the relevant publication date for 'non-traditional' outputs where applicable. However, it is necessary that this date, however derived, falls within the assessment period.

In the case of confidential or sensitive outputs (section 4.3.6.8), which may not be made public, the overarching definition of year of publication remains, namely the date of finalisation that is stated within or on the output or the associated information to be provided for each Research Output (section 4.3.5.1).

(c) Revisions

There may be some cases in which a Research Output was revised following the publication of the output (e.g., snapshots of publications on a website or a revised version of a computer programme). These outputs are only acceptable if the Research Group can demonstrate that the Research Output meets all the eligibility criteria.

The year of publication is normally the latest of the year indicated as published, printed or the year of copyright. Institutions should note that copyright dates or 'date last updated' which appear on web pages, do not typically refer to a publication included on that page. Web page dates should not be used as evidence of the year of publication.

(d) Reprints and Multiple Editions

Where there has been a reprint or new edition of a Research Output within the assessment period and both versions are included as 'best' outputs, the 'best' output justification attaching to the reprint or new edition must state how it has contributed substantially new research. The justification should include a reference to the other reprint or edition.

A reprint or edition that does not meet the definition of research is not eligible for inclusion as a 'best' output or other output in the body of work. The same principle applies to new compilations or exhibitions of creative works.

Where there have been multiple prints or editions within the assessment period, none of which constitute substantially more new research than the other, the researcher may decide which edition or print is to be submitted for assessment. The same principles applies to new compilations or exhibitions of creative works.

Institutions are responsible for ensuring that any revisions or reprints that occurred outside the assessment period are not included as a Research Output.

(e) Patents

The relevant date for Patents is the 'priority date' (i.e., the date at which the Patent was first lodged). The Research Group must include the patent's status and patent number in the 'best' output justification.

Institutions are responsible for ensuring that patents which are confidential or sensitive output are identified appropriately (section 4.3.6.8).

(f) Exceptions to the Date of Publication Rule

Where a Research Output was originally produced in a medium where no year of publication is stated within or on the output, a letter from an editor, conference organiser or publisher may be acceptable evidence to identify the year of publication. A letter cannot override a year of publication stated within the output.

There is no requirement for the letter to be attached, however the letter should be referred to in the 'best' output justification and retained by the institution. This explanation is only required for the four 'best' outputs, not the other outputs listed in the body of work (section 4.3.7).

Provided no other date exists within or on the Research Output, the date an output was 'presented' may be acceptable evidence of the year of publication (e.g., to a conference in the case of a conference paper, or to the commissioning agent in the case of a report).

4.3.6.3 PUBLISHED VERSION

The Research Output included in the four 'best' outputs must be the 'published version'.

The following versions of a Research Output are eligible for submission in the RQF:

1. Publisher-generated version for publication; or
2. Post-print (i.e., the final draft post-refereeing).

The following versions of a Research Output are not eligible for submission:

1. Unpublished / manuscript forms of a Research Output; or
2. Pre-print (before any peer review, refereeing or quality assurance process).

Variations as applicable are outlined in the Panel-Specific Guidance.

4.3.6.4 CO-AUTHORSHIP

Co-authored outputs may be submitted for assessment by all co-authors, and thus could be submitted by more than one institution and for more than one Research Group. The contribution to a co-authored Research Output will not be assessed solely on the basis of the order in which co-authors are listed, nor on the basis of any claimed contributions. Researchers can explain their contribution to the Research Output in the 'best' output justification, however Research Outputs must not be pro-rated between co-authors, nor between Research Groups or institutions.

A co-authored Research Output can be listed as a 'best' output by each co-author within a Research Group. For example, a Research Group of 10 researchers is required to include a total of 40 'best' outputs, but there may be fewer than 40 *unique* 'best' outputs if some of the outputs were co-authored, and the Research Group submitted an output by multiple co-authors in the Research Group.

4.3.6.5 'BEST' OUTPUT JUSTIFICATIONS

A justification for the choice by the assessed researcher of the four 'best' outputs should be provided in no more than 100 words for each Research Output. The 'best' output justification must not include an abstract or summary of the output.

Where two or more researchers in the one Research Group list the same Research Output, the institution may determine whether the 'best' output justification should be the same or differ for each researcher.

4.3.6.6 ACCESSIBILITY OF FOUR 'BEST' OUTPUTS

All 'best' outputs must be available for Assessment Panel and Advisor scrutiny for the period of the RQF assessment process. These Research Outputs must be stored in the institution's RQF repository wherever possible.

Where the institution or the researcher is the copyright owner, or where the copyright owner has given express permission for the Research

Output to be stored in an 'open access' repository, the Research Output should be stored in an 'open access' repository or an 'open access' part of the RQF repository. Institutions must not submit the actual Research Output.

The institution must certify that the Research Outputs are available for scrutiny during the period of assessment. The evidence portfolio must provide a stable link (i.e., a URL) directly to the Research Output (or stable links, if the Research Output is made up of multiple objects). The link must not refer to a metadata page. Further detail on this process is outlined in the *RQF Technical Specifications*.

Outputs may contain embedded links but Panel Members and Advisors will not access these links. Further detail is outlined in the *RQF Technical Specifications* (section 3.2.1).

There may be limited circumstances in which an output cannot be stored in the institution's RQF repository:

- o the copyright owner does not give permission for the Research Output to be stored in an institutional repository; and/or
- o reasons of sensitivity; and/or
- o physical or technical limitations of the output.

A statement of reasons must be provided where a Research Output must be viewed outside the institution's RQF repository for one or more of the reasons outlined above in the fields labelled 'Research Output How Made Available' and 'Research Output Non Repository Justification'. The statement must identify the conditions under which this output can be made available (i.e., to certain Panel Members, Advisors, under embargo, etc.).

Institutions are required to make the Research Output available within four working days of a request by an RQF Panel Chair or from DEST or for such other period as may be agreed to by the institution and DEST.

Additional information covering the process by which a Research Output can be made available will be provided with the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

4.3.6.7 MANAGING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS

Institutions must make all reasonable efforts to ensure that the copyright owner has given permission to store Research Outputs in an institution's RQF repository. This includes following the steps outlined at section 7.8. Where the copyright owner has not given permission for the Research Output to be stored in an institutional repository, the institution must provide a justification of:

- o why the output cannot be stored electronically; and
- o how the output can be provided to a Panel Member or Advisor without breaching the licence conditions for the output.

This justification must state that the steps outlined at section 7.8 have been taken.

In this case, the Research Output must be provided following the process outlined in section 4.3.6.9.

4.3.6.8 SENSITIVITY: CONFIDENTIAL OR SENSITIVE OUTPUTS

The institution is responsible for indicating the conditions in which it is both appropriate and inappropriate for these Research Outputs to be viewed. The sensitivity of the Research Output must be specifically identified.

DEST will treat Research Outputs based on the type of sensitivity assigned to the output by the institution. Any disclosure of the output that exceeds the terms allowed by the institution will be treated as unauthorised.

Sensitive Research Outputs may include, but are not limited to:

- o commercially sensitive Research Outputs;
- o Research Outputs for Government agencies that have not been released to the public; or
- o Research Outputs that are culturally sensitive.

The institution is responsible for identifying the nature of the sensitivity, the damage that may flow if sensitivity is not maintained or respected, and the conditions under which the Research Outputs may be assessed. DEST will regard such Research Outputs as having been submitted and received in confidence and will maintain the sensitivity of the output, unless otherwise required by law.

The institution is responsible for ensuring that any necessary permissions have been obtained from the organisation which commissioned the Research Output or from the researcher who conducted the research, as determined by the intellectual property arrangements in any commissioning contract or similar.

The institution is responsible for ensuring that the information submitted as part of a Research Group's evidence portfolio identifies the conditions in which it is inappropriate for a Panel Member to view a sensitive Research Output submitted by the Group. Further detail on this process is outlined in the *RQF Technical Specifications*.

Commercially Sensitive Research Outputs

A Research Output that is inherently confidential in nature may be submitted as part of the Research Group's evidence portfolio provided the necessary permissions have been obtained.

Culturally Sensitive Research Outputs

A Research Output that is culturally sensitive may be submitted as part of the Research Group's evidence portfolio provided the necessary permissions have been obtained.

Research for Government agencies that has not been released to the public

A Research Output that was produced for Government agencies but which has not yet been released to the public may be submitted as part of the Research Group's evidence portfolio, provided that all necessary permissions have been obtained. The report must have been produced in the assessment period even if not publicly released.

Australian Government Security Classified Research Outputs

A Research Output that includes information classified in line with the Australian *Protective Security Manual 2005* as either 'in-Confidence' or greater or 'Restricted' or greater may not be submitted as part of the Research Group's evidence portfolio.

4.3.6.9 MANAGING PHYSICAL, TECHNICAL OR LEGAL LIMITATIONS

A statement of reasons must be provided where a Research Output cannot be stored due to physical, technical or legal limitations of the institution's RQF repository. For example, it may be possible that an output cannot be physically stored in the repository, such as a sculpture or a book that was not provided in digital form.

The institution must identify the conditions under which this Research Output can be made available. Outlined below are suggested means by which the Research Output may be provided:

- o from an institution's library which has an agreement with another library (e.g., using inter-library loans, Document Delivery or equivalent processes, or the National Library of Australia);
- o from a personal loan from the author; or
- o by making the output available 'on site' to Panel Members at the Panel's or DEST's request.

Additional information covering the process by which a Research Output can be made available will be provided with the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

4.3.7 Body of Work for Researchers in the Research Group

The 'body of work' for all assessed researchers in the Research Group is an aggregated list of the Research Outputs produced by members of the Research Group over the assessment period, including the four 'best' outputs for each assessed researcher. This data will be collected on an assessed researcher basis, and collated by DEST. The format in which this data must be provided is specified in the *RQF Technical Specifications*.

The body of work includes Research Outputs that must be fully-reported, other Research Outputs that may be reported, and older research included for Impact Assessment.

Except for the application of the date of publication rule for older research included for Impact Assessment, each listed output must be an acceptable output as defined in section 4.3.6.

Sufficient information must be provided to enable the Panel to verify independently the existence of any Research Output listed in the body of work. There is no requirement for Research Outputs listed in the body of work to be made available for assessment.

At a minimum, the body of work must include the following information for each listed Research Output:

1. Research Output type;
2. Full title of the output;
3. Full title of outlet in which the output appeared;
4. All named authors, listed in the order in which they appear;
5. Year Published;
6. Year available (if different from above); and
7. ISSN, ISBN or equivalent (if available).

Additional information may be provided to assist with verifying the existence of the Research Output. The format in which this data must be provided is specified in the *RQF Technical Specifications*.

Confidential or sensitive Research Outputs should also be listed in the body of work, as long as their confidentiality or sensitivity does not prevent the disclosure of the title or existence of the Research Output.

4.3.7.1 RESEARCH OUTPUTS THAT MUST BE FULLY-REPORTED

Research Outputs that must be 'fully-reported' are outputs of a type that researchers must list in their entirety. These outputs will be used to derive one or more metrics for the Research Group where the Panel considers these relevant and appropriate. Further information is provided in the Panel-Specific Guidance.

This list of Research Outputs that must be fully-reported includes every acceptable Research Output that is produced by the Research Group as outlined in the Panel-Specific Guidance.¹¹

4.3.7.2 OTHER RESEARCH OUTPUTS THAT MAY BE REPORTED

Other outputs may be selectively listed for inclusion in the body of work. These outputs should include any forms of Research Outputs where it is considered by the Group to be relevant for the assessment of Research Quality. This section does not inform the calculation of metrics.

A sub-section of the body of work is provided for Research Outputs that were not published in the assessment period but have been included for the assessment of impact (section 5.2.4). This section does not inform the calculation of metrics.

4.3.7.3 BODY OF WORK WHERE A RESEARCHER IS IN TWO RESEARCH GROUPS

Where a researcher is in two Research Groups (sections 2.2.2 and 3.3), institutions must divide the researcher's Research Outputs, including the researcher's body of work, between those Research Groups. This means that the same Research Output cannot be listed for the researcher in the body of work for each Research Group although the Research Output may be listed by another researcher in the Research Group. All Research Outputs must still be reported as required above.

¹¹ These are typically Books, Book Chapters or Journal Articles or equivalent, as defined in accordance with the Higher Education Research Data Collection.

5. Quality and Impact

5.1 Quality Scale

The Quality Assessment of the Research Group is based on the following aspects of the evidence portfolio:

- o the Context Statement;
- o review of the 'best' four Research Outputs nominated by each researcher in the Research Group;
- o the body of work for all researchers in the Research Group; and
- o associated metrics.

Assessment Panels will report their assessments of Research Quality using the following five-point, criterion-referenced scale. The criteria for quality are intended to assess research that has a predominantly international focus as well as that which has a predominantly national focus or application. Further information will be provided in the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

| Rating | Description |
|--------|---|
| 5 | Research that is world leading in its field or makes an equally exceptional contribution in an area of particular significance to Australia. |
| 4 | Research that meets world standards of excellence in its field or makes an equally excellent contribution in an area of particular significance to Australia. |
| 3 | Research that is recognised internationally as excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour but which nonetheless falls short of the highest standards of excellence. |
| 2 | Research that is recognised as methodologically sound in its field and of high originality, significance and rigour. |
| 1 | Research that is deemed to fall below the standard of recognised quality work. |

5.2 Impact Statement

The Impact Assessment of the Research Group is based on an Impact Statement (including impact-related indicators).

5.2.1 Overview

The Impact Statement for the Research Group must include the following:

- o a statement of claims against generic and panel-specific impact criteria, including impact-related indicators (quantitative or other information) in support of those claims;
- o up to four case studies that illustrate the Research Group's claims of impact; and
- o where appropriate, details of end-users who may be contacted to support the Research Group's claims.

Institutions may provide information on research income as part of each Research Group's Context Statement. Where appropriate, the Research Group should refer to research income information that is relevant to Research Impact in the Impact Statement.

The Impact Statement can also include information additional to that in the Context Statement to assist Panel Members and Advisors to understand the strategic aims and objectives of the Research Group where this information is specifically relevant to the impact assessment.

Consistent with the assessment of the Quality of the Research Group, impact is attributed to the Research Group to which the assessed researcher belongs at the Staff Census Date, notwithstanding where the researcher was employed at the time of publication or when the impact occurred.

The Impact Statement is free text (i.e., graphs, tables, figures, etc., can be included). The Impact Statement must not exceed 10 pages in length, not including the end-user details. A template to assist with the compilation of the Impact Statement is available on the RQF website.

The Impact Statement must be submitted as a single Portable Document Format (PDF) file not exceeding 15 pages (10 pages for the Impact Statement and 5 pages for end-user details). It must comply with the following format:

- o A4 paper size;
- o text in single column black type;
- o 11 point font (references may be reproduced in at least 10 point font);
- o at least a 2 cm margin on all edges;
- o at least single line spacing; and
- o contain no embedded links.

The Research Group is required to ensure that no Australian Government Security Classified information is contained in the Impact Statement.

5.2.2 Conditions for Impact Assessment

For the Research Group to be eligible for an Impact rating, it must achieve a minimum Quality rating of "2", that is, the research of the Research Group must be recognised as methodologically sound in its field and of high originality, significance and rigour.

Research Groups that receive a Quality rating of "1" will have a published rating for Impact of 'Ineligible for Impact Assessment'.

Assessment Panels and Advisors will consider the impact of a Research Group as a whole and provide an Impact rating for the Research Group overall. The rating will not be determined by averaging out the ratings for individual case studies.

Further detail outlining how an Assessment Panel will arrive at Quality and Impact ratings will be outlined in the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

5.2.3 Basis and Timeframe for Impact Assessment

The Impact Statement must only refer to impact that occurred during the assessment period and be based on either:

- o the 'best' Research Outputs for the Research Group; and/or
- o body of work for researchers in the Research Group; and/or
- o an 'Older Research Output' produced by assessed researchers between 1 January 1995 and 31 December 2000.

5.2.4 Older Research Included for Impact Assessment

'Older Research Outputs' produced by assessed researchers between 1 January 1995 and 31 December 2000 may be submitted to inform the Impact Assessment provided that there is a demonstrated relationship between this output and either one of the 'best' Research Outputs or an output listed in the body of work.

A Research Output that is published prior to 1 January 1995, or which does not meet the definition of research, cannot be a basis for Impact Assessment.

Any Older Research Outputs referred to in the Impact Statement must be included in a sub-section of the body of work (section 4.3.7) entitled 'Older Research Included for Impact Assessment'.

At a minimum, the body of work must include the following information for each listed Older Research Output:

1. Research Output type;
2. Full title of the output;
3. Full title of outlet in which the output appeared;
4. All named authors, listed in the order in which they appear;
5. Year Published;
6. Year available (if different from above);

7. Statement of the link between the Older Research Output and Research Output(s) in the body of work (50 words); and
8. ISSN, ISBN or equivalent (if available).

Additional information may be provided to assist with verifying the existence of the Research Output. The format in which this data must be provided is specified in the *RQF Technical Specifications*.

5.2.5 Statement of claims

In its Impact Statement, the Research Group must provide a statement of claims against one or more of the following broad criteria with reference to its overall benefit:

- o demonstrated engagement with end-users, recognising the importance of the research to address a defined social, economic, environmental and/or cultural issue; and/or
- o demonstrated uptake of the research by the relevant end-users to generate new policies, products, processes, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks; and/or
- o how and to what extent the research has produced social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefits regionally, nationally and/or internationally.

While the Impact Statement should be structured to address the specific requirements of each rating descriptor for assessing impact (section 5.2.8), the Research Group must not self-rate its impact.

The Research Group should include identifiable and supportable impact-related indicators. This requires the Impact Statement to identify clearly the beneficiaries of the research and the way in which they have benefited. It is important to provide evidence in the Impact Statement that links the research of the Research Group to the benefit claimed.

Research Groups will not be assessed against prescriptive definitions of 'impact'. Rather, the statement of claims should identify the type of impacts and related benefits against which the Research Group nominates to be measured. All impact will be considered against standards appropriate for each discipline. It is therefore expected that all disciplines will be able to achieve top level ratings.

The Impact Statement must not include any material where the copyright owner has not given permission for its inclusion.

Further guidance on making a statement of claims for impact is provided in the Panel-Specific Guidance.

5.2.6 Case Studies

The Research Group may provide up to four case studies that demonstrate the level of impact achieved by its research. These case studies count towards the 10 page limit for the Impact Statement.

5.2.7 End-User details

The Research Group may include details of end-users who can be contacted by DEST to seek verification of its claims. The Research

Group should not seek end-user testimonials or assessments of impact, although prior to the assessment phase Research Groups should ensure that the end-users are aware that their details have been provided to DEST and have confirmed that they are willing to be contacted.

Where end-user details are provided, the Research Group must include the following details in an appendix to the Impact Statement:

- o Name;
- o Position;
- o Organisation;
- o Contact details;
- o Relationship with the Research Group; and
- o Any potential conflicts of interest.

Impact Statements should not assume that any nominated end-users will be contacted. This will occur only where the Panel requests DEST to contact the end-user(s).

End-user details must not exceed five pages and do not count towards the 10 page limit for the Impact Statement.

5.2.8 Impact Scale

The rating scale for assessing impact is outlined below. Further explanation and interpretation of each rating point is below.

| Rating | Description |
|--------|---|
| A | Adoption of the research has produced an outstanding social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefit for the wider community, regionally within Australia, nationally or internationally. |
| B | Adoption of the research has produced a significant social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefit for the wider community, regionally within Australia, nationally or internationally. |
| C | Research has been adopted to produce new policies, products, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks in the end-user community. |
| D | Research has engaged with the end-user community to address a social, economic, environmental and/or cultural issue, regionally within Australia, nationally or internationally. |
| E | Research has had limited or no identifiable social, economic, environmental and/or cultural outcome, regionally within Australia, nationally or internationally. |

Further information will be provided in the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

Impact Assessments will be conducted on all Research Groups for which an Impact Statement has been provided, regardless of the Quality rating. Where the Panel determines that the Quality rating for a Research Group is less than “2”, the Group will be rated as ‘Ineligible for Impact Assessment’.

5.3 Explaining Impact for the Purposes of the RQF

Research Impact relates to the benefits of research produced by institutions that extend beyond academe into the wider community. Research Impact does not, therefore, relate to academic citations, academic research income, or markers of academic esteem. Members of the academic community may be considered to be end-users in some cases, for example, those cases where impact is based on research into higher education teaching practices, mediated through applied research or other forms of activities or outputs. In these cases the impact being claimed must be clearly related to the original research of the Research Group.

5.3.1 Domains of Research Impact

Research Impact can be demonstrated across four broad impact domains:

- **Social Benefit** - Adding to the social capital of the nation. For example, improving people’s health and quality of life; stimulating new approaches to social issues; changes in community attitudes; influence upon developments or questions in society at large; informed public debate and improved policy-making; enhancing the knowledge and understanding of the nation; improved equity; improvements in health, safety and security; improved social attachment; and improvements in the level and security of political rights.
- **Economic Benefit** - Adding to the economic capital of the nation. For example, improved productivity; adding to economic growth and wealth creation; enhancing the skills base; increased employment; reduced costs; increased innovation capability and global competitiveness; improvements in service delivery; as well as unquantified economic returns resulting from social and public policy adjustments.
- **Environmental Benefit** - Adding to the natural capital of the nation. For example, improvements in environment and lifestyle; reduced waste and pollution; improved management of natural resources; reduced consumption of fossil fuels; uptake of recycling techniques; reduced environmental risk; preservation initiatives; conservation of biodiversity; enhancement of ecosystem services; improved plant and animal varieties; and adaptation to climate change.
- **Cultural Benefit** - Adding to the cultural capital of the nation. For example, supporting greater understanding of where we have come from, and who and what we are as a nation and society; understanding how we relate to other societies and cultures; stimulating creativity within the community; contributing to cultural preservation and enrichment; and bringing new ideas and new modes of experience to the nation.

This list is not exhaustive or mutually exclusive and Research Groups are encouraged to identify other impacts relevant to their area or discipline. The impact domains are intended to provide prompts or starting points for Research Groups who are writing their Impact Statements. It will also be used to assist Assessment Panels and Advisors when assessing Impact Statements.

While it may be possible for Research Groups to demonstrate Research Impact across the four domains, this is not a requirement. High impact research may be demonstrated in one very specific field and may occur at the local or regional level as well as the national or international level.

Many of these benefits could be achieved in a variety of different ways. Often, impact will be achieved by directly affecting professionals and practitioners in the research area. In this case, Research Groups should consider the high-level outcomes desired in their own sector. These could include improved quality of products/services, cost-effectiveness, customer satisfaction, lives saved or productivity.

In other instances, Research Groups could achieve an impact through policy changes. Policy impact may be demonstrated throughout all four domains of impact and may be broader than its effect on government. Policy impacts can also include changes to policies of corporations, councils, professional groups and non-government organisations.

5.3.2 Linking the Impact Claimed to the Research of the Group

Research Groups must demonstrate the link between the original research and the impact being claimed. In many instances the research will be mediated through outputs other than the original Research Output. For example, it may often be the case that research reaches the end-user through pamphlets, textbooks, training seminars with industry or speeches given at practitioner conferences. In these circumstances, Research Groups should provide a clear reference to these outputs in their Impact Statement sufficient for their existence to be verified.

The Research Groups must make clear that these additional Research Outputs are based on their original research. Without evidence of these impact-related outputs, Assessment Panels and Advisors may find it difficult to identify the link between the original research and the final impact claimed.

Research Groups should also identify clearly the beneficiaries of the research and the way in which they have benefited. It is important to provide evidence that links the research of the Research Group to the claimed benefit.

Assessment Panels and Advisors will look for evidence of methods for supporting their impact. Research Groups should attempt to show a systematic approach to disseminating research and encouraging end-users to adopt research findings. This could include evidence of relationships and systematic interactions with end-users and end-user organisations. Further information on the assessment of impact will be provided in the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

5.3.3 Interpreting the Ratings

| Rating | Description |
|--------|---|
| D | Research has engaged with the end-user community to address social, economic, environmental and/or cultural issues, regionally within Australia, nationally or internationally. |

The 'D' rating represents the entry level of Research Impact and is broadly referred to as engagement. This is where Research Groups have actively engaged with end-users as they disseminate the outcomes of their research.

This rating would be appropriate where this engagement did not, or had not yet, led to the research being adopted through new products being created or new policies, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks adopted. A 'D' rating does not necessarily mean that the Research Group did not have a significant impact on society. In many cases, D level impact may be a first step to higher-level impact, which could be recognised in future RQF cycles.

Examples:¹²

- The research has led to the creation of, or is part of a Cooperative Research Centre (CRC), as this shows engagement with industry.
- Research into the genesis of mineral deposits, directly funded by industry and presented to industry through seminars, forums and industry publications.
- Research conducted to improve occupational health and safety (OH&S) in the workplace in collaboration with industry. Industry provided the funding and real examples of OH&S case studies. Recommendations have been examined by OH&S departments of the industry sponsors, but have not been adopted.
- Research conducted on the development of fundamental motor skills for primary school students. The results were presented to primary school physical education teachers and curriculum boards as the Research Group conducted clinics throughout Australia.

| Rating | Description |
|--------|---|
| C | Research has been adopted to produce new policies, products, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks in the end-user community. |

The 'C' rating represents actual adoption of the research by end-users. This rating is distinct from engagement as end-users are already familiar with the research, how it can address particular issues and the end-users have deliberately chosen to implement it. This adoption can

¹² All examples in this section are indicative only and should not be taken to restrict a Panel's consideration of the evidence before them.

be demonstrated in a number of ways including new policies, practices or legislation, changed attitudes, behaviours or outlooks, and new products, programmes, etc.

In the case of a research finding used to teach students, the end-users are the teachers, schools and curriculum boards (e.g. schools, the VET sector or universities). The decision to use the new research is evidence of the adoption required to achieve a rating of 'C'. Adoption of research by the VET sector can show successful transfer and adoption of new innovations to firms and industries and practitioners.

A rating of 'C' would be awarded where these policies, products, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks did not, or had not yet, led to a significant or outstanding benefit.

Examples:

- o Research into the genesis of mineral deposits adopted by the industry in their mineral exploration projects.
- o Research conducted to improve OH&S in the workplace in collaboration with industry. Industry provided the funding and real examples of OH&S case studies. Recommendations were implemented by the industry and/or government.
- o A new method in electrotechnology being taught in universities or the VET sector.
- o Research conducted on the development of fundamental motor skills for primary school students. As a result of clinics for physical education teachers, a number of schools incorporated the research into their physical education programme.

| Rating | Description |
|--------|---|
| A | Adoption of the research has produced an outstanding social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefit for the wider community, regionally within Australia, nationally or internationally. |
| B | Adoption of the research has produced a significant social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefit for the wider community, regionally within Australia, nationally or internationally. |

The 'B' and 'A' ratings represent the social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefit for the wider community as a result of the research having been adopted. Generally, this benefit will have accrued because of the new policies, products, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks which the research has produced (see Rating 'C', above). To receive a 'B' or an 'A', the Impact Statement must show how the policy, product, attitude, behaviour, etc., actually benefited the wider community. This would include identifying the beneficiaries and the benefit; and explaining how the research has led to the claimed benefit.

The difference between rating 'B' and rating 'A' is one of degree, rather than a substantive difference. It is expected that the 'A' rating will only be awarded in limited cases in relation to the highest Research Impact.

Examples:

- Research into the genesis of mineral deposits adopted by the industry in mineral exploration projects resulting in a more focused mineral exploration, thus creating the best chance for a mineral discovery, reduce exploration risk, prevent wasteful spending on less scientific targets and increase spending on the scientifically best-justified targets. Achievement of an 'A' rating would require significant economic benefits for the involved company.
- Research conducted on ways to improve OH&S in the workplace in collaboration with industry. Industry provided the funding and real examples of OH&S case studies. Recommendations were implemented by the industry and/or government, and employers reported a reduced incidence of accidents and work-induced illness, resulting in increased productivity, performance and morale.
- Research conducted on the development of fundamental motor skills for primary school students. The programme is picked up at a state or national level and feedback from physical education teachers shows that students' motor skills have improved over the period of implementation, resulting in higher levels of physical activity amongst students.

5.4 Exemption from Impact Assessment

In some cases, the research orientation, the discipline and/or the stage of development of the research may mean that the institution considers that it is not appropriate for the Research Group to be assessed for Research Impact. In these cases, the Research Group may be exempt from Impact Assessment.

The Research Group's exemption from Impact Assessment must indicate why the Research Group is claiming an exemption using one of the following:

- the research conducted by the Research Group is too new to have had any identifiable or verifiable impact;
- the sole intent of the research conducted by the Research Group is the advancement of knowledge in the discipline; and/or
- the research conducted by the Research Group takes longer than 12 years from publication to lead to an identifiable or verifiable impact.

Research Groups submitting an exemption from Impact Assessment will have 'Not Assessed' for impact publicly reported for their Research Group.

6. METRICS

The following quantitative measures may be used in the RQF assessment process:

1. Ranked Research Outlets; and
2. Citation Data.

Where appropriate, metrics will be used to supplement the expert review process. They provide additional indicators of the quality of a Research Group. They will not be combined or weighted in any formulaic way to obtain a single quantitative rating. These quantitative measures will be applied on a discipline-specific basis.

The metrics methodology takes into account the fact that members of Research Groups may publish in journals which fall outside the 'core' discipline of the Group.

All fully-reported Research Outputs listed in the body work which appear in any discipline-specific outlet ranking will be ranked according to the list relevant to the discipline, regardless of the Assessment Panel to which the Research Group has been assigned.

All fully-reported Research Outputs listed in the body of work which appear in journals indexed by the citation database supplier will be used for citation analysis, regardless of the discipline to which the journal is assigned.

DEST will provide the metrics to the Assessment Panel to which the Research Group is assigned. The Assessment Panel will determine how metrics will be used in the assessment process. Further detail on how metrics will be used in the assessment will be provided in the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

For example, a Research Group that includes environmental sciences as one of its RFCD codes may list Research Outputs which sit within the chemistry and biological sciences journal sets. Relevant rankings and citation benchmarks will be drawn from chemistry and biological sciences for relevant Research Outputs. A Research Group in business psychology may list Research Outputs that sit within the business and psychology journal sets. Where the Research Group is assessed by Panel 8, both ranking and citation metrics will be used. If the Home Panel assessing the Research Group is Panel 10, then citation analysis will not be used for assessment.

Further detail on how metrics will be used in the assessment will be provided in the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

6.1 Ranked Outlets

A research 'Outlet' refers to the avenues in which an output appears, such as journal name, book publisher, theatre, art gallery, etc. A Research 'Output' refers to the individual journal articles, book

chapters, artistic performances, films, etc., that are contained in a Research Group's body of work.

Research outlets will be classified into four tiers. The percentage distribution for each of the tiers may vary slightly across disciplines. Tiers will have the following approximate percentage distributions: Tier A* ('top 5%'), Tier A ('next 15%'), Tier B ('next 30%') and Tier C ('bottom 50%').

DEST will sort ranked outlets for each Research Group's fully-reported outputs, distributing them across the four tiers according to the rankings developed through sector consultation at the discipline level. DEST will provide a summary table to Panels showing the number and distribution of publications across tiers for each Research Group being assessed by that Panel.

Research Groups should refer to the Ranked Outlets List for their discipline, which will be provided with the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

6.2 Citation Data

The RQF uses Standard Bibliometric measures based on indexed journal literature which will be provided by a commercial citation database supplier. The two standard measures to be used in the RQF are:

1. citations per publication; and
2. the centile distribution of the Research Group's Research Outputs.

Further information on which disciplines will use Standard Bibliometrics is provided in the Panel-Specific Guidance.

6.2.1 Citations Per Publication

DEST will analyse the fully-reported component of the body of work for each Research Group, obtaining total publication and citation counts using the citation database supplier. A citation per publication rate will also be calculated for each fully-reported component of the body of work.

DEST will provide this data in summary form to Panel Members and Advisors together with relevant world and Australian benchmark data for the Research Group.

6.2.2 Centile Distribution of the Research Group's Output

DEST will analyse the relevant outputs from the fully-reported component of the body of work for each Research Group, using the citation database supplier to obtain a distribution of these outputs across centile bands. This will show the number and proportion of each Research Group's Research Outputs in the body of work that are judged to be among the top 1%, 10%, 20% and 50% most highly cited publications for its discipline in any given year.

The benchmark data on which this analysis is based will be obtained from the citation database supplier. Further information on this process will be provided with the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

7. OTHER MATTERS

7.1 Certification of the Institution Submission

The institution is responsible for collecting, validating and transmitting all information in each evidence portfolio by the due date of the Submission.

The Vice-Chancellor, or institutional equivalent, is required to provide a Certification Statement for the Institution Submission. No part of the Institution Submission is eligible for assessment without a signed Certification Statement.

The Vice-Chancellor, or institutional equivalent, is required to certify that:

- all assessed researchers are eligible or have requested and been granted an eligibility exemption by DEST;
- no Research Outputs stored in the institution's RQF repository for inclusion in the RQF infringe the owner's copyright;
- where the institution or a researcher in the institution owns the copyright for a Research Output, DEST is granted a royalty-free site licence for the storing, communicating, linking to and/or copying of this output for the purposes of the RQF for the purposes of the RQF;
- the institution gives an express licence to DEST for the use of material submitted as part of the RQF;
- the institution has complied with relevant privacy requirements and all individuals named in evidence portfolios or elsewhere in the submission are aware of this and of the uses to which DEST may put this information (including provision to the Assessment Panels and Moderation Panel);
- the institution acknowledges that the final ratings for Quality and Impact for each submitted Research Group will be published and that some or all of the evidence portfolios may be published by DEST with the institution's consent; and
- the institution acknowledges and agrees that all information in the Submission may be used for policy development and programme management other than for the purposes of the RQF, from time to time as required, within DEST.

The Vice-Chancellor, or institutional equivalent, is also required to indicate that they have made all reasonable efforts to verify that the information submitted as part of the Institution Submission and the evidence portfolios is correct and has been compiled in accordance with these Specifications.

A proforma Certification Statement will be provided to institutions. The submission must be certified through the RQF Information Management System (IMS) no later than 5pm AEST, Wednesday 30 April 2008. The hard-copy signed Certification Statement must arrive at DEST no later than 5pm AEST, Wednesday 7 May 2008.

The Department will accept a late Certification Statement only in exceptional circumstances considered by DEST to be beyond the control of the institution, which includes where a Certification Statement is late due solely to mishandling by DEST.

An institution must provide any evidence requested by DEST to support its claim that failure to meet the deadline was for reasons beyond its control. DEST reserves the right whether or not to seek such further evidence.

Evidence which may be considered includes proof of submission or posting of the Certification Statement which clearly shows the time and date of submission or posting. DEST's decision, with respect to consideration of late submission or posting, will be final. No correspondence will be entered into in relation to the decision other than to inform the institution of the decision.

7.2 Incomplete, False or Misleading Information

Providing false or misleading information is a serious offence.

If DEST considers that any information provided by an institution, either as part of the Institution Submission or an evidence portfolio, is incomplete, inaccurate or contains false or misleading information, DEST may in its absolute discretion decide not to provide this information to Chairs, Panel Members or Advisors for consideration.

If an institution and/or researcher submitted or assessed as part of the RQF provides DEST incomplete, unsatisfactory, inaccurate, or misleading information in relation to any part of the RQF, DEST may in its absolute discretion decide to not provide this information to Chairs, Panel Members or Advisors for consideration.

If it appears that any institution or person knowingly has provided false or misleading information, or knowingly has omitted any matter or thing without which the information is misleading, or it appears that any other criminal offence may have been committed, DEST may investigate the matter with a view to prosecution under Commonwealth criminal law. The Commonwealth is committed to protecting its revenue, expenditure and property from any attempt, by members of the public, contractors, sub-contractors, agents, intermediaries or its own employees, to gain financial or other benefits by deceit.

Examples of misleading information and misconduct include, but are not restricted to:

1. providing, in whole or in part, fictitious evidence portfolios;
2. making false claims in lists of Research Outputs;
3. failing to disclose to DEST the existence, and nature of, actual or potential conflicts of interest of any of the parties involved in information provided to DEST (such as any affiliations or financial interest in any organisation that has a direct interest in the matter or outputs of the project); or
4. submitting forged documentation.

7.3 Privacy Complaints and Advice

DEST is bound, in administering the RQF, by the provisions of the *Privacy Act 1988* ('Privacy Act'). Section 14 of the Privacy Act contains the Information Privacy Principles (IPPs) which prescribe the rules for handling personal information. In brief, the IPPs require that:

- o personal information is collected in accordance with IPPs 1-3;
- o suitable storage arrangements, including appropriate filing procedures, are in place;
- o suitable security arrangements exist for all records containing personal information;
- o access to a person's own personal information held by an organisation is made available to the person at no charge;
- o records are accurate, up-to-date, complete and not misleading;
- o where a record is found to be inaccurate, the correction is made;
- o where a person requests that a record be amended because it is inaccurate, but the record is found to be accurate, the details of the request for amendment are noted on the record;
- o the personal information is only to be used for the purposes for which it was collected, or for other purposes where expressly allowed by IPP 10; and

Complaints about breaches of privacy should be referred to:

Privacy Contact Officer
Litigation and External Review Section
Procurement, Assurance and Legal Group
GPO Box 9880
Canberra ACT 2601.

Privacy complaints may also be emailed to privacy@dest.gov.au.

Privacy complaints can be made directly to the Federal Privacy Commissioner, however the Federal Privacy Commissioner prefers that DEST be given an opportunity to deal with the complaint in the first instance.

7.4 Freedom of Information

All documents sent to DEST with regards to the RQF are subject to the *Freedom of Information Act 1982* ('FOI Act'). Unless a document falls under an exemption provision, it will be made available to the general public if requested under the FOI Act. Decisions regarding requests for access will be made by DEST's authorised FOI decision-maker in accordance with the requirements of the FOI Act.

7.5 Intellectual Property

DEST does not claim ownership of any intellectual property submitted by an institution as part of a Submission for the RQF, however institutions are required to give an express licence to DEST for the use of material submitted as part of the RQF for the purposes of the RQF.

Except where permissions have been sought and obtained by DEST from copyright owners or other mechanisms (section 7.8), each institution is required to have obtained a licence or licences sufficient to store Research Outputs in institutional repositories and to allow Chairs, Panel Members or Advisors to evaluate Research Outputs provided for the purposes of the RQF, except in situations covered in section 4.3.6.9.

The institution must make all best efforts at ensuring that it has copyright permission to store Research Outputs in institutional repositories.

Where this information contains sensitivities that may be managed under the provisions of section 4.3.6.8 (Managing Reasons of Sensitivity), it is the responsibility of the institution to ensure that this is indicated in the institution submission.

DEST retains the intellectual property in all materials created by DEST, Chairs, Panel Members or Advisors in the process for assessing Research Groups in the RQF.

7.6 Contact Details

Queries concerning the RQF and these specifications should be directed to:

rqf@dest.gov.au

Please include your name, institution and contact details in your query.

The Department maintains a website which contains all documentation relating to the RQF. See:

www.dest.gov.au/research/rqf

7.7 Acceptable Research Outputs

Research Outputs are broadly defined as any form of assessable output embodying research as defined for the RQF. Research Outputs generally should be publicly available. Research Outputs that are not publicly available may be submitted as long as they meet the criteria outlined at section 4.3.6.8.

The institution must verify that the submitted Research Outputs meet the definition of research for the purposes of the RQF. Additional information regarding Research Outputs is provided in the Panel-Specific Guidance.

Subject to the requirements of these Specifications, the following list gives an indication of Research Outputs that may be acceptable for the RQF:

- o Books (Authored Research, Edited, Revision or New Edition)
- o Book Chapters
- o Journal Articles (Refereed, Scholarly Journal, Other Contributions to Scholarly Reviewed Journal, Non-Refereed Articles, Letters or Notes)
- o Reviews

- Conference Publications (Refereed, Non-Refereed, Extracts of Paper)
- Edited Volumes of Conference Proceedings
- Audio-Visual Recordings
- Computer Software, Databases
- Technical Drawings, Designs or Working Models
- Design Exhibitions or Awards
- Patents or Plant Breeding Rights
- Major Exhibitions, Written or Recorded Works, Exhibitions of Original Art, Representations of Original Art
- Recorded Major Original Creative Works
- Research Reports - Commissioned by Government, Industry or Other
- Technical Reports
- Legal Cases
- Entries in a Dictionary/Encyclopaedia
- Maps
- Newspaper or Magazine Articles
- Translations
- New Media Outputs

7.8 Managing Copyright in Research Outputs

The RQF is affected by the *Copyright Act 1968* ('the Copyright Act') at two key points:

1. the process of 'storing' Research Outputs, whether in the institution's RQF repository or through any form of linking or copying; and
2. the storing of Research Outputs in institutional repositories and subsequently enabling Chairs, Panel Members or Advisors to view and assess Research Outputs, through the RQF IMS and institutions' RQF repositories.

When storing and/or copying Research Outputs and creating links to these outputs, institutions are required to ensure that permission has been granted by the copyright owner to make the Research Output available to Chairs, Panel Members or Advisors for the purposes of the RQF.

The permission must relate to the version of the Research Output that is submitted and which meets the definition of 'published' as outlined in section 4.3.6.3. Licences or permissions to store, communicate, link to, and/or copy a version of the Research Output that do not meet this definition are not sufficient for the purposes of the RQF.

Institutions must ensure that they have not infringed the rights of the copyright owners of the Research Outputs submitted for the purposes of the RQF.

Where the institution or the researcher is the copyright owner, or where the copyright owner has given express permission for the Research

Output to be stored in an 'open access' repository, the Research Output should be stored in an 'open access' repository or an 'open access' part of the RQF repository. In these cases, permissions are not required to provide for the Research Output to be stored in an 'open access' repository.

The Vice-Chancellor's Certification Statement requires that all copyright clearances and/or steps taken below have been obtained prior to the Institution Submission cut-off date.

7.8.1 Agreements Allowing the Use of Outputs for the RQF

Institutions or researchers who hold the copyright for Research Outputs that are submitted as part of the RQF do so on the condition that they grant a royalty-free site licence to DEST for the storing, communicating, linking to and/or copying of this output for the purposes of the RQF.

The Vice-Chancellors' Certification Statement also states that no Research Outputs may be stored in the institution's RQF repository for inclusion in the RQF which infringe the owner's copyright. If an institution or researcher has a licence to use a Research Output that is not broad enough to allow the Research Output to be stored, communicated, linked to and/or copied for the purposes of the RQF, then the institution must ensure they have permission from the copyright owner for the output to be stored, communicated, linked to and/or copied for the purposes of the RQF.

With the Council of Australian University Librarians (CAUL), and assisted by the Open Access to Knowledge Law Project (OAKLAW) and Universities Australia (UA), DEST has conducted a process for arranging for copyright owners to allow the storage, communication, linking to and/or copying of Research Outputs for the purposes of the RQF. Following this process, CAUL and DEST have negotiated with publishers to obtain agreement to store, communicate, link to and/or copy Research Outputs in the institution's RQF repository for the purposes of the RQF. These publishers will not seek remuneration from DEST or any institution for the use of these Research Outputs for the purposes of the RQF.

This also means that institutions and researchers whose Research Outputs are covered by the publishers identified above are not required to obtain specific approval to store, communicate, link to and/or copy Research Outputs in the institution's RQF repository for the purposes of the RQF. The publishers are listed on the RQF website.

DEST is arranging for a process to allow the use of Research Outputs not covered through the publishers listed on the RQF website to be stored, communicated, linked to and/or copied for the purposes of the RQF. The application of the outcomes of this process to the RQF will be outlined on the RQF website.

7.8.2 Copyright Checklist for the Use of Outputs for the RQF

A checklist will be provided on the RQF website to assist researchers and institutions ensure that they have appropriate permission for the use of their Research Outputs in the RQF and the storage of those outputs in their institution's RQF repository.

APPENDICES

A. PANEL-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE

1. BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
2. PHYSICAL, CHEMICAL AND EARTH SCIENCES
3. ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY
4. MATHEMATICAL AND INFORMATION SCIENCES AND TECHNOLOGY
5. AGRICULTURAL, VETERINARY, FOOD AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
6. CLINICAL SCIENCES AND CLINICAL PHYSIOLOGY
7. PUBLIC HEALTH AND HEALTH SERVICES
8. PSYCHOLOGY, PSYCHIATRY, NEUROLOGICAL, BEHAVIOURAL AND COGNITIVE SCIENCES
9. SOCIAL SCIENCES AND POLITICS
10. ECONOMICS, COMMERCE AND MANAGEMENT
11. LAW, EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES
12. HUMANITIES
13. CREATIVE ARTS, DESIGN AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

B. RQF ASSESSMENT PANELS BY RFCD CODE

C. LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A: Panel-Specific Guidance

Purpose

The purpose of the Panel-Specific Guidance is to assist institutions and Research Groups when preparing their evidence portfolios for the RQF. The Panel-Specific Guidance provides information for institutions on the following requirements outlined in the *RQF Submission Specifications* above:

1. The Context Statement (section 4.3.3);
2. Acceptable Forms of Research Outputs (section 4.3.6.1);
3. Date of Publication (section 4.3.6.2);
4. Published Version (section 4.3.6.3);
5. Body of Work for Researchers in the Research Group (section 4.3.7);
6. Statement of Claims for Impact (section 5.2);
7. Linking the Impact Claimed to the Research of the Group (section 5.3.2); and
8. Metrics (section 6).

Guidance is included on each of these topics only where there is material additional to what has been outlined in the *RQF Submission Specifications* above. The examples used for each Panel are not exhaustive or necessarily confined to any designated Panel.

The Panel-Specific Guidance has drawn on examples provided through consultation with the RQF Reference Committee, as well as a series of discipline workshops involving 120 sector representatives, two rounds of consultation with institutions the Learned Academies, university cohort groups, Panel Chairs, the Australian Research Council, the National Health and Medical Research Council, the Council of Australian Postgraduate Associations and the National Tertiary Education Union.

Application of Panel-Specific Guidance to Research Groups

Where a Research Group identifies a secondary Panel it should take into account the Panel-Specific Guidance for the Home and the secondary Panel. This is relevant to determining which Research Outputs are fully-reported in the body of work and which will therefore have metrics derived from them. Metrics will be derived according to the requirements for both Panels.

Research Groups should be aware that Panel Chairs may reassign a Research Group's Home Panel and/or secondary Panel(s) (as outlined in section 3.5 of the *RQF Submission Specifications* above). In such cases, the fully-reported component of the Panel-Specific Guidance (for the Panel(s) to which the Research Group has been reassigned) will apply.

1. BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Panel 1 – Biological Sciences consists of nine disciplines, including:

Biochemistry and Cell Biology;

Genetics;

Microbiology;

Botany;

Zoology;

Physiology;

Ecology and Evolution;

Biotechnology; and

Other Biological Sciences.

1.1 The Context Statement

In making a case for the quality of their research, Research Groups may include information relevant to the assessment period under headings such as those outlined below in the descriptive component of the Context Statement.

Research Groups should only provide information under these headings where they consider it appropriate to articulate the quality of their research.

Statement of History, Strategic Focus, and Research Objectives of the Group

In making a case for the quality of the research environment in the Biological Sciences, Research Groups may include information on research infrastructure and facilities along with other aspects of research structure and research strategy.

Summary of Main Achievements of the Research Group

Main achievements reported by Research Groups could include but not be limited to:

- contributions to the advancement of knowledge;
- contributions to policy and practice;
- peer reviewed publications;
- competitive grant or industry funding success; and/or
- HDR student completions and destinations.

Extent of Cohesion and Collaboration, where it has occurred, within the Research Group

No panel-specific guidance.

Collaborative Research within the Institution and/or with Researchers at Other Institutions or Agencies

Demonstration of collaborative research could include but not be limited to:

- research networks;
- formal linkage programmes/joint ventures;
- exchange visits;
- strategic alliances;
- joint research grants;
- co-authorship;
- joint appointments; and/or
- co-supervision of HDR students.

Support for ECRs and HDR Students

Demonstration of support for ECRs and HDR students could include but not be limited to:

- funding and other support specific to HDR students and ECRs;
- integration of HDR students and ECRs into the work of the Research Group (including through funded research projects);
- courses and workshops;
- national and international exchanges;
- support for skills development (e.g., entrepreneurship, leadership, business, research management);
- working groups on critical issues for ECRs and HDR students;
- support for conference attendance and participation;
- mentoring; and/or
- support for publishing, including co-authorship.

Esteem Factors

Demonstration of peer recognition of Research Quality could include but not be limited to:

- presentation of keynote addresses at national and international conferences;
- membership of review panels on prestigious grant applications;
- prestigious national and international awards and prizes;
- editorial and refereeing service for prestigious national and international journals/publishers;
- election to learned societies; and/or
- appointments to relevant national or international organisations, committees and research councils.

Other income that supports the Research Group

Other income that supports the Research Group, including research infrastructure and facilities could include but not be limited to:

- *Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities* (LIEF) grants;
- grants from community organisations (e.g., LandCare);
- patent royalties;
- professional consulting;
- industry funding not included elsewhere; and/or
- venture capital and commercialisation.

1.2 Acceptable Types of Research Outputs - Four 'Best'

There are no restrictions on the types of Research Output that may be included in the four 'best' provided that they meet the eligibility criteria for Acceptable Research Outputs.

It is likely that most Research Outputs submitted to the Biological Sciences Panel will be Journal Articles.¹³

Other types of Research Outputs will be accepted. Research Output type will not, of itself, determine the assessment of Research Quality. In addition to the four HERDC categories, types of Research Outputs not collected through HERDC such as Patents, keynote addresses, Databases and Research Reports can all be submitted in the four 'best' Research Outputs.

Where Patents are submitted as one of the four 'best', Research Groups must provide details of the underlying research and scientific methodology relating to that Patent in the 'best output justification'.

While bio-informatic databases, in and of themselves, do not fall within the definition of research used for the purposes of the RQF, they are considered acceptable outputs where their content involved research. Research derived from analysis and interpretation of Bio-informatic Databases is also acceptable.

1.3 Date of Publication

No panel-specific guidance.

1.4 Published Version

No panel-specific guidance.

¹³ Types of Research Outputs listed both here and in the body of work for Researchers in the Research Group are defined in accordance with the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC).

1.5 'Body of Work' for Researchers in the Research Group

All Research Outputs published in the assessment period in the following categories must be 'fully-reported' in the body of work for Research Groups in Panel 1:

- Journal Articles.

These outputs will be used to derive one or more metrics for the Research Group where the Panel considers these relevant and appropriate.

Research Groups may selectively list other Research Outputs published in the assessment period if they consider them relevant for the assessment of Research Quality. These Research Outputs will not inform the calculation of metrics. Selectively listed Research Outputs could include but not be limited to:

- Books;
- Book Chapters;
- Conference Publications;
- Computer Software and Databases;
- Research Reports;
- Patents; and
- Plant Breeders' Rights.

All Research Outputs included in the four 'best' are in the body of work and receive the same treatment for metrics as the remainder of the Research Outputs in the body of work. Only Journal Articles will inform the calculation of metrics.

1.6 Statement of Claims for Impact

The following guidance on making a statement of claims for impact provides some examples of the types of impacts and related benefits against which a Research Group might nominate to be assessed. These examples are intended as a guide only and should not be read as either mutually exclusive or exhaustive.

Demonstrated engagement with end-users, recognising the importance of the research to address a defined social, economic, environmental and/or cultural issue:

- involvement in community/end-user initiated projects or programmes;
- engagement with industry in collaborative projects funded partly or entirely by industry partners;
- involvement in international or developing world projects or aid programmes;
- communication of research to a wider national and/or international audience through public lectures and/or media;
- involvement in CRC programmes, ARC Linkage projects, and/or other commercialisation schemes; and/or
- licensed/patented technologies.

Demonstrated uptake of the research by the relevant end-users to generate new policies, products, processes, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks:

- employment of PhD graduates enabling the transfer of research to end-user organisations;
- creation of spin-off companies marketing/commercialising new products/technologies or significant co-investment in commercialisation by investors and/or end-users; and/or
- creation of processes that lead to improved outcomes and productivity in industry and/or policy.

How and to what extent the research has produced social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefits regionally, nationally and/or internationally:

- successful commercialisation of technologies, processes, systems and products;
- creation of a new process/methodology/product/analysis or theoretical tool which becomes standard professional practice resulting in measurable benefit; and/or
- technologies, processes, systems and products that enable systemic change resulting in measurable benefit.

1.7 Linking the Impact Claimed to the Research of the Group

Impact-related outputs that have not been included in the body of work should be referenced clearly in the Impact Statement where it is necessary to substantiate any linkage between the research and the impact claimed. Examples of evidence that links the impact claimed to the Research of the Group could include but not be limited to:

- Patents;
- Trademarks; and
- Plant Breeder's Rights.

1.8 Metrics

Metrics for Research Groups submitted to Panel 1 will consist of ranked journals and citation analysis (citations per publication and proportion within discipline-specific percentiles). Ranked outlets and citation analysis will be drawn from the fully-reported list of Research Outputs provided in the Research Group's body of work.

RANKED OUTLETS

Ranked outlets will be considered as part of the assessment of Research Groups. The full list of ranked outlets will be provided with the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

BIBLIOMETRICS

Citation analysis will be performed on articles in journals indexed by the citation database supplier that are listed in the body of work.

2. PHYSICAL, CHEMICAL AND EARTH SCIENCES

Panel 2 – Physical, Chemical and Earth Sciences consists of 20 disciplines, including:

Astronomical Sciences;
Theoretical and Condensed Matter Physics;
Atomic and Molecular Physics, Nuclear and Particle Physics and Plasma Physics;
Optical Physics;
Classical Physics;
Other Physical Sciences;
Physical Chemistry (incl. Structural);
Inorganic Chemistry;
Organic Chemistry;
Analytical Chemistry;
Macromolecular Chemistry;
Theoretical and Computational Chemistry;
Other Chemical Sciences;
Geology;
Geophysics;
Geochemistry;
Oceanography;
Hydrology;
Atmospheric Sciences; and
Other Earth Sciences.

2.1 The Context Statement

In making a case for the quality of their research, Research Groups may include information relevant to the assessment period under headings such as those outlined below in the descriptive component of the Context Statement.

Research Groups should only provide information under these headings where they consider it appropriate to articulate the quality of their research.

Statement of History, Strategic Focus, and Research Objectives

In making a case for the quality of the research environment in the Physical, Chemical and Earth Sciences, Research Groups may include information on research infrastructure and facilities, including competitive access to collaborative infrastructure and facilities both nationally and internationally (as in the case of 'suitcase physics').

Research Groups may also include information on other aspects of research structure and research strategy.

Summary of Main Achievements of the Research Group

Main achievements reported by Research Groups could include but not be limited to:

- contributions to the advancement of knowledge;
- contributions to policy and practice;
- peer reviewed publications;
- competitive grant success; and/or
- HDR completions and destinations.

Extent of Cohesion and Collaboration, where it has occurred, within the Research Group

The extent of cohesion and collaboration within the Research Group could include but not be limited to Research Groups that share a common research area or engage in collaborative research.

Collaborative Research within the Institution and/or with Researchers at Other Institutions or Agencies

Demonstration of collaborative research could include but not be limited to:

- research networks;
- formal linkage programmes/joint ventures;
- exchange visits;
- strategic alliances;
- joint research grants;
- co-authorship;
- joint appointments; and/or
- co-supervision of HDR students.

Support for ECRs and HDR Students

Demonstration of support for ECRs and HDR students could include but not be limited to:

- funding and other support specific to HDR students and ECRs;
- integration of HDR students and ECRs into the work of the Research Group (including through funded research projects);
- courses and workshops;
- national and international exchanges;
- working groups on critical issues for ECRs and HDR students;
- support for skills development (e.g., entrepreneurship, leadership, business, research management);
- mentoring; and/or
- support for publishing, including co-authorship.

Esteem Factors

Demonstration of peer recognition of Research Quality could include but not be limited to:

- presentation of keynote addresses at national and international conferences;
- prestigious national and international awards and prizes;
- editorial and refereeing service for prestigious national and international journals/publishers;
- election to learned societies; and/or
- appointments to relevant national or international organisations, committees and research councils.

Other income that supports the Research Group

Other income that supports Research Groups in Physical, Chemical and Earth Sciences could include but not be limited to:

- income from sources that support the research environment of the Group (i.e., income from the *Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities* (LIEF) programme, or access to facilities such as telescopes awarded on a competitive basis); and/or
- venture capital and commercialisation.

2.2 Acceptable Types of Research Outputs - Four 'Best'

There are no restrictions on the types of Research Output that may be included in the four 'best' provided that they meet the eligibility criteria for Acceptable Research Outputs.

It is likely that most Research Outputs submitted to the Physical, Chemical and Earth Sciences Panel will consist of Journal Articles, Books and Book Chapters.¹⁴

Other types of Research Outputs will be accepted. Research Output type will not, of itself, determine the assessment of Research Quality. In addition to the four HERDC categories, types of Research Outputs not collected through HERDC such as Patents, keynote addresses, Databases and Research reports can all be submitted for the four 'best' Research Outputs.

Where Patents are submitted as one of the four 'best', Research Groups must provide details of the underlying research and scientific methodology relating to that Patent in the 'best output justification'.

2.3 Date of Publication

No panel-specific guidance.

2.4 Published Version

No panel-specific guidance.

¹⁴ Types of Research Outputs listed both here and in the body of work for Researchers in the Research Group are defined in accordance with the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC).

2.5 'Body of Work' for Researchers in the Research Group

All Research Outputs published in the assessment period in the following categories must be 'fully-reported' in the body of work for Research Groups in Panel 2:

- Journal Articles.

These outputs will be used to derive one or more metrics for the Research Group where the Panel considers these relevant and appropriate.

Research Groups may selectively list other Research Outputs published in the assessment period if they consider them relevant for the assessment of Research Quality. These Research Outputs will not inform the calculation of metrics. Selectively listed Research Outputs may include, but not necessarily be limited to:

- Books;
- Book Chapters;
- Conference Publications;
- Databases;
- Research Reports; and
- Patents.

All Research Outputs included in the four 'best' are in the body of work and receive the same treatment for metrics as the remainder of the Research Outputs in the body of work. Only Journal Articles will inform the calculation of metrics.

2.6 Statement of Claims for Impact

The following guidance on making a statement of claims for impact provides some examples of the types of impacts and related benefits against which a Research Group might nominate to be assessed. These examples are intended as a guide only and should not be read as either mutually exclusive or exhaustive.

Demonstrated engagement with end-users, recognising the importance of the research to address a defined social, economic, environmental and/or cultural issue:

- involvement in community/end-user initiated projects or programmes;
- involvement in CRC programmes, ARC Linkage projects, and/or other commercialisation schemes;
- communication of research to a wider national and/or international audience through public lectures and/or media;
- invitations to provide expert advice at a state/national/international level (e.g., involvement in reference, advisory and/or steering committees); and/or
- licensed/patented technologies.

Demonstrated uptake of the research by the relevant end-users to generate new policies, products, processes, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks:

- employment of PhD graduates enabling the transfer of research to end-user organisations;
- creation of spin-off companies marketing/commercialising new products/technologies or significant co-investment in commercialisation by investors and/or end-users;
- adopting of design, licensing or transfer of intellectual property, as evidenced by independent evaluation that outlines the value derived from particular research or a consultancy; and/or
- creation of new processes, such as new data analysis or scientific recommendations, that lead to improved outcomes and productivity in industry and/or policy.

How and to what extent the research has produced social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefits regionally, nationally and/or internationally:

- successful commercialisation of technologies, processes, systems and products, as measured by indicators such as independent company valuation;
- creation of a new process/methodology/product or theoretical tool which becomes standard professional practice with measurable benefit;
- technologies, processes, systems and products that enable systemic change which results in measurable benefit; and/or
- research that has resulted in cost savings and/or has substantially raised productivity for industry and/or government resulting in significant or outstanding benefit.

2.7 Linking the Impact Claimed to the Research of the Group

No panel-specific guidance.

2.8 Metrics

Metrics for Research Groups submitted to Panel 2 will consist of ranked journals and citation analysis (citations per publication and proportion within discipline-specific percentiles). Ranked outlets and citation analysis will be drawn from the fully-reported list of Research Outputs provided in the Research Group's body of work.

RANKED OUTLETS

Ranked outlets will be considered as part of the assessment of Research Groups. The full list of ranked outlets will be provided with the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

BIBLIOMETRICS

Citation analysis will be performed on articles in journals indexed by the citation database supplier that are listed in the body of work.

3. ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

Panel 3 – Engineering and Technology consists of 16 disciplines including:

Aerospace Engineering;
Manufacturing Engineering;
Automotive Engineering;
Mechanical and Industrial Engineering;
Chemical Engineering;
Resources Engineering;
Civil Engineering;
Electrical and Electronic Engineering;
Geomatic Engineering;
Environmental Engineering;
Maritime Engineering;
Metallurgy;
Materials Engineering;
Biomedical Engineering;
Computer Hardware;
Communications Technologies;
Interdisciplinary Engineering; and
Other Engineering and Technology.

3.1 The Context Statement

In making a case for the quality of their research, Research Groups may include information relevant to the assessment period under headings such as those outlined below in the descriptive component of the Context Statement.

Research Groups should only provide information under these headings where they consider it appropriate to articulate the quality of their research.

Statement of History, Strategic Focus, and Research Objectives

A statement of history may be provided outlining the process by which the Research Group was established (e.g., seed-funding, strategic initiative, organic growth) in this section.

In making a case for the quality of the research environment in Engineering and Technology, Research Groups may include information on research infrastructure and facilities along with other aspects of research structure and research strategy.

Summary of Main Achievements of the Research Group

Main achievements reported by Research Groups could include but not be limited to:

- contributions to the advancement of knowledge;
- contributions to policy and practice;
- peer reviewed publications;

- competitive grant success; and/or
- HDR completions and destinations.

Extent of Cohesion and Collaboration, where it has occurred, within the Research Group

Research Groups in Engineering and Technology may demonstrate coherence by undertaking research in a well defined traditional disciplinary area, or doing research of a complementary nature in an emerging interdisciplinary area focused on a common application.

Collaborative Research within the Institution and/or with Researchers at Other Institutions or Agencies

Demonstration of collaborative research could include but not be limited to:

- research networks;
- common equipment;
- formal linkage programmes/joint ventures;
- exchange visits;
- strategic alliances;
- joint research grants;
- co-authorship;
- joint appointments; and/or
- co-supervision of HDR students.

Support for ECRs and HDR Students

Demonstration of support for ECRs and HDR students could include but not be limited to:

- funding and other support specific to HDR students and ECRs;
- integration of HDR students and ECRs into the work of the Research Group (including through funded research projects);
- courses and workshops;
- national and international exchanges;
- working groups on critical issues for ECRs and HDR students;
- support for skills development (e.g., entrepreneurship, leadership, business, research management);
- mentoring; and/or
- support for publishing, including co-authorship.

Esteem Factors

Demonstration of peer recognition of Research Quality could include but not be limited to:

- presentation of keynote addresses at national and international conferences;
- prestigious national and international awards and prizes;

- editorial and refereeing service for prestigious national and international journals/publishers;
- election to learned societies; and/or
- appointments to relevant national or international organisations, committees and research councils.

Other income that supports the Research Group

Other income that supports the Research Group could include but not be limited to:

- research infrastructure and facilities (such as *Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities* (LIEF) grants);
- industry income;
- venture capital and commercialisation; and/or
- consultancies.

Research Groups in this Panel area may demonstrate a broad coverage of research grant types.

3.2 Acceptable Types of Research Outputs - Four 'Best'

There are no restrictions on the types of Research Output that may be included in the four 'best' provided that they meet the eligibility criteria for Acceptable Research Outputs.

It is likely that most Research Outputs submitted to the Engineering and Technology Panel will consist of Journal Articles and Conference Publications.¹⁵

Other types of Research Outputs will be accepted. Research Output type will not, of itself, determine the assessment of Research Quality. In addition to the four HERDC categories, types of Research Outputs not collected through HERDC such as Patents, and Textbooks can be submitted in the four 'best' Research Outputs.

3.3 Date of Publication

A proportion of Conference Publications and/or Commissioned Research Reports submitted for assessment to Panel 3 may have no year of publication stated within or on the output. In such cases, the Exception to the Date of Publication Rule applies.

3.4 Published Version

No panel-specific guidance.

¹⁵ Types of Research Outputs listed both here and in the body of work for Researchers in the Research Group are defined in accordance with the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC).

3.5 'Body of Work' for Researchers in the Research Group

All Research Outputs published in the assessment period in the following categories must be 'fully-reported' in the body of work for Research Groups in Panel 3:

- Journal Articles; and
- Conference Publications (for selected disciplines).

The fully-reported outputs will be used to derive one or more metrics for the Research Group where the Panel considers these relevant and appropriate.

Research Groups may selectively list other Research Outputs published in the assessment period if they consider them relevant for the assessment of Research Quality. These Research Outputs will not inform the calculation of metrics. Selectively listed Research Outputs could include but not be limited to:

- Books;
- Book Chapters;
- Edited Books;
- Research Reports – Commissioned by Government, Industry or Other; and
- Patents.

All Research Outputs included in the four 'best' are in the body of work and receive the same treatment for metrics as the remainder of the Research Outputs in the body of work. Only Journal Articles and Conference Publications (for some Engineering disciplines only) will inform the calculation of metrics.

3.6 Statement of Claims for Impact

The following guidance on making a statement of claims for impact provides some examples of the types of impacts and related benefits against which a Research Group might nominate to be assessed. These examples are intended as a guide only and should not be read as either mutually exclusive or exhaustive.

Demonstrated engagement with end-users, recognising the importance of the research to address a defined social, economic, environmental and/or cultural issue:

- involvement in national and/or international forums for industry and/or professional societies, to increase awareness of emerging methodologies, processes and technologies;
- communication of research to a wider national and/or international audience through broadcast, print and new media;
- proof of concept or prototype systems demonstrated to industry;
- involvement in CRC programmes, ARC Linkage projects, and/or other commercialisation schemes; and/or
- licenced/patented technologies.

Demonstrated uptake of the research by the relevant end-users to generate new policies, products, processes, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks:

- creation of spin-off companies marketing/commercialising new products/technologies;
- adopting of design, licensing or transfer of intellectual property, as evidenced by independent evaluation that outlines the value derived from particular research or a consultancy;
- creation of a new process/methodology/product/analysis or theoretical tool which becomes standard professional or engineering practice, but has not yet realised its full potential to deliver measurable benefit; and/or
- dissemination of research through widespread adoption of teaching and/or training materials.

How and to what extent the research has produced social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefits regionally, nationally and/or internationally:

- successful commercialisation of technologies, processes, systems, and products as measured by indicators such as independent company valuation;
- creation of a new process/methodology/analysis or theoretical tool which becomes standard professional or engineering practice with measurable benefit; and/or
- technologies, processes, systems and products that enable systemic change which results in measurable benefit.

3.7 Linking the Impact Claimed to the Research of the Group

No panel-specific guidance.

3.8 Metrics

Metrics for Research Groups submitted to Panel 3 will consist of ranked journals (and for selected disciplines, ranked Conferences) and citation analysis (citations per publication and proportion within discipline-specific percentiles). Ranked outlets and citation analysis will be drawn from the fully-reported list of Research Outputs provided in the Research Group's body of work.

RANKED OUTLETS

Ranked outlets will be considered as part of the assessment of Research Groups. The full list of ranked outlets will be provided with the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

BIBLIOMETRICS

Citation analysis will be performed on articles in journals indexed by the citation database supplier that are listed in the body of work.

4. MATHEMATICAL AND INFORMATION SCIENCES AND TECHNOLOGY

Panel 4 – Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology consists of nine disciplines including:

Mathematics;

Statistics;

Other Mathematical Sciences;

Information Systems;

Artificial Intelligence and Signal and Image Processing;

Computer Software;

Computation Theory and Mathematics;

Data Format; and

Other Information, Computing and Communication Sciences.

4.1 The Context Statement

In making a case for the quality of their research, Research Groups may include information relevant to the assessment period under headings such as those outlined below in the descriptive component of the Context Statement.

Research Groups should only provide information under these headings where they consider it appropriate to articulate the quality of their research.

Statement of History, Strategic Focus, and Research Objectives

In making a case for the quality of the research environment in the Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology, Research Groups may include information on research infrastructure and facilities along with other aspects of research structure and research strategy.

Summary of Main Achievements of the Research Group

Main achievements reported by Research Groups could include but not be limited to:

- contributions to the advancement of knowledge;
- contributions to policy and practice;
- peer reviewed publications;
- competitive grant success; and/or
- HDR completions and destinations.

Extent of Cohesion and Collaboration, where it has occurred, within the Research Group

No panel-specific guidance.

Collaborative Research within the Institution and/or with Researchers at Other Institutions or Agencies

Demonstration of collaborative research could include but not be limited to:

- research networks;
- formal linkage programmes/joint ventures;
- exchange visits;
- strategic alliances;
- joint research grants;
- co-authorship;
- joint appointments; and/or
- co-supervision of HDR students.

Support for ECRs and HDR Students

Research Groups may include information on the role played by ECRs, Postdoctoral Researchers and HDR students in the research of the Group in terms of their involvement in collaborations with the senior researchers in the Group, including co-authored publications.

Any awards and distinctions achieved by Postdoctoral Researchers, ECRs and/or HDR students may also be emphasised.

Esteem Factors

Demonstration of peer recognition of Research Quality could include but not be limited to:

- presentation of keynote addresses at national and international conferences;
- membership of conference organisation committees;
- prestigious national and international awards and prizes;
- editorial and refereeing service for prestigious national and international journals/publishers;
- election to learned societies; and/or
- appointments to relevant national or international organisations, committees and research councils.

Other income that supports the Research Group

Other income that supports the Research Group could include but not be limited to:

- research infrastructure and facilities (such as *Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities* (LIEF) grants);
- venture capital and commercialisation; and/or
- industry contracts.

4.2 Acceptable Types of Research Outputs – Four ‘Best’

There are no restrictions on the types of Research Output that may be included in the four ‘best’ provided that they meet the eligibility criteria for Acceptable Research Outputs.

It is likely that most Research Outputs submitted to the Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology Panel will consist of Journal Articles and Conference Publications.¹⁶

Other types of Research Outputs will be accepted. Research Output type will not, of itself, determine the assessment of Research Quality. In addition to the four HERDC categories, types of Research Outputs not collected through HERDC such as Research Reports – Commissioned by industry and, in the area of Computer Science, Computer Software, Computer Databases, can all be submitted in the four ‘best’ Research Outputs.

4.3 Date of Publication

It is recognised that in a number of disciplines within Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology it is common for researchers to publish a preliminary version of a research result in an international Conference Publication followed by a more complete and revised version of the result in a Journal Article. In cases where both outputs are included in the four ‘best’ the Research Group must demonstrate in the ‘best’ output justification how the subsequent publication of a research result has contributed substantially new research. Any revision of a Research Output must have occurred within the assessment period for it to be included in either the four ‘best’ or the body of work.

4.4 Published Version

No panel-specific guidance.

4.5 ‘Body of Work’ for Researchers in the Research Group

All Research Outputs published in the assessment period in the following categories must be ‘fully-reported’ in the body of work for Research Groups in Panel 4:

- Journal Articles;
- Conference Publications (for Other Information, Computing and Communication Sciences).

The ‘fully-reported’ outputs in the body of work will be used to derive one or more metrics for the Research Group where the Panel considers these relevant and appropriate.

¹⁶ Types of Research Outputs listed both here and in the body of work for Researchers in the Research Group are defined in accordance with the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC).

Research Groups may selectively list other Research Outputs published in the assessment period if they consider them relevant for the assessment of Research Quality. These Research Outputs will not inform the calculation of metrics. Selectively listed Research Outputs could include but not be limited to:

- Books;
- Book Chapters;
- Conference papers; and
- Research Reports.

All Research Outputs included in the four 'best' will be listed in the body of work and receive the same treatment for metrics as the remainder of the Research Outputs in the body of work. Only Journal Articles will inform the calculation of metrics.

4.6 Statement of Claims for Impact

The following guidance on making a statement of claims for impact provides some examples of the types of impacts and related benefits against which a Research Group might nominate to be assessed. These examples are intended as a guide only and should not be read as either mutually exclusive or exhaustive.

Demonstrated engagement with end-users, recognising the importance of the research to address a defined social, economic, environmental and/or cultural issue:

- involvement in national and/or international forums for industry and/or professional societies, to increase awareness of emerging methodologies, processes and technologies;
- communication of research to a wider national and/or international audience through broadcast, print or new media;
- involvement in CRC programmes, ARC Linkage projects, and/or other commercialisation schemes; and/or
- licensed/patented technologies.

Demonstrated uptake of the research by the relevant end-users to generate new policies, products, processes, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks:

- formation of successful spin-off companies marketing/commercialising new products/technologies;
- creation of technologies, paradigms, and/or products that change the way IT is used in a large number of companies or communities such as project management methodology or risk frameworks;
- employment of PhD graduates enabling the transfer of research to end-user organisations; and/or
- creation of new technologies, processes, systems or products adopted by industry or government that have not yet realised their potential to deliver measurable benefit.

How and to what extent the research has produced social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefits regionally, nationally and/or internationally:

- successful commercialisation of technologies, processes, systems and products resulting in significant or outstanding benefit;
- technologies, processes, systems and products that enable systemic change which results in measurable benefit; and/or
- research that has resulted in significant or outstanding cost savings and/or has substantially raised productivity for industry and/or government.

4.7 Linking the Impact Claimed to the Research of the Group

No panel-specific guidance.

4.8 Metrics

Metrics for Research Groups submitted to Panel 4 will consist of ranked journals (and ranked Conferences for Other Information Computing and Communication Sciences) and citation analysis (citations per publication and proportion within discipline-specific percentiles). Ranked outlets and citations analysis will be drawn from the fully-reported list of Research Outputs provided in the Research Group's body of work.

RANKED OUTLETS

Ranked outlets will be considered as part of the assessment of Research Groups. The full list of ranked outlets will be provided with the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

BIBLIOMETRICS

For Mathematical Sciences, citation analysis will be performed on articles in journals indexed by the citation database supplier that are listed in the body of work.

No citation analysis will be undertaken for Other Information, Computing and Communication Sciences.

5. AGRICULTURAL, VETERINARY, FOOD AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Panel 5 – Agricultural, Veterinary, Food and Environmental Sciences consists of 11 disciplines including:

Industrial Biotechnology and Food Sciences;
Soil and Water Sciences;
Crop and Pasture Production;
Horticulture;
Animal Production;
Veterinary Sciences;
Forestry Sciences;
Fisheries Sciences;
Environmental Sciences;
Land, Parks and Agriculture Management; and
Other Agricultural, Veterinary and Environmental Sciences.

5.1 The Context Statement

In making a case for the quality of their research, Research Groups may include information relevant to the assessment period under headings such as those outlined below in the descriptive component of the Context Statement.

Research Groups should only provide information under these headings where they consider it appropriate to articulate the quality of their research.

Statement of History, Strategic Focus, and Research Objectives

In making a case for the quality of the research environment in the Agricultural, Veterinary, Food and Environmental Sciences, Research Groups may include information on research infrastructure and facilities along with other aspects of research structure and research strategy.

Summary of Main Achievements of the Research Group

Main achievements reported by Research Groups could include but not be limited to:

- contributions to the advancement of knowledge;
- contributions to policy and practice;
- peer reviewed publications;
- competitive grant success; and/or
- HDR completions and destinations.

Extent of Cohesion and Collaboration, where it has occurred, within the Research Group

No panel-specific guidance.

Collaborative Research within the Institution and/or with Researchers at Other Institutions or Agencies

Demonstration of collaborative research could include but not be limited to:

- research networks;
- formal linkage programmes/joint ventures;
- exchange visits;
- collaboration with industry;
- strategic alliances;
- joint research grants;
- co-authorship;
- joint appointments; and/or
- co-supervision of HDR students.

Support for ECRs and HDR Students

Research Groups may also include information on the role played by ECRs, Postdoctoral Researchers, and HDR students in the research of the Group.

Demonstration of support for ECRs and HDR students could include but not be limited to support for skills development (e.g., entrepreneurship, leadership, business, research management).

Esteem Factors

Demonstration of peer recognition of Research Quality could include but not be limited to:

- presentation of keynote addresses at national and international conferences;
- prestigious national and international awards and prizes;
- editorial and refereeing service for prestigious national and international journals/publishers;
- election to learned societies; and/or
- appointments to relevant national or international organisations, committees and research councils.

Other income that supports the Research Group

Other income that supports the Research Group could include but not be limited to:

- *Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities* (LIEF) grants; and/or
- venture capital and commercialisation.

5.2 Acceptable Types of Research Outputs – Four ‘Best’

There are no restrictions on the types of Research Output that may be included in the four ‘best’ provided that they meet the eligibility criteria for Acceptable Research Outputs.

It is likely that most Research Outputs submitted to the Agricultural, Veterinary, Food and Environmental Sciences Panel will consist of Journal Articles.¹⁷

Other types of Research Outputs will be accepted. Research Output type will not, of itself, determine the assessment of Research Quality. In addition to the four HERDC categories, types of Research Outputs not collected through HERDC such as Patents, Computer Software and Research Reports can all be submitted in the four ‘best’ Research Outputs.

Where Patents are submitted as one of the four ‘best’, Research Groups must provide details of the underlying research and scientific methodology relating to that Patent in the ‘best output justification’.

5.3 Date of Publication

No panel-specific guidance.

5.4 Published Version

No panel-specific guidance.

5.5 ‘Body of Work’ for Researchers in the Research Group

All Research Outputs published in the assessment period in the following categories must be ‘fully-reported’ in the body of work for Research Groups in Panel 5:

- Journal Articles.

The ‘fully-reported’ outputs in the body of work will be used to derive one or more metrics for the Research Group where the Panel considers these relevant and appropriate.

Research Groups may selectively list other Research Outputs published in the assessment period if they consider them relevant for the assessment of Research Quality. These Research Outputs will not inform the calculation of metrics. Selectively listed Research Outputs could include but not be limited to:

- Books;
- Book Chapters;
- Patents;
- Research Reports (e.g., clinical case reports) for Research Groups in the area of Veterinary, Environmental and other Sciences; and
- Plant Breeders’ Rights for Research Groups in the area of Agricultural Sciences.

¹⁷ Types of Research Outputs listed both here and in the body of work for Researchers in the Research Group are defined in accordance with the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC).

All Research Outputs included in the four 'best' will be listed in the body of work and receive the same treatment for metrics as the remainder of the Research Outputs in the body of work. Only Journal Articles will inform the calculation of metrics.

5.6 Statement of Claims for Impact

The following guidance on making a statement of claims for impact provides some examples of the types of impacts and related benefits against which a Research Group might nominate to be assessed. These examples are intended as a guide only and should not be read as either mutually exclusive or exhaustive.

Demonstrated engagement with end-users, recognising the importance of the research to address a defined social, economic, environmental and/or cultural issue:

- involvement in community/end-user initiated projects or programmes;
- communication of research to a wider national and/or international audience;
- involvement in CRC programmes, ARC Linkage projects, and/or other commercialisation schemes; and/or
- engagement with government or industry as demonstrated by collaborative projects with, and/or funding from, government or industry partners.

Demonstrated uptake of the research by the relevant end-users to generate new policies, products, processes, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks:

- employment of PhD graduates enabling the transfer of research to end-user organisations; and/or
- creation of spin-off companies marketing/commercialising new products/technologies or significant *co-investment* in commercialisation by investors and/or end-users.

How and to what extent the research has produced social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefits regionally, nationally and/or internationally:

- research that has formed the basis of significant or outstanding improvements in veterinary, agricultural or forest management practices and technologies;
- research that has led to new procedures or behaviours that ameliorate the environment or its sustainability; and/or
- research that has improved efficiency, availability or quality of food or foodstuffs in the Australian or international community.

5.7 Linking the Impact Claimed to the Research of the Group

Impact-related outputs that have not been included in the body of work should be referenced clearly in the Impact Statement where it is necessary to substantiate any linkage between the research and the impact claimed. Examples of evidence that links the impact claimed to the Research of the Group could include but not be limited to:

- broadcast and print media; and
- government policy outputs.

5.8 Metrics

Metrics for Research Groups submitted to Panel 5 will consist of ranked journals and citation analysis (citations per publication and proportion within discipline-specific percentiles). Journal rankings and citation analysis will be drawn from the 'fully-reported' Research Outputs provided in the Research Group's body of work.

RANKED OUTLETS

Ranked outlets will be considered as part of the assessment of Research Groups. The full list of ranked outlets will be provided with the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

BIBLIOMETRICS

Citation analysis will be performed on articles in journals indexed by the citation database supplier that are listed in the body of work.

6. CLINICAL SCIENCES AND CLINICAL PHYSIOLOGY

Panel 6 – Clinical Sciences and Clinical Physiology consists of 10 disciplines including:

Medicine – general;
Immunology;
Medical Biochemistry and Clinical Chemistry;
Medical Microbiology;
Pharmacology and Pharmaceutical Sciences;
Medical Physiology;
Dentistry;
Optometry;
Clinical Sciences (exc. Psychiatry); and
Mental Health.

6.1 The Context Statement

In making a case for the quality of their research, Research Groups may include information relevant to the assessment period under headings such as those outlined below in the descriptive component of the Context Statement.

Research Groups should only provide information under these headings where they consider it appropriate to articulate the quality of their research.

Statement of History, Strategic Focus, and Research Objectives

In making a case for the quality of the research environment the Clinical Sciences and Clinical Physiology, Research Groups may include information on research infrastructure and facilities and all other aspects of research structure and research strategy.

Summary of Main Achievements of the Research Group

Main achievements reported by Research Groups could include but not be limited to:

- contributions to the advancement of knowledge;
- peer reviewed publications;
- competitive grant success; and/or
- HDR completions and destinations.

Extent of Cohesion and Collaboration, where it has occurred, within the Research Group

No panel-specific guidance.

Collaborative Research within the Institution and/or with Researchers at Other Institutions or Agencies

Demonstration of collaborative research could include but not be limited to:

- research networks;
- collaboration with industry;
- formal linkage programmes/joint ventures;
- exchange visits;
- strategic alliances;
- joint research grants;
- co-authorship;
- joint appointments;
- co-supervision of HDR students; and/or
- collaborations with adjunct researchers and other researchers not eligible for inclusion in a Research Group.

Support for ECRs and HDR Students

Demonstration of support for ECRs and HDR students could include but not be limited to:

- funding and other support specific to HDR students and ECRs;
- integration of HDR students and ECRs into the work of the Research Group (including through funded research projects);
- courses and workshops;
- national and international exchanges;
- working groups on critical issues for ECRs and HDR students;
- support for skills development (e.g., entrepreneurship, leadership, business, research management);
- mentoring; and/or
- support for publishing, including co-authorship.

Esteem Factors

Demonstration of peer recognition of Research Quality could include but not be limited to:

- presentation of keynote addresses at national and international conferences;
- prestigious national and international awards and prizes;
- editorial and refereeing service for prestigious national and international journals/publishers;
- election to learned societies; and/or
- appointments to relevant national or international organisations, committees and research councils.

Other income that supports the Research Group

Other income that supports the Research Group could include but not be limited to:

- *Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities* (LIEF) grants;
- venture capital and commercialisation;
- dental clinic income used to fund research; and/or
- donations, endowments and bequests.

6.2 Acceptable Types of Research Outputs - Four 'Best'

There are no restrictions on the types of Research Output that may be included in the four 'best' provided that they meet the eligibility criteria for Acceptable Research Outputs.

It is likely that most Research Outputs submitted to the Clinical Sciences and Clinical Physiology Panel will consist of Journal Articles.¹⁸

Other types of Research Outputs will be accepted. Research Output type will not, of itself, determine the assessment of Research Quality. In addition to the four HERDC categories, types of Research Outputs not collected through HERDC such as Research reports can be submitted in the four 'best' Research Outputs.

Where Patents are submitted as one of the four 'best', Research Groups must provide details of the underlying research and scientific methodology relating to that Patent, along with the full details of the Patents, in the 'best output justification'.

6.3 Date of Publication

No panel-specific guidance.

6.4 Published Version

No panel-specific guidance.

6.5 'Body of Work' for Researchers in the Research Group

All Research Outputs published in the assessment period in the following categories must be 'fully-reported' in the body of work for Research Groups in Panel 6:

- Journal Articles.

The fully-reported outputs will be used to derive one or more metrics for the Research Group where the Panel considers these relevant and appropriate.

¹⁸ Types of Research Outputs listed both here and in the body of work for Researchers in the Research Group are defined in accordance with the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC).

Research Groups may selectively list other Research Outputs published in the assessment period if they consider them relevant for the assessment of Research Quality. These Research Outputs will not inform the calculation of metrics. Selectively listed Research Outputs could include but not be limited to:

- Books;
- Book Chapters;
- Conference Publications;
- Research Reports – Commissioned by Government, Industry or Other; and
- Patents.

All Research Outputs included in the four 'best' are in the body of work and receive the same treatment for metrics as the remainder of the Research Outputs in the body of work. Only Journal Articles will inform the calculation of metrics.

6.6 Statement of Claims for Impact

The following guidance on making a statement of claims for impact provides some examples of the types of impacts and related benefits against which a Research Group might nominate to be assessed. These examples are intended as a guide only and should not be read as either mutually exclusive or exhaustive.

Demonstrated engagement with end-users, recognising the importance of the research to address a defined social, economic, environmental and/or cultural issue:

- involvement in community/end-user initiated projects or programmes;
- involvement in international or developing world projects;
- involvement in CRC programmes, ARC Linkage projects, and/or other commercialisation schemes; and/or
- licensed/patented technologies.

Demonstrated uptake of the research by the relevant end-users to generate new policies, products, processes, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks:

- medical education of practitioners and students resulting in changes to diagnostics and/or clinical guidelines;
- creation of spin-off companies marketing/commercialising new products/technologies or significant co-investment in commercialisation by investors and/or end-users;
- funding from industry and/or community partners; and/or
- creation of processes that lead to improved outcomes and productivity in industry and/or policy.

How and to what extent the research has produced social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefits regionally, nationally and/or internationally:

- successful commercialisation of technologies, processes, systems and products, as measured by indicators such as independent company valuation;
- improved health outcomes through improved effectiveness and efficacy of the device, procedure or drug as indicated by increases in well being, life-span or survival ratio of the patients;
- improved quality of care resulting from adoption of better clinical practice or procedures as indicated by decreased numbers of sentinel events, mortality and morbidity; and/or
- improved training for medical practitioners resulting from increases in medical knowledge and the implications of this for the use of medical devices as indicated by increase of successful procedures or recoveries.

6.7 Linking the Impact Claimed to the Research of the Group

No panel-specific guidance.

6.8 Metrics

Metrics for Research Groups submitted to Panel 6 will consist of ranked journals and citation analysis (citations per publication and proportion within discipline-specific percentiles). Journal rankings and citation analysis will be drawn from the fully-reported list of Research Outputs provided in the Research Group's body of work.

RANKED OUTLETS

Ranked outlets will be considered as part of the assessment of Research Groups. The full list of ranked outlets will be provided with the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

BIBLIOMETRICS

Citation analysis will be performed on articles in journals indexed by the citation database supplier that are listed in the body of work.

7. PUBLIC HEALTH AND HEALTH SERVICES

Panel 7 – Public Health and Health Services consists of five disciplines including:

Nursing;
Public Health and Health Services (excluding Mental Health);
Complementary/alternative Medicine;
Human Movement and Sports Science; and
Other Medical and Health Sciences.

7.1 The Context Statement

In making a case for the quality of their research, Research Groups may include information relevant to the assessment period under headings such as those outlined below in the descriptive component of the Context Statement.

Research Groups should only provide information under these headings where they consider it appropriate to articulate the quality of their research.

Statement of History, Strategic Focus, and Research Objectives

In making a case for the quality of the research environment in Public Health and Health Services, Research Groups may include information on research infrastructure and facilities along with other aspects of research structure and research strategy.

Summary of Main Achievements of the Research Group

Main achievements reported by Research Groups could include but not be limited to:

- contributions to the advancement of knowledge;
- contributions to policy and practice;
- peer reviewed publications;
- competitive grant success; and/or
- HDR completions and destinations.

Extent of Cohesion and Collaboration, where it has occurred, within the Research Group

No panel-specific guidance.

Collaborative Research within the Institution and/or with Researchers at Other Institutions or Agencies

Demonstration of collaborative research could include but not be limited to:

- research networks;
- exchange visits;
- strategic alliances;
- joint research grants;
- joint ventures;

- co-authorship;
- joint appointments;
- co-supervision of HDR students; and/or
- collaborations with adjunct researchers and other researchers not eligible for inclusion in a Research Group.

Support for ECRs and HDR Students

Demonstration of support for ECRs and HDR students could include but not be limited to:

- funding and other support specific to HDR students and ECRs;
- integration of HDR students and ECRs into the work of the Research Group (including through funded research projects);
- courses and workshops;
- national and international exchanges;
- working groups on critical issues for ECRs and HDR students;
- support for skills development (e.g., entrepreneurship, leadership, business, research management);
- mentoring; and/or
- support for publishing, including co-authorship.

Esteem Factors

Demonstration of peer recognition of Research Quality could include but not be limited to:

- presentation of keynote addresses at national and international conferences;
- prestigious national and international awards and prizes;
- editorial and refereeing service for prestigious national and international journals/publishers;
- election to learned societies; and/or
- appointments to relevant national or international organisations, committees and research councils.

Other income that supports the Research Group

Other income that supports the Research Group could include but not be limited to:

- *Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities* (LIEF) grants;
- venture capital and commercialisation; and/or
- commissioned applied research.

7.2 Acceptable Types of Research Outputs - Four 'Best'

There are no restrictions on the types of Research Output that may be included in the four 'best' provided that they meet the eligibility criteria for Acceptable Research Outputs.

It is likely Research Outputs submitted to the Public Health and Health Services Panel will be in a variety of types. Likely types of Research

Output include Books, Book Chapters and Journal Articles,¹⁹ Research Reports, and Articles in Professional Journals.

Other types of Research Outputs will be accepted. Research Output type will not, of itself, determine the assessment of Research Quality. In addition to the four HERDC categories, types of Research Outputs not collected through HERDC such as Research Reports can all be submitted in the four 'best' Research Outputs.

7.3 Date of Publication

No panel-specific guidance.

7.4 Published Version

No panel-specific guidance.

7.5 'Body of Work' for Researchers in the Research Group

All Research Outputs published in the assessment period in the following categories must be 'fully-reported' in the body of work for Research Groups in Panel 7:

- Journal Articles.

The full-reported outputs will be used to derive one or more metrics for the Research Group where the Panel considers these relevant and appropriate.

Research Groups may selectively list other Research Outputs published in the assessment period if they consider them relevant for the assessment of Research Quality. These Research Outputs will not inform the calculation of metrics. Selectively listed Research Outputs could include but not be limited to:

- Books;
- Book Chapters;
- Conference Publications; and
- Research Reports – Commissioned by Government, Industry or Other.

All Research Outputs included in the four 'best' are in the body of work and receive the same treatment for metrics as the remainder of the Research Outputs in the body of work. Only Journal Articles will inform the calculation of metrics.

7.6 Statement of Claims for Impact

The following guidance on making a statement of claims for impact provides some examples of the types of impacts and related benefits against which a Research Group might nominate to be assessed. These examples are intended as a guide only and should not be read as either mutually exclusive or exhaustive.

¹⁹ Types of Research Outputs listed both here and in the body of work for Researchers in the Research Group are defined in accordance with the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC).

Demonstrated engagement with end-users, recognising the importance of the research to address a defined social, economic, environmental and/or cultural issue:

- involvement in community/end-user initiated projects and programmes;
- research reports on review of practices presented through workshops, in-service seminars and meetings; and/or
- funding from industry and/or community partners.

Demonstrated uptake of the research by the relevant end-users to generate new policies, products, processes, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks:

- improved practice in hospitals and/or other health care institutions;
- research that leads to established benchmarks or standards for the provision of health care programmes; and/or
- policies for public health, health promotion, clinical services or other health practices aimed at health improvement, and/or health service/system effectiveness, efficiency, and/or equity.

How and to what extent the research has produced social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefit regionally, nationally and/or internationally:

- improved health outcomes through improved effectiveness and efficacy of the device, procedure or drug as indicated by increases in wellbeing, life span or survival rates of the patients;
- improved training for complementary or alternative health practitioners resulting from increases in knowledge and the implications of this for the use of procedures as indicated by increase of successful outcomes;
- successful commercialisation of therapeutic devices, national or global in scale, resulting from the successful completion of trials; and/or
- improvements to cost efficiencies resulting in savings to the public and health sector through the development of new techniques and/or uses of diagnostic tools.

7.7 Linking the Impact Claimed to the Research of the Group

Impact-related outputs that have not been included in the body of work should be referenced clearly in the Impact Statement where it is necessary to substantiate any linkage between the research and the impact claimed. An example of evidence that links the impact claimed to the Research of the Group could include but not be limited to commissioned research reports.

7.8 Metrics

Metrics for Research Groups submitted to Panel 7 will consist of ranked journals and citation analysis (citations per publication and proportion within discipline-specific percentiles). Journal rankings and citation analysis will be drawn from the fully-reported list of Research Outputs provided in the Research Group's body of work.

RANKED OUTLETS

Ranked outlets will be considered as part of the assessment of Research Groups. The full list of ranked outlets will be provided with the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

BIBLIOMETRICS

Citation analysis will be performed on articles in journals indexed by the citation database supplier that are listed in the body of work.

8. PSYCHOLOGY, PSYCHIATRY, NEUROLOGICAL, BEHAVIOURAL AND COGNITIVE SCIENCES

Panel 8 – Psychology, Psychiatry, Neurological, Behavioural and Cognitive Sciences consists of six disciplines including:

Neurosciences;
Psychology;
Psychiatry;
Cognitive Science;
Other Behavioural and Cognitive Sciences; and
Linguistics.

8.1 The Context Statement

In making a case for the quality of their research, Research Groups may include information relevant to the assessment period under headings such as those outlined below in the descriptive component of the Context Statement.

Research Groups should only provide information under these headings where they consider it appropriate to articulate the quality of their research.

Statement of History, Strategic Focus, and Research Objectives

In making a case for the quality of the research environment in Psychology, Psychiatry, Neurological, Behavioural and Cognitive Sciences, Research Groups may include information on research infrastructure and facilities along with other aspects of research structure and research strategy (including the involvement of research support staff who are not eligible researchers).

Summary of Main Achievements of the Research Group

Main achievements reported by Research Groups could include but not be limited to:

- contributions to the advancement of knowledge;
- contributions to policy and practice;
- peer reviewed publications;
- competitive grant success; and/or
- HDR completions and destinations.

Extent of Cohesion and Collaboration, where it has occurred, within the Research Group

No panel-specific guidance.

Collaborative Research within the Institution and/or with Researchers at Other Institutions or Agencies

Demonstration of collaborative research could include but not be limited to:

- research networks;
- formal linkage programmes/joint ventures;

- exchange visits;
- strategic alliances;
- joint research grants;
- co-authorship;
- joint appointments;
- co-supervision of HDR students; and/or
- collaborations with adjunct researchers and other researchers not eligible for inclusion in a Research Group.

Support for ECRs and HDR Students

Demonstration of support for ECRs and HDR students could include but not be limited to:

- funding and other support specific to HDR students and ECRs;
- integration of HDR students and ECRs into the work of the Research Group (including through funded research projects);
- courses and workshops;
- national and international exchanges;
- working groups on critical issues for ECRs and HDR students;
- support for skills development (e.g., entrepreneurship, leadership, business, research management);
- mentoring; and/or
- support for publishing, including co-authorship.

Esteem Factors

Demonstration of peer recognition of Research Quality could include but not be limited to:

- presentation of keynote addresses at national and international conferences;
- prestigious national and international awards and prizes;
- editorial and refereeing service for prestigious national and international journals/publishers;
- election to learned societies; and/or
- appointments to relevant national or international organisations, committees and research councils.

Other income that supports the Research Group

Other income that supports the Research Group could include but not be limited to:

- *Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities* (LIEF) grants; and/or
- venture capital and commercialisation.

8.2 Acceptable Types of Research Outputs - Four 'Best'

There are no restrictions on the types of Research Output that may be included in the four 'best' provided that they meet the eligibility criteria

for Acceptable Research Outputs.

It is likely that most Research Outputs submitted to the Psychology, Psychiatry, Neurological, Behavioural and Cognitive Sciences Panel will consist of Books, Book Chapters, and Journal Articles.²⁰

Other types of Research Outputs will be accepted. Research Output type will not, of itself, determine the assessment of Research Quality. In addition to the four HERDC categories, types of Research Outputs not collected through HERDC such as Research Reports can be submitted in the four 'best' Research Outputs.

8.3 Date of Publication

No panel-specific guidance.

8.4 Published Version

No panel-specific guidance.

8.5 'Body of Work' for Researchers in the Research Group

All Research Outputs published in the assessment period in the following categories must be 'fully-reported' in the body of work for Research Groups in Panel 8:

- Books;
- Book Chapters; and
- Journal Articles.

The fully-reported outputs will be used to derive one or more metrics for the Research Group where the Panel considers these relevant and appropriate.

Research Groups may selectively list other types of Research Outputs published in the assessment period if they consider them relevant for the assessment of Research Quality, but this should be done in exceptional cases only. Conference Publications should only be included in the body of work if published in the proceedings of nationally and/or internationally prestigious conferences. These Research Outputs will not inform the calculation of metrics.

All Research Outputs included in the four 'best' are in the body of work and receive the same treatment for metrics as the remainder of the Research Outputs in the body of work. Only Journal Articles (and, for Linguistics, Books and Book Chapters) will inform the calculation of metrics.

8.6 Statement of Claims for Impact

The following guidance on making a statement of claims for impact provides some examples of the types of impacts and related benefits against which a Research Group might nominate to be assessed. These examples are intended as a guide only and should not be read as either mutually exclusive or exhaustive.

²⁰ Types of Research Outputs listed both here and in the body of work for Researchers in the Research Group are defined in accordance with the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC).

Demonstrated engagement with end-users, recognising the importance of the research to address a defined social, economic, environmental and/or cultural issue:

- involvement in community/end-user initiated projects and programmes;
- involvement in CRC programmes, ARC Linkage projects, and/or other commercialisation schemes;
- engagement with and receipt of funding from industry partners and/or government;
- communication of research to a wider national and/or international audience (e.g., via professional publications, public lectures and/or through the general media); and/or
- research reports on review of practices presented through workshops, in-service seminars and meetings.

Demonstrated uptake of the research by the relevant end-users to generate new policies, products, processes, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks:

- evidence that research findings have influenced the professional practice of psychologists, psychiatrists and medical practitioners;
- production of material that has been incorporated into educational programmes (including community-based language programmes and/or tertiary education programmes);
- evidence that changed attitudes towards cultures and language groups have been informed by research;
- evidence that government policy has been modified or developed on the basis of research findings; and/or
- evidence that the findings of research have led to governments or other agencies/organisations funding an intervention programme.

How and to what extent the research has produced social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefits regionally, nationally, and/or internationally:

- production of evidence that has demonstrably influenced the outcome of court hearings such as: native title claims and/or court cases in which forensic linguists have been engaged as expert witnesses;
- research that has formed the foundation for significant or outstanding improvements in health-related policies with a provincial and/or local scope;
- adoption of research has led to new procedures and behaviours that has reduced treatment time and costs resulting in significant or outstanding benefit to the society; and/or
- research findings adopted in government/industry legislation/regulation resulting in a substantial or outstanding level of public benefit.

8.7 Linking the Impact Claimed to the Research of the Group

Impact-related outputs that have not been included in the body of work should be referenced clearly in the Impact Statement where it is necessary to substantiate any linkage between the research and the impact claimed. Examples of evidence that links the impact claimed to the Research of the Group could include but not be limited to:

- articles in professional journals;
- books written for professionals;
- conference posters;
- multimedia works;
- trade books;
- creation of new digital archives of language and other cultural material which have been used by the public to access such information;
- community programmes aimed at language issues, for example, workshops assisting mixed-language couples to raise their children bilingually;
- language-testing projects for example, for assessing the English language competence of overseas students or professional immigrants, or for assessing the Languages Other than English (LOTE) proficiencies of interpreters, translators or LOTE graduates; and
- programme of public education.

8.8 Metrics

Metrics for Research Groups submitted to Panel 8 will consist of ranked journal and publisher outlet analysis and citation analysis (citations per publication and proportion within discipline-specific percentiles). Journal and publisher rankings and citation analysis will be drawn from the fully-reported list of Research Outputs provided in the Research Group's body of work.

RANKED OUTLETS

Ranked outlets will be considered as part of the assessment of Research Groups. The full list of ranked outlets will be provided with the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

BIBLIOMETRICS

Citation analysis will be performed on articles in journals indexed by the citation database supplier that are listed in the body of work.

9. SOCIAL SCIENCES AND POLITICS

Panel 9 – Social Sciences and Politics consists of seven disciplines including:

Political Science;
Policy and Administration;
Other Policy and Political Science;
Sociology;
Anthropology;
Human Geography; and
Demography.

9.1 The Context Statement

In making a case for the quality of their research, Research Groups may include information relevant to the assessment period under headings such as those outlined below in the descriptive component of the Context Statement.

Research Groups should only provide information under these headings where they consider it appropriate to articulate the quality of their research.

Statement of History, Strategic Focus, and Research Objectives

In making a case for the quality of the research environment in Social Sciences and Politics, Research Groups may include information on research infrastructure and facilities along with other aspects of research structure, research strategy and staffing (including the involvement of research support staff who are not eligible researchers).

Summary of Main Achievements of the Research Group

Main achievements reported by Research Groups could include but not be limited to:

- contributions to the advancement of knowledge;
- contributions to policy and practice;
- peer reviewed publications;
- competitive grant success; and/or
- HDR completions and destinations.

Extent of Cohesion and Collaboration, where it has occurred, within the Research Group

The extent of cohesion and collaboration within the Research Group could include but not be limited to shared research areas, approaches or projects.

Collaborative Research within the Institution and/or with Researchers at Other Institutions or Agencies

Demonstration of collaborative research could include but not be limited to:

- research networks;
- formal linkage programmes/joint ventures;
- exchange visits;
- strategic alliances;
- joint research grants;
- co-authorship;
- joint appointments; and/or
- co-supervision of HDR students.

Support for ECRs and HDR Students

Research Groups may also identify the role played in the research of the Group by Postdoctoral, ECRs and/or HDR students by highlighting their participation in competitive grants and other research income, and how they have collaborated or assisted with the production of Research Outputs published in the assessment period either jointly or by other researchers in the Group.

Esteem Factors

Demonstration of peer recognition of Research Quality could include but not be limited to:

- presentation of keynote addresses at national and international conferences;
- prestigious national and international awards and prizes;
- editorial and refereeing service for prestigious national and international journals/publishers;
- election to learned societies; and/or
- appointments to relevant national or international organisations, committees and research councils.

Other income that supports the Research Group

Other income that supports Research Groups in the Social Sciences and Politics may include income derived from applied research, which is not reportable in a HERDC category. It is recognised that other research income may constitute an important dimension of the impact of political and social scientists.

9.2 Acceptable Types of Research Outputs – Four ‘Best’

There are no restrictions on the types of Research Output that may be included in the four ‘best’ provided that they meet the eligibility criteria for Acceptable Research Outputs.

It is likely that most Research Outputs submitted to the Social Sciences and Politics Panel will consist of Books, Book Chapters and Journal Articles.²¹

Other types of Research Outputs will be accepted. Research Output type will not, of itself, determine the assessment of Research Quality. In addition to the four HERDC categories, types of Research Outputs not collected through HERDC such as Research reports can be submitted in the four 'best' Research Outputs.

9.3 Date of Publication

It is likely that a proportion of outputs submitted to Panel 9 were originally published electronically. These Research Outputs are acceptable provided that they are published in the assessment period. Where no year of publication is stated within or on the output, the Exceptions to the Date of Publication Rule applies.

9.4 Published Version

No panel-specific guidance.

9.5 'Body of Work' for the Researchers in the Research Group

All Research Outputs published in the assessment period in the following categories must be 'fully reported' in the body of work for Research Groups in Panel 9:

- Books;
- Book Chapters; and
- Journal Articles.

The fully-reported outputs will be used to derive one or more metrics for the Research Group where the Panel considers these relevant and appropriate.

Research Groups may selectively list other Research Outputs published in the assessment period if they consider them relevant for the assessment of Research Quality. These Research Outputs will not inform the calculation of metrics. Selectively listed Research Outputs could include but not be limited to:

- Journal Articles and Books not collected through HERDC;
- Reference Entries;
- Databases; and
- Research Reports – Commissioned by Government, Industry or Other.

All Research Outputs included in the four 'best' are in the body of work and receive the same treatment for metrics as the remainder of the Research Outputs in the body of work. Only Journal Articles, Books and Book Chapters will inform the calculation of metrics.

²¹ Types of Research Outputs listed both here and in the body of work for Researchers in the Research Group are defined in accordance with the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC).

9.6 Statement of Claims for Impact

The following guidance on making a statement of claims for impact provides some examples of the types of impacts and related benefits against which a Research Group might nominate to be assessed. These examples are intended as a guide only and should not be read as either mutually exclusive or exhaustive.

Demonstrated engagement with end-users, recognising the importance of the research to address a defined social, economic, environmental and/or cultural issue:

- involvement in community/end-user initiated projects and programmes;
- research which informs policy debate at a national level;
- serving in a professional capacity on government committees; and/or
- communication of research to a wider national and/or international audience.

Demonstrated uptake of the research by the relevant end-users to generate new policies, products, processes, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks:

- citations of research in relevant legislation, legal judgments, committees of inquiry or policy statements; and/or
- public debate that has influenced public opinion.

How and to what extent the research has produced social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefits regionally, nationally, and/or internationally:

- decrease in human and financial cost of alcohol consumption in different occupational and socio-economic groups resulting from research papers and reports as indicated by successful accident prevention programmes and decreased insurance claims.

9.7 Linking the Impact Claimed to the Research of the Group

Impact-related outputs that have not been included in the body of work should be referenced clearly in the Impact Statement where it is necessary to substantiate any linkage between the research and the impact claimed. Examples of evidence that links the impact claimed to the Research of the Group could include but not be limited to:

- op-ed articles;
- multimedia works; and
- media presentations.

9.8 Metrics

Metrics for Research Groups submitted to Panel 9 will consist of ranked journal and publisher outlet analysis and citation analysis. Journal and publisher rankings will be drawn from the fully-reported list of Research Outputs provided in the Research Group's body of work.

RANKED OUTLETS

Ranked outlets will be considered as part of the assessment of Research Groups. The full list of ranked outlets will be provided with the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

BIBLIOMETRICS

Citation analysis will not be undertaken for any disciplines in Panel 9.

10. ECONOMICS, COMMERCE AND MANAGEMENT

Panel 10 – Economics, Commerce and Management consists of 12 disciplines including:

Economic Theory;
Applied Economics;
Economic History and History of Economic Thought;
Econometrics;
Other Economics;
Accounting, Auditing and Accountability;
Business and Management;
Banking, Finance and Investment;
Transportation;
Tourism;
Services;
Other Commerce, Management, Tourism and Services.

10.1 The Context Statement

In making a case for the quality of their research, Research Groups may include information relevant to the assessment period under headings such as those outlined below in the descriptive component of the Context Statement.

Research Groups should only provide information under these headings where they consider it appropriate to articulate the quality of their research.

Statement of History, Strategic Focus, and Research Objectives

In making a case for the quality of the research environment in Economics, Commerce and Management, Research Groups may include information on research infrastructure and facilities and other aspects of research structure, research support policies and research strategy.

Summary of Main Achievements of the Research Group

Main achievements reported by Research Groups could include but not be limited to:

- contributions to the advancement of knowledge;
- contributions to policy and practice;
- peer reviewed publications;
- competitive grant success; and/or
- HDR completions and destinations.

Extent of Cohesion and Collaboration, where it has occurred, within the Research Group

The extent of cohesion and collaboration within the Research Group could include but not be limited to:

- shared research themes and/or programmes;
- joint grants/research projects/publications and/or other activities

undertaken collaboratively (including contribution to strategic research plans, conferences, seminars and/or workshops); and/or

- joint supervision of HDR students.

Collaborative Research within the Institution and/or with Researchers at Other Institutions or Agencies

Demonstration of collaborative research could include but not be limited to:

- sponsored conferences, seminars and workshops;
- research networks;
- formal linkage programmes/joint ventures;
- exchange visits;
- strategic alliances;
- joint research grants;
- co-authorship;
- joint appointments; and/or
- co-supervision of HDR students.

Support for ECRs and HDR Students

Research Groups may include information in their Context Statement on HDR training in the faculty to which the Research Group is connected.

Esteem Factors

Demonstration of peer recognition of Research Quality could include but not be limited to:

- presentation of keynote addresses at national and international conferences;
- invitations to sit on advisory boards and/or management groups of commercial, government and/or not-for-profit organisations;
- prestigious national and international awards and prizes;
- editorial and refereeing service for prestigious national and international journals/publishers;
- election to learned academies or societies or societies; and/or
- appointments to relevant national or international organisations, committees and research councils.

Other income that supports the Research Group

Other income that supports the Research Group could include but not be limited to *Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities* (LIEF) grants.

10.2 Acceptable Types of Research Outputs - Four 'Best'

There are no restrictions on the types of Research Output that may be included in the four 'best' provided that they meet the eligibility criteria for Acceptable Research Outputs.

It is likely that most Research Outputs submitted to the Economics, Commerce and Management Panel will consist of Books, Book Chapters and Journal Articles.²²

Other types of Research Outputs will be accepted. Research Output type will not, of itself, determine the assessment of Research Quality. In addition to the four HERDC categories, types of Research Outputs not collected through HERDC such as Research reports can be submitted in the four 'best' Research Outputs.

10.3 Date of Publication

No panel-specific guidance.

10.4 Published Version

No panel-specific guidance.

10.5 'Body of Work' for the Researchers in the Research Group

All Research Outputs published in the assessment period in the following categories must be 'fully-reported' in the body of work for Research Groups in Panel 10:

- Books;
- Book Chapters; and
- Journal Articles.

The fully-reported outputs will be used to derive one or more metrics for the Research Group where the Panel considers these relevant and appropriate.

Research Groups may selectively list other Research Outputs published in the assessment period if they consider them relevant for the assessment of Research Quality. These Research Outputs will not inform the calculation of metrics. Selectively listed Research Outputs could include but not be limited to:

- Journal Articles and Books not collected through HERDC;
- Edited Research Books;
- Conference Publications; and
- Research Reports – Commissioned by Government, Industry and other agencies.

All Research Outputs included in the four 'best' are in the body of work and receive the same treatment for metrics as the remainder of the Research Outputs in the body of work. Only Journal Articles, Books and Book Chapters will inform the calculation of metrics.

10.6 Statement of Claims for Impact

The following guidance on making a statement of claims for impact provides some examples of the types of impacts and related benefits against which a Research Group might nominate to be assessed. These

²² Types of Research Outputs listed both here and in the body of work for Researchers in the Research Group are defined in accordance with the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC).

examples are intended as a guide only and should not be read as either mutually exclusive or exhaustive.

Demonstrated engagement with end-users, recognising the importance of the research to address a defined social, economic, environmental and/or cultural issue:

- involvement in community/end-user initiated projects and programmes;
- engagement with and receipt of funding from industry partners;
- communication of research to a wider national and/or international audience;
- involvement in CRC programmes, ARC Linkage projects, and/or other commercialisation schemes;
- proof of concept demonstrations to industry; and/or
- invitations to provide expert advice at national/international level (e.g., involvement in reference, advisory and/or steering committees).

Demonstrated uptake of the research by the relevant end-users to generate new policies, products, processes, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks:

- research which informs policy changes at a local or national level;
- creation of spin-off companies marketing/commercialising new products/technologies;
- adoption of new attitudes and behaviours across organisations, industries or communities;
- citations of research in relevant legislation, judgments or policy statements;
- dissemination of research through widespread adoption of teaching and/or training materials; and/or
- establishment of tools and methodologies which have been adopted for purposes of benchmarking across organisations, industries or communities.

How and to what extent the research has produced social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefits regionally, nationally, and/or internationally:

- evidence that research has contributed to a policy outcome that has produced measurable significant or outstanding benefit;
- implementation of new processes, methodologies or tools across organisations, industries or communities that have led to significant or outstanding improvements in outcomes and/or productivity;
- significant or outstanding success in the commercialisation of technologies, methodologies, tools, processes, systems and/or products; and/or
- research that has resulted in significant or outstanding cost savings and/or has substantially raised productivity for industry and/or government.

10.7 Linking the Impact Claimed to the Research of the Group

Impact-related outputs that have not been included in the body of work should be referenced clearly in the Impact Statement where it is necessary to substantiate any linkage between the research and the impact claimed. Examples of evidence that links the impact claimed to the Research of the Group could include but not be limited to:

- training manuals; and
- best practice models.

10.8 Metrics

Metrics for Groups submitted to Panel 10 will consist of ranked journal and publisher outlet analysis. Ranked outlets (including journals) will be drawn from the fully-reported list of Research Outputs provided in the Research Group's body of work.

RANKED OUTLETS

Ranked outlets will be considered as part of the assessment of Research Groups. The full list of ranked outlets will be provided with the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

BIBLIOMETRICS

Citation analysis will not be used for any discipline covered by Panel 10.

11.LAW, EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES

Panel 11 – Law, Education and Professional Practices consists of 13 disciplines including:

Education Studies;
Curriculum Studies;
Professional Development of Teachers;
Other Education;
Journalism, Communication and Media;
Librarianship and Curatorial Studies;
Other Journalism, Librarianship and Curatorial studies;
Social Work;
Law;
Professional Development of Law Practitioners;
Justice and Legal Studies;
Law Enforcement; and
Other Law, Justice and Law Enforcement.

11.1 The Context Statement

In making a case for the quality of their research, Research Groups may include information relevant to the assessment period under headings such as those outlined below in the descriptive component of the Context Statement.

Research Groups should only provide information under these headings where they consider it appropriate to articulate the quality of their research.

Statement of History, Strategic Focus, and Research Objectives

In making a case for the quality of the research environment the Education, Law and Professional Practices, Research Groups may include information on research infrastructure and facilities along with other aspects of research structure and research strategy (including the involvement of research support staff who are not eligible researchers).

Research Groups may also discuss trends in their research performance over the assessment period.

Reference may also be made to the commitment to a particular approach to scholarship, industry and community engagement and style of research leadership (where this exists), to demonstrate the objectives and achievements of the Research Group.

Summary of Main Achievements of the Research Group

Main achievements reported by Research Groups could include but not be limited to:

- contributions to the advancement of knowledge;
- contributions to policy and practice;
- peer reviewed publications;
- competitive grant success; and/or
- HDR completions and destinations.

Extent of Cohesion and Collaboration, where it has occurred, within the Research Group

Research Groups submitted to the Panel on Law, Education and Professional Practices may not necessarily cohere around a common research agenda except in the broadest sense, for example a Law or Education faculty may be appropriately considered as a Research Group by an institution.

Collaborative Research within the Institution and/or with Researchers at Other Institutions or Agencies

Demonstration of collaborative research could include but not be limited to:

- research networks;
- cross-disciplinary research centres and project teams;
- joint and collaborative publications;
- collaborations with adjunct researchers and other researchers not eligible for inclusion in a Research Group;
- formal linkage programmes/joint ventures;
- exchange visits;
- strategic alliances;
- joint research projects, consultancies and/or grants;
- joint appointments; and/or
- co-supervision of HDR students.

Support for ECRs and HDR Students

Demonstration of support for ECRs and HDR students could include but not be limited to:

- funding and other support specific to HDR students and ECRs;
- integration of HDR students and ECRs into the work of the Research Group (including through funded research projects);
- courses and workshops aimed at HDR students and ECRs;
- national and international exchanges;
- working groups on critical issues for ECRs and HDR students;
- support for skills development (e.g., entrepreneurship, leadership, business, research management);

- mentoring; and/or
- support for publishing, including co-authorship.

Esteem Factors

Demonstration of peer recognition of Research Quality could include but not be limited to:

- presentation of keynote addresses at national and international conferences and invited public lectures;
- appointments to state-level organisations and committees;
- prestigious national and international awards and prizes;
- journal editorships;
- editorial and refereeing service for prestigious national and international journals/publishers;
- election to learned societies;
- international recognition (e.g., visiting posts in overseas institutions); and/or
- appointments to relevant national or international organisations, committees and research councils.

Other income that supports the Research Group

Other income that supports the Research Group could include but not be limited to:

- income derived from applied research which is not reportable in a HERDC category;
- income provided specifically for hosting, organising, or attending a conference or workshop;
- royalties from educational texts and software; and/or
- informal research consultancies and professional development work in Education.

11.2 Acceptable Types of Research Outputs - Four 'Best'

There are no restrictions on the types of Research Output that may be included in the four 'best' provided that they meet the eligibility criteria for Acceptable Research Outputs.

It is likely that most Research Outputs submitted to the Law, Education and Professional Practices Panel will consist of Books – Authored Research/Other and Edited, Book Chapters and Journal Articles, as well as Research Reports.²³

Other types of Research Outputs will be accepted. Research Output type will not, of itself, determine the assessment of Research Quality. In addition to the four HERDC categories, types of Research Outputs not collected through HERDC such as Research reports can be submitted in the four 'best' Research Outputs.

²³ Types of Research Outputs listed both here and in the body of work for Researchers in the Research Group are defined in accordance with the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC).

In Law, for example, Textbooks are often considered to be comparable in quality to Research Reports provided they incorporate significant scholarly research and contribute to legal knowledge. However, Textbooks that contain mainly primary sources will not usually be regarded by the Panel as acceptable Research Outputs.

In Education, Books not collected through HERDC are likely to be submitted as part of the four 'best' for the quality assessment.

In the Professional Practices, Books and Journal Articles not collected through HERDC and Research Reports are likely to be submitted as part of the four 'best'.

Book reviews will not generally be regarded as acceptable Research Outputs.

11.3 Date of Publication

Dates recorded for Research Outputs in this Panel may refer to the date when the Research Output was 'presented' rather than published (including exhibited, performed, etc.).

In the case of the four 'best' Research Outputs, an explanation of the variance between dates must be provided, if necessary, in the 'best' output justification.

11.4 Published Version

No panel-specific guidance.

11.5 'Body of Work' for the Researchers in the Research Group

All Research Outputs published in the assessment period in the following categories must be 'fully-reported' in the body of work for Research Groups in Panel 11:

- Books;
- Book Chapters; and
- Journal Articles.

The fully-reported outputs will be used to derive one or more metrics for the Research Group where the Panel considers these relevant and appropriate.

Research Groups may selectively list other Research Outputs published in the assessment period if they consider them relevant for the assessment of Research Quality. These Research Outputs will not inform the calculation of metrics. Selectively listed Research Outputs could include but not be limited to:

- Journal articles and Books not collected through HERDC;
- Conference Publications;
- Information products such as metadata schemas, information portals, databases, etc.;
- Research Reports;

- published literary works; and
- play and film scripts.

All Research Outputs included in the four 'best' will be listed in the body of work and receive the same treatment for metrics as the remainder of the Research Outputs in the body of work. Only Journal Articles, Books and Book Chapters will inform the calculation of metrics.

11.6 Statement of Claims for Impact

The following guidance on making a statement of claims for impact provides some examples of the types of impacts and related benefits against which a Research Group might nominate to be assessed. These examples are intended as a guide only and should not be read as either mutually exclusive or exhaustive.

Demonstrated engagement with end-users, recognising the importance of the research to address a defined social, economic, environmental and/or cultural issue:

- involvement in community/end-user initiated projects and partnerships with the public sector, grant-aided and/or non-government organisations;
- contribution to policy debate at international, national, state and local levels;
- establishing or developing media outlets (radio stations, magazines, network media) contributions to creative industries, audience development, and contributions, not just to the content of public debate but also to the ways in which that debate is conducted; and/or
- participation in education programmes for relevant end-users.

Demonstrated uptake of the research by the relevant end-users to generate new policies, products, processes, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks may include the following:

- research has generated debate amongst end-users about legal contexts, legal, socio-legal and political values and/or the benefits of an existing or proposed policy or legislative amendment;
- research has contributed to a change in educational practice or approach in media or communications;
- research has contributed to a policy, legislative or standards outcome; and/or
- research has generated public debate that has influenced public opinion on major social issues.

How and to what extent the research has produced social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefits regionally, nationally, and/or internationally:

- theories of justice that lead to major changes in the ways that offenders are dealt with in the criminal justice systems nationally and/or internationally;
- research that has made a major contribution to a policy, legislative, or professional practice outcome that has produced a substantial or

- outstanding level of measurable benefit;
- media or communications, such as the development of electronic communications and resources, that has resulted in significant or outstanding benefit; and/or
- research that has had a significant or outstanding influence on the understanding of legal contexts, legal, socio-legal and political values and/or policy decision-making by end-users including law reform bodies, justice agencies, and peak professional or non-government organisations.

11.7 Linking the Impact Claimed to the Research of the Group

Impact-related outputs that have not been included in the body of work should be referenced clearly in the Impact Statement where it is necessary to substantiate any linkage between the research and the impact claimed. Examples of evidence that links the impact claimed to the Research of the Group could include but not be limited to:

- citations in legal judgments and law reform commission reports;
- inter-governmental and non-government sector reports;
- media coverage;
- AUSTLII references;
- trade books;
- commissioned research reports;
- articles in professional journals;
- books written for professionals;
- citations by justice agencies, law reform agencies, parliamentary committees and/or Hansard; and
- e-learning applications and learning objects.

11.8 Metrics

Metrics for Groups submitted to Panel 11 will consist of ranked journal and publisher outlet analysis. Ranked outlets will be drawn from the fully-reported list of Research Outputs provided in the Research Group's body of work.

RANKED OUTLETS

Ranked outlets will be considered as part of the assessment of Research Groups. The full list of ranked outlets will be provided with the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

BIBLIOMETRICS

Citations analysis will not be used for most disciplines covered by Panel 11. Citation measures for Library and Information Sciences may be used.

12.HUMANITIES

Panel 12 – Humanities consists of 13 disciplines including:

History and Philosophy of Science and Medicine;

Other Studies in Human Society;

Language Studies;

Literature Studies;

Cultural Studies;

Other Language and Culture;

Historical Studies;

Archaeology and Prehistory;

Other History and Archaeology;

Philosophy;

Religion and Religious Traditions;

Other Philosophy and Religion; and

Art History and Appreciation.

12.1 The Context Statement

In making a case for the quality of their research, Research Groups may include information relevant to the assessment period under headings such as those outlined below in the descriptive component of the Context Statement.

Research Groups should only provide information under these headings where they consider it appropriate to articulate the quality of their research.

Statement of History, Strategic Focus, and Research Objectives

In making a case for the quality of the research environment in the Humanities, Research Groups may provide information on research infrastructure and facilities as well as other aspects of research structure, staffing and research strategy (including the involvement of research support staff who are not eligible researchers).

Summary of Main Achievements

Main achievements reported by Research Groups could include but not be limited to:

- contributions to the advancement of knowledge;
- contributions to policy and practice;
- peer reviewed publications;
- competitive grant success; and/or
- HDR completions and destinations.

Extent of Cohesion and Collaboration, where it has occurred, within the Research Group

No panel-specific guidance.

Collaborative Research within the Institution and/or with Researchers at Other Institutions or Agencies

Demonstration of collaborative research could include but not be limited to:

- international conference seminars;
- collaborations with adjunct researchers and other researchers not eligible for inclusion in a Research Group;
- invitations to collaborate on international research projects;
- research networks;
- formal linkage programmes/joint ventures;
- exchange visits;
- strategic alliances;
- joint research grants;
- co-authorship;
- joint appointments; and/or
- co-supervision of HDR students.

Support for ECRs and HDR Students

Support for ECRs and HDR students could include but not be limited to:

- participation in competitive grants and other research income;
- collaboration or assistance with the production of Research Outputs submitted by other researchers in the Group;
- support for skills development (e.g., entrepreneurship, leadership, business, research management);
- establishing working groups on critical issues for ECRs and HDR students; and/or
- providing arrangements for mentoring.

Esteem Factors

Demonstration of peer recognition of Research Quality could include but not be limited to:

- presentation of keynote addresses at national and international conferences;
- prestigious national and international awards and prizes;
- editorial and refereeing service for prestigious national and international journals/publishers;
- election to learned academies or societies and/or societies; and/or
- appointments to relevant national or international organisations, committees and research councils.

Other income that supports the Research Group

Other income that supports the Research Group could include but not be limited to:

- endowed chairs, lectureships and scholarships; and/or
- endowments for library research resources.

12.2 Acceptable Types of Research Outputs - Four 'Best'

There are no restrictions on the types of Research Output that may be included in the four 'best' provided that they meet the eligibility criteria for Acceptable Research Outputs.

It is likely that most Research Outputs submitted to the Humanities Panel will consist of Books, Book Chapters, Journal Articles, and Research Reports.²⁴

Other types of Research Outputs will be accepted. Research Output type will not, of itself, determine the assessment of Research Quality. In addition to the four HERDC categories, types of Research Outputs not collected through HERDC such as Research Reports can be submitted in the four 'best' Research Outputs.

12.3 Date of Publication

It is likely that a proportion of outputs submitted to Panel 12 were originally published electronically. These Research Outputs are acceptable provided that they are published in the assessment period. Where no year of publication is stated within or on the output, the Exceptions to the Date of Publication Rule applies.

12.4 Published Version

No panel-specific guidance.

12.5 'Body of Work' for Researchers in the Research Group

All Research Outputs published in the assessment period in the following categories must be 'fully-reported' in the body of work for Research Groups in Panel 12:

- Books;
- Book Chapters; and
- Journal Articles.

The fully-reported outputs will be used to derive one or more metrics for the Research Group where the Panel considers these relevant and appropriate.

²⁴ Types of Research Outputs listed both here and in the body of work for Researchers in the Research Group are defined in accordance with the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC).

Research Groups may selectively list other Research Outputs published in the assessment period if they consider them relevant for the assessment of Research Quality. These Research Outputs will not inform the calculation of metrics. Selectively listed Research Outputs could include but not be limited to:

- Conference Publications;
- Exhibitions;
- Databases;
- Books and Journal Articles not collected through HERDC;
- Research Reports Commissioned by Government, Industry or Other; and
- Creative Works (such as film scripts that are appropriate to the field of research).

All Research Outputs included in the four 'best' are in the body of work and receive the same treatment for metrics as the remainder of the Research Outputs in the body of work. Only Books, Book Chapters and Journal Articles will inform the calculation of metrics.

12.6 Statement of Claims for Impact

The following guidance on making a statement of claims for impact provides some examples of the types of impacts and related benefits against which a Research Group might nominate to be assessed. These examples are intended as a guide only and should not be read as either mutually exclusive or exhaustive.

Demonstrated engagement with end-users, recognising the importance of the research to address a defined social, economic, environmental and/or cultural issue:

- involvement in community/end-user initiated projects and programmes;
- research which informs policy changes at a national level;
- engagement with and receipt of funding from industry partners;
- initiations to provide expert advice at local/national/international level (e.g., involvement in reference, advisory and/or steering committees; and/or
- communication of research to a local/community, or wider national and/or international audience.

Demonstrated uptake of the research by the relevant end-users to generate new policies, products, processes, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks:

- public debate that has influenced public opinion;
- creation and development of digital facsimiles as well as large microfilm or digital archives that enrich culture and public debate by making key resources widely available; and/or
- evidence that research has contributed to a policy outcome but which is at too early a stage to have produced a measurable benefit.

How and to what extent the research has produced social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefits regionally, nationally, and/or internationally:

- historical research that has led to the preservation of media and/or other cultural artefacts;
- evidence that research has contributed to a policy outcome that has produced a measurably significant or outstanding benefit;
- historical research which has led to preservation of sites and sites being listed in the World Heritage and/or National Trust lists; and/or
- transformation of significant, local, national and/or international cultural/theological ideas, practices or understandings, leading to significant or outstanding benefit (for example in the development of community media, practitioner networks and/or public institutions).

12.7 Linking the Impact Claimed to the Research of the Group

Impact-related outputs that have not been included in the body of work should be referenced clearly in the Impact Statement where it is necessary to substantiate any linkage between the research and the impact claimed. Examples of evidence that links the impact claimed to the Research of the Group could include but not be limited to:

- op-ed articles;
- multimedia works;
- other media appearances;
- trade books;
- commissioned research reports;
- articles in professional journals;
- books written for professionals;
- curriculum documents;
- textbooks;
- reviews;
- heritage assessments; and
- public performances.

12.8 Metrics

Metrics for Groups submitted to Panel 12 will consist of ranked journal and publisher outlet analysis. Ranked outlets will be drawn from the fully-reported list of research Outputs provided in the Research group's body of work.

RANKED OUTLETS

Ranked outlets will be considered as part of the assessment of Research Groups. The full list of ranked outlets will be provided with the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

BIBLIOMETRICS

Non-standard bibliometric measures may be used pending further development.

13.CREATIVE ARTS, DESIGN AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Panel 13 – Creative Arts, Design and Built Environment consists of eight disciplines including:

Architecture and Urban Environment;
Building;
Other Architecture, Urban Environment and Building;
Performing Arts;
Visual Arts and Crafts;
Cinema, Electronic Arts and Multimedia;
Design Studies; and
Other Arts (excluding Art History and Appreciation).

13.1 The Context Statement

In making a case for the quality of their research, Research Groups may include information relevant to the assessment period under headings such as those outlined below in the descriptive component of the Context Statement.

Research Groups should only provide information under these headings where they consider it appropriate to articulate the quality of their research.

Statement of History, Strategic Focus, and Research Objectives

In making a case for the quality of the research environment in the Creative Arts, Design and Built Environment, Research Groups may include information on research infrastructure and facilities along with all aspects of research structure and research strategy (including the involvement of research support staff who are not eligible researchers).

Summary of Main Achievements of the Research Group

Main achievements reported by Research Groups could include but not be limited to:

- contributions to the advancement of knowledge;
- contributions to policy and practice;
- peer reviewed publications;
- professional, industry and community awards;
- competitive grant success; and/or
- HDR completions, destinations and/or artistic successes.

Extent of Cohesion and Collaboration, where it has occurred, within the Research Group

The extent of cohesion and collaboration within the Research Group could include but not be limited to research jointly undertaken around shared themes or areas.

Collaborative Research within the Institution and/or with Researchers at other Institutions or Agencies

Demonstration of collaborative research could include but not be limited to:

- adjunct professorships held by visitors in the submitting group and by members of the submitting group at other universities;
- research networks;
- co-hosting significant international conferences/forums;
- co-leadership of international research and standards groups;
- formal linkage programmes/joint ventures;
- exchange visits;
- strategic alliances;
- joint research grants;
- co-authorship;
- joint appointments; and/or
- co-supervision of HDR students.

Support for ECRs and HDR Students

Demonstration of support for ECRs and HDR students could include but not be limited to:

- funding and other support specific to HDR students and ECRs;
- integration of HDR students and ECRs into the work of the Research Group (including funded research projects);
- courses and workshops;
- national and international exchanges;
- working groups on critical issues for ECRs and HDR students;
- support for conference attendance and participation;
- support networks, collaborations on arts projects;
- support for skills development (e.g., entrepreneurship, leadership, business, research management);
- mentoring; and/or
- support for publishing, including co-authorship.

Esteem Factors

Demonstration of peer recognition of Research Quality could include but not be limited to:

- presentation of keynote addresses at national and international conferences, or at forums such as arts festivals and theatre houses;
- curatorial/juried selection of work for exhibition, recording, screening, etc.;
- evidence of critical review of art works;
- publicly commissioned artworks;
- prestigious international and national awards and prizes;

- editorial and refereeing service for prestigious international and national journals/publishers;
- election to learned societies; and/or
- appointments to relevant national or international organisations, committees and research councils.

Other income that supports the Research Group

Other income that supports the Research Group could include but not be limited to:

- income from Commonwealth or State Government arts funding programmes in which grants are awarded competitively through merit-based, peer assessment;
- catalogue printing;
- support from professional institutions;
- informal research consultancies and professional development; and/or
- royalties from educational texts and software.

13.2 Acceptable Types of Research Outputs – Four ‘Best’

There are no restrictions on the types of Research Output that may be included in the four ‘best’ provided that they meet the eligibility criteria for Acceptable Research Outputs.

It is likely that most Research Outputs submitted to the Creative Arts, Design and Built Environment Panel will consist of Books, Book Chapters, Journal Articles, Creative Works, and Designs and Working Models.²⁵

Other types of Research Outputs will be accepted. Research Output type will not, of itself, determine the assessment of Research Quality. In addition to the four HERDC categories, types of Research Outputs not collected through HERDC such as Technical Drawings and Designs, Design Exhibitions, Audio-Visual Recordings, Reproductions of Original Art, Compositions, Scripts, Creative Writing, Performances, Films and New Media Outputs can be submitted in the four ‘best’ Research Outputs.

Where it is not self-evident that a Research Output constitutes research, clarification should be included in the ‘best’ output justification.

13.3 Date of Publication

Dates recorded for Research Outputs in Creative Arts, Design and Built Environment frequently refer to the date when the Research Output was ‘presented’ rather than published (including exhibited, performed, etc.). In the case of the four ‘best’ Research Outputs, an explanation of the variance between dates must be provided, if necessary, in the ‘best’ output justification.

²⁵ Types of Research Outputs listed both here and in the body of work for Researchers in the Research Group are defined in accordance with the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC).

In some cases the Research Output explaining the research component of a public building occurs later than the date of completion of the building. In these cases, the date of publication should refer to the Research Output.

13.4 Published Version

Research Outputs that are brought into the public domain through exhibition, performance, broadcasting, commissioning, etc., are also eligible as 'best' research outputs provided that they meet the Acceptable Research Outputs requirements.

13.5 'Body of Work' for Researchers in the Research Group

All Research Outputs published in the assessment period in the following categories must be 'fully-reported' in the body of work for Research Groups in Panel 13:

- Books;
- Book Chapters;
- Journal Articles;
- Conference Publications (for the discipline of Architecture only);
- Designs; and
- Original Creative Work.²⁶

The 'fully-reported' outputs in the body of work will be used to derive one or more metrics for the Research Group where the Panel considers these relevant and appropriate.

Research Groups may selectively list other Research Outputs published in the assessment period if they consider them relevant for the assessment of Research Quality. These Research Outputs will not inform the calculation of metrics. Selectively listed Research Outputs could include but not be limited to:

- Conference Publications (except for the discipline of Architecture);
- catalogues and catalogue essays;
- programmes and programme essays; and
- Books or Journal articles not collected through HERDC.

All Research Outputs included in the four 'best' will be listed in the body of work and receive the same treatment for metrics as the remainder of the Research Outputs in the body of work.

²⁶ Design is defined as significant original design work which is brought into the public domain, for example via exhibition of designs, models and prototypes, commercial production, construction or patents. Original Creative Work is defined as significant original work which is brought into the public domain, for example via exhibition, performance, recording, publication, broadcast or screening. Original creative work includes artworks, craftworks, installations, public art, images, compositions, scripts, literary works, recorded performances, films and digital media outputs.

13.6 Statement of Claims for Impact

The following guidance on making a statement of claims for impact provides some examples of the types of impacts and related benefits against which a Research Group might nominate to be assessed. These examples are intended as a guide only and should not be read as either mutually exclusive or exhaustive.

Research Groups in the disciplines of Design and Built Environment may also benefit from noting the examples included for Panel 3: Engineering and Technology.

Demonstrated engagement with end-users, recognising the importance of the research to address a defined social, economic, environmental and/or cultural issue:

- partnerships and collaboration with end-users and receipt of funding from partner organisations and/or funding from partnership grant programmes, including those run by the ARC, CRCs, the Australia Council and/or other Government agencies;
- engagement by overseas research bodies of research groups within Australia that influence policy and technical directions overseas;
- commercialisation of intellectual property created through research;
- expert participation in organisations, government agencies and significant events, in governance, management and/or advisory roles at national/international level; and/or
- communication of research outcomes to end-users and wider national and/or international audiences (e.g., professional publications, artists' residencies, public lectures and/or media exposure).

Demonstrated uptake of the research by the relevant end-users to generate new policies, products, processes, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks:

- development and widespread use of Building Information Modelling-based software tools by designers, construction managers and facilities managers;
- evidence of innovation, take-up and significant positive outcomes from the commercialisation of intellectual property created through research, and/or the formation of spin-off companies or significant co-investment in commercialisation by investors and/or end-users;
- construction of buildings, production of objects, or creation of major public artworks undertaken by the Research Group;
- evidence of recognised influential expert contribution to arts, design, built environment and cultural organisations at national/international level (e.g., membership of expert peer review panels of arts funding agencies, membership of juries for prizes and awards, board memberships, and involvement in reference, advisory and/or steering committees); and/or
- evidence of recognised influential expert contribution to the policy, legislative and regulatory framework for the arts and culture, design, architecture and built environment, including contributions to policy, legislation, regulations, codes, standards and practice

guidelines, etc., at international, national, state and local levels.

How and to what extent the research has produced social, economic, environmental and/or cultural benefits regionally, nationally, and/or internationally:

- transformation in international perceptions of Australian culture, as indicated by growing interests of international audiences, artists and performing art industries for Australia's performing art culture leading to measurable benefit;
- use of Building Information Modelling-based software tools has led to a broader recognition of the value of advanced modelling as a value add for designers, construction managers and facilities managers;
- independent evaluation of a project promoting innovation amongst design and construction firms with results indicating a significant and positive impact on industry attitudes, as indicated by documented changes to business processes to include innovation as criteria in the design of procurement systems and the selection of appropriate contractors and consultants;
- enhancement of Australia's performing arts quality and scope resulting from better understanding of cinema audience's needs and preferences, and adaptation and use of new digital technologies as indicated by greater public participation and satisfaction captured by the audience surveys; and/or
- advancement in sophistication of Australian readers and authors as indicated by the variety of books published and sold, and readers' participation in meetings with authors or their responsiveness to broadcasting about books and authors.

13.7 Linking the Impact Claimed to the Research of the Group

Impact-related outputs that have not been included in the body of work should be referenced clearly in the Impact Statement where it is necessary to substantiate any linkage between the research and the impact claimed. Examples of evidence that links the impact claimed to the Research of the Group could include but not be limited to:

- multimedia works;
- other media appearances;
- trade books;
- commissioned research reports;
- articles in professional journals;
- books written for professionals;
- drama and applied theatre in educational, community, cultural or social contexts; and/or
- input to collaborative community events, festivals, artworks and social interventions.

13.8 Metrics

Metrics for Groups submitted to Panel 13 will consist of ranked journal and publisher outlet analysis and ranked conferences (for Architecture only).

RANKED OUTLETS

Ranked outlets will be considered as part of the assessment of Research Groups. The full list of ranked outlets will be provided with the *Guidance Material for Assessment Panels and Advisors*.

BIBLIOMETRICS

Bibliometrics will not be used for any discipline covered by Panel 13.

B: RQF Assessment Panels by RFCD Codes

| PANEL NAMES | RFCD CODES | DISCIPLINE & SUB-DISCIPLINE AREAS |
|---|---|--|
| 1. Biological sciences | 2701-2799 | Biochemistry and cell biology, Genetics, Microbiology, Botany, Zoology, Physiology, Ecology & evolution, Biotechnology, Other biological sciences |
| 2. Physical, chemical and earth sciences | 2401-2699 | Astronomical sciences, Theoretical & condensed matter physics, Atomic & molecular physics; Nuclear & particle physics; Plasma physics, Optical physics, Classical physics, Other physical sciences, Physical chemistry, Inorganic chemistry, Organic chemistry, Analytical chemistry, Macromolecular chemistry, Theoretical & computational chemistry, Other chemical sciences, Geology, Geophysics, Geochemistry, Oceanography, Hydrology, Atmospheric sciences, Other earth sciences |
| 3. Engineering and technology | 2902-2999 | Aerospace engineering, Manufacturing engineering, Automotive engineering, Mechanical & industrial engineering, Chemical engineering, Resources engineering, Civil engineering, Electrical & electronic engineering, Geomatic engineering, Environmental engineering, Maritime engineering, Metallurgy, Materials engineering, Biomedical engineering, Computer hardware, Communications technologies, Interdisciplinary engineering, Other engineering & technology |
| 4. Mathematical and information sciences and technology | 2301-2399 2801-2899 | Mathematics, Statistics, Other mathematical sciences, Information systems, Artificial intelligence & signal & image processing, Computer software, Computation theory & mathematics, Data format, Other information, computing & communication sciences |
| 5. Agricultural, veterinary, food and environmental sciences | 2901 3001-3099 | Industrial biotechnology & food sciences, Soil & water sciences, Crop & pasture production, Horticulture, Animal production, Veterinary sciences, Forestry sciences, Fisheries sciences, Environmental sciences, Land, parks & agricultural management, Other agricultural, veterinary & environmental sciences |
| 6. Clinical sciences and clinical physiology | 3201-3206 3208-3210 (less 321021) 321204 | Medicine – general, Immunology, Medical biochemistry & clinical chemistry, Medical microbiology, Pharmacology & pharmaceutical sciences, Medical physiology, Dentistry, Optometry, Clinical sciences (exc. Psychiatry), Mental health |
| 7. Public health and health services | 3211-3299 (less 321204) | Nursing, Public health & health services (exc. Mental health), Complementary/alternative medicine, Human movement & sports science, Other medical & health sciences |
| 8. Psychology, psychiatry, neurological, behavioural and cognitive sciences | 3207, 321021 3801 3802 3803-3899 | Neurosciences, Psychology, Psychiatry, Cognitive science, Other behavioural & cognitive sciences & Linguistics. |
| 9. Social sciences and politics | 3601-3705 (less 3702) | Political science, Policy & administration, Other policy & political science, Sociology, Anthropology, Human geography, Demography |
| 10. Economics, commerce and management | 3401-3599 | Economic theory, Applied economics, Economic history & history of economic thought, Econometrics, Other economics, Accounting, auditing & accountability, Business and management, Banking, finance and investment, Transportation, Tourism, Services, Other commerce, management, tourism and services |
| 11. Law, Education and Professional Practices | 3301-3399 3901-4099 3702 | Education studies, Curriculum studies, Professional development of teachers, Other education, Journalism, communication and media, Librarianship, Curatorial studies, Social work, Other journalism, librarianship & curatorial studies, Law, Professional development of practitioners, Justice & legal studies, Law enforcement, Other law, justice |
| 12. Humanities | 3706-3799 419901 4201-4499 | History & philosophy of science & medicine, Other studies in human society, Art History and appreciation, Language studies, Literature studies, Cultural studies, Other language & culture, Historical studies, Archaeology & prehistory, Other history & archaeology, Philosophy, Religion & religious traditions, Other philosophy & religion |
| 13. Creative arts, design and built environment | 3101-3199 4101-4199 (less 419901) | Architecture and urban environment, building, Other architecture, urban environment and building, Performing arts, Visual arts & crafts, Cinema, electronic arts & multimedia, Design studies, Other arts (exc. Art history & appreciation) |

C: List of Abbreviations

| | |
|---------|--|
| ABS | Australian Bureau of Statistics |
| ACGR | Australian Competitive Grants Register |
| ADST | Australian Daylight Saving Time |
| AEST | Australian Eastern Standard Time |
| APA | Australian Postgraduate Award |
| APAI | Australian Postgraduate Award (Industry) |
| ARC | Australian Research Council |
| ASCED | Australian Standard Classification of Education |
| AUSTLII | Australasian Legal Information Institute |
| CAUL | Council of Australian University Librarians |
| CRC | Cooperative Research Centre |
| DAG | Development Advisory Group |
| DEST | Department Education, Science and Training |
| DOHA | Department of Health and Ageing |
| EAG | Expert Advisory Group |
| ECR | Early Career Researcher |
| EFTSL | Equivalent Full Time Student Load |
| EIS | Expression of Intent to Submit |
| FTE | Full-time Equivalent |
| FOI | Freedom of Information |
| HDR | Higher Degree by Research |
| HEP | Higher Education Provider |
| HERDC | Higher Education Research Data Collection |
| HESA | <i>Higher Education Support Act 2003</i> |
| IGS | Institutional Grants Scheme |
| IMS | Information Management System |
| IPP | Information Privacy Principles |
| ISBN | International Standard Book Number |
| ISSN | International Standard Serial Number |
| LIEF | Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities Programme |
| LOTE | Languages Other than English |
| MRI | Medical Research Institute |
| NHMRC | National Health and Medical Research Council |
| OAKLAW | Open Access to Knowledge Law Project |
| OECD | Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development |
| PBRF | Performance-Based Research Fund |
| PCT | Patent Cooperation Treaty |
| RAE | Research Assessment Exercise |
| R&D | Research and Development |
| RDC | Research and Development Corporation |
| RFCD | Research Fields, Courses and Disciplines |
| RQF | Research Quality Framework |
| RTS | Research Training Scheme |
| SEO | Socio-economic Objective |
| UA | Universities Australia |
| VET | Vocational Education and Training |