

ERA 1 → ERA II

**(i) Deakin and Faculty of
Bus. & Law Response to
ERA I**

**(ii) Reflections on ERA from
a REC Member**

(iii) Update for ERA II

Prof Pasquale Sgro
and
Prof Ross Chapman



PART 1

ERA Results for Deakin FoRs as a Whole

- 22 two-digit (broad) and 59 four-digit (discipline)
- 4 rated at 5 (well above world standard) [four-digit]
- 12 rated at 4 (above world standard) [3 two- and 9 four-digit]
- 21 at 3 (world standard) [6 two- and 15 four-digit]

Fives

FoR Code	FoR Name	Deakin Rating	% A and A* ranked journals	% C or not ranked journals	% conferences of total journals and conferences	average citations per scopus indexed journal article	peer review	FTE of "Teaching and Research" and "Research only"	ERA 2010 Australian Average	Volume threshold
0912	Materials Engineering	5	61%	15%	21%	10.29	no	26.59	3.5	2-5X
0608	Zoology	5	44%	35%	0%	11.94	no	4.46	3.5	1-2X
1116	Medical Physiology	5	81%	2%	0%	18.50	no	2.28	4.3	1-2X
1106	Human Movement and Sports Science	5	55%	24%	4%	11.03	no	13.49	3.7	2-5X

Fours

FoR Code	FoR Name	Deakin Rating	% A and A* ranked journals	%C or not ranked journals	% conferences of total journals and conferences	average citations per scopus indexed journal article	peer review	FTE of "Teaching and Research" and "Research only"	ERA 2010 Australian Average	Volume threshold
0301	Analytical Chemistry	4	75%	7%	0%	11.74	no	4.04	3.5	1-2X
2102	Curatorial and Related Studies	4	31%	23%	32%	0.27	yes	4.16	4.0	1-2X
09 (EE)	Engineering	4	53%	17%	40%	7.58	no	59.07	3.0	2-5X
0910	Manufacturing Engineering	4	62%	13%	44%	5.48	no	8.16	4.0	1-2X
1504	Commercial Services	4	23%	12%	26%	2.03	yes	2.90	2.4	2-5X
0704	Fisheries Sciences	4	21%	36%	2%	6.56	no	2.75	4.2	1-2X
11 (BCH)	Medical and Health Sciences	4	53%	20%	4%	15.99	no	37.27	2.9	>5X
1114	Paediatrics and Reproductive Medicine	4	54%	15%	13%	18.28	no	2.56	2.6	1-2X
1115	Pharmacology and Pharmaceutical Sciences	4	56%	13%	0%	19.88	no	0.72	3.4	1-2X
11 (PAH)	Medical and Health Sciences	4	43%	33%	11%	12.21	no	137.08	2.9	>5X
1110	Nursing	4	58%	26%	3%	5.21	no	28.09	3.4	2-5X
1111	Nutrition and Dietetics	4	50%	38%	6%	19.10	no	15.38	3.1	2-5X

High Volume: One, Two or Three

FoR Code	FoR Name	Deakin Rating	% A and A* ranked journals	%C or not ranked journals	% conferences of total journals and conferences	average citations per scopus indexed journal article	peer review	FTE of "Teaching and Research" and "Research only"	ERA 2010 Australian Average	Volume threshold
12 (HCA)	Built Environment and Design	2	55%	25%	74%	4.40	yes	16.18	2.5	>5X
18 (HCA)	Law and Legal Studies	2	28%	43%	0%	1.79	yes	39.70	2.7	>5X
1801	Law	2	28%	43%	0%	1.79	yes	38.50	2.7	>5X
19 (HCA)	Studies In Creative Arts and Writing	3	22%	25%	27%	2.67	yes	40.15	2.8	>5X
20 (HCA)	Language, Communication and Culture	2	21%	27%	12%	1.20	yes	30.18	2.8	>5X
2005	Literary Studies	3	13%	20%	0%	0.00	yes	10.80	3.0	>5X
21 (HCA)	History and Archaeology	3	46%	16%	19%	0.80	yes	18.19	3.0	>5X
2103	Historical Studies	3	49%	15%	18%	1.02	yes	12.03	3.1	>5X
22 (HCA)	Philosophy and Religious Studies	2	32%	33%	16%	0.82	yes	9.74	3.0	>5X
13 (SBE)	Education	2	31%	22%	48%	3.52	yes	97.54	2.2	>5X
1302	Curriculum and Pedagogy	3	31%	26%	44%	2.67	yes	32.16	2.3	>5X
1303	Specialist Studies In Education	3	31%	17%	47%	4.04	yes	35.27	2.5	>5X
14 (SBE)	Economics	2	40%	21%	5%	5.82	yes	27.73	2.2	>5X
1402	Applied Economics	3	53%	13%	3%	5.98	yes	19.47	2.1	>5X
15 (SBE)	Commerce, Management, Tourism and	2	14%	51%	44%	3.89	yes	122.79	2.2	>5X
1503	Business and Management	2	15%	64%	11%	4.01	yes	21.35	2.2	>5X
1505	Marketing	1	3%	58%	53%	3.48	yes	21.26	2.2	>5X
1599	Other Commerce, Management, Tourism and Services	1	0%	88%	96%	17.00	yes	50.78	1.0	>5X
16 (SBE)	Studies In Human Society	2	26%	37%	23%	4.90	yes	68.02	2.1	>5X
1606	Political Science	2	37%	37%	24%	1.74	yes	19.05	2.3	>5X
1608	Sociology	2	35%	34%	37%	8.59	yes	16.22	2.4	>5X

Decorative geometric shapes in the top left corner, including overlapping squares and circles in various colors like green, blue, red, and yellow.

Similar Tables Developed for:


- Peer Reviewed: Low Volume One, Two or Three Ranked
- Peer Reviewed: >40% A*/A
- Citation: Low Volume One, Two or Three Ranked
- FoRs with >40% C and Unranked Journals
- FoRs with High Conferences: Low A*/A

Faculty of Business and Law

1	FoR Code	FoR Name	Deakin Rating	% A and A* ranked journals	%C or not ranked journals	% conferences of total journals and conferences	ERA 2012 prediction	ERA 2014 Prediction	Comments
108	14 (SBE)	Economics	2	40%	21%	5%	3	3+	new staff hirings will come on stream
109	1401	Economic Theory	n/a	0%	50%	18%	3	3	reallocation of journal FoR codes
110	1402	Applied Economics	3	53%	13%	3%	3	4	new staff hirings will come on stream
111	1403	Econometrics	n/a	4%	35%	4%	3	3	new staff hirings will come on stream
112	1499	Other Economics	n/a	32%	30%	0%	n/a		
114	15 (SBE)	Commerce, Management, Tourism and Services	2	14%	51%	44%	2	3-	new staff hirings will come on stream
115	1501	Accounting, Auditing and Accountability	1	15%	37%	27%	2	2	new staff hirings will come on stream
116	1502	Banking, Finance and Investment	2	23%	37%	23%	2	3	new staff hirings will come on stream
117	1503	Business and Management	2	15%	64%	11%	2	3	new staff hirings will come on stream
118	1504	Commercial Services	4	23%	12%	26%	4	4	
119	1505	Marketing	1	3%	58%	53%	1	2	marginal improvements will occur, some new staff
120	1506	Tourism	1	7%	39%	34%	n/a		
121	1507	Transportation and Freight Services	n/a	0%	100%	0%	n/a		
122	1599	Other Commerce, Management, Tourism and Services	1	0%	88%	96%	n/a		
149	08 (MIC)	Information and Computing Sciences	1	21%	42%	82%	3	3	Increase in the number of indexed journal will result in more quality items contributing to the assessment
				26%	42%	78%			
				22%	44%	47%			
				20%	60%	84%			
				40%	40%	86%			
				38%	19%	67%			
155	0806	Information Systems	n/a	20%	44%	89%	3	3	Increase in the journals that are indexed should result in an assessment for this area
				2%	35%	31%			
				0%	85%	88%			

Comparative Results for Business and Law FoRs

ERA 2010 Results - Deakin University and Comparative Institutions																	
Faculty of Business and Law Submissions																	
ERA Comparative Table																	
Cluster	FoR	DEAKIN	Monash	Curtin	Griffith	LaTrobe	Swinburne	Wollongong	Newcastle	UTS	UWSyd	USA	UTAS	Macquarie	QUT	UQ	
MIC	8 Information and Computing Sciences	1	3	2	3	1	3	2	2	3	1	2	NA	3	4	3	
SBE	14 Economics	2	4	2	1	2	2	1	1	4	1	1	2	2	3	4	
SBE	1402 Applied Economics	3	3	2	1	2	1	1	2	5	1	2	1	1	4	3	
SBE	15 Commerce, Management, Tourism and Services	2	3	2	3	3	1	2	2	3	2	2	1	2	3	4	
SBE	1501 Accounting, Auditing and Accountability	1	4	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	3	1	2	2	4	
SBE	1502 Banking, Finance and Investment	2	3	1	1	2	NA	1	NA	3	2	NA	NA	3	NA	5	
SBE	1503 Business and Management	2	3	2	3	2	1	2	2	4	2	3	2	3	4	5	
SBE	1504 Commercial Services	4	NA	NA	4	2	NA	NA	NA	2	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
SBE	1505 Marketing	1	3	2	2	2	1	3	2	3	2	2	NA	2	2	4	
SBE	1506 Tourism	1	3	3	4	4	NA	5	2	3	2	3	1	NA	NA	3	
SBE	1599 Other Commerce, Management, Tourism and Services	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
HCA	18 Law and Legal Studies	2	4	1	4	3	1	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	4	
HCA	1801 Law	2	4	1	4	3	1	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	4	

Decorative geometric shapes in the top left corner, including overlapping circles and squares in various colors like blue, green, yellow, and red.

Critical Questions – Deakin University

- *What areas do we want to be known for?*
- What FoR Codes describe these area best?
- What were our scores?
- How can these be improved?
- How do we compare to other universities?



Future Strategies?

- Excellence, especially in key areas
- Improving research questions
- Understanding cutting edge work in the field
- Focus on quality over quantity
- Don't report conference papers with low or no ERA rank

Decorative geometric shapes in the top left corner, including overlapping squares and circles in various colors like green, blue, red, and yellow.

Future Strategies?

- Recruitment on track record not potential
- Teaching relief for key researchers
- Focusing HDR projects in key areas
- Collaboration with excellent groups
- Revitalising research activity (*OSP*)

Game Playing

- Assigning publications to FoR Codes
- Maximise A^*/A to B/C ratio
- Reassign B and C to sacrifice codes
- **Context statement?**
- Alignment with 20% outputs selected for peer review

Decorative geometric shapes in the top left corner, including overlapping circles and squares in various colors like green, blue, red, and yellow.

Improving the process

- Journal re-ranking to address anomalies
 - Peak bodies, professional organisations and learned societies
- Peer Review?
 - Poorly understood with huge influence
 - *Pressure ARC to provide clarity?*

Evaluation

- **Volume Risk**
 - **High**, difficult to reassign or focus strength
 - **Low**, small personnel change catastrophic
- **Quality Risk**
 - Low A*/A to B/C and high % conference papers
- **Peer review *versus* citation assessment**

PART 2

Reflections on ERA 1 Process from a REC Member (Victor Callan, UQ*)

1. **The full basket of outputs** was assessed by the ERA panel in assigning ratings to 4 or 2-digit FoRs
2. Research outputs were reviewed (read) by **three ERA panel members and peer-reviewers**
3. **Proportion of A* and A journal papers combined** were a significant influence on the final ERA ratings
4. **B journal outputs** were a positive influence if over time there was a decreasing proportion with subsequent increase in A*/A proportion

* **Professor and Research Director, UQ Business School**

Reflections (cont.)

5. C journals (and evidence of increasing over time), high proportions of conference proceedings, text books and vanity press books were **a large negative**
6. Books and book chapter **with quality publishers** did influence rating
7. **Grant income per FTE** (Competitive, Public sector, Industry, CRC) did matter in the initial rating, and exceptional grant income per FTE (cf benchmark) led to "raised" ratings
8. **Background Statements** of limited use – in most cases provided limited additional evidence
 - major editorships, highly cited papers, awards, influential research centres, etc.

Decorative geometric shapes in various colors (green, yellow, blue, red, grey) arranged in a cluster in the top left corner.

Reflections (cont.)

8. **FTE numbers** provided context but were not applied beyond this – so size was not a factor in final rating
9. **Esteem factors** not as influential compared to journal rankings, grant records
10. The evaluations by the **three ERA panel members** mattered most, but influenced by
 - 2-6 peer evaluations for each FoR code
 - opinions and discussions with other panel members

PART 3

Update for ERA II

- Minister Carr's press release <http://minister.innovation.gov.au/Carr/MediaReleases/Pages/IMPROVEMENTSTOEXCELLENCEINRESEARCHFORAUSTRALIA.aspx>
- “In light of these two factors – that ERA could work perfectly well without the rankings, and that their existence was focussing ill-informed, undesirable behaviour in the management of research – I have made the decision to remove the rankings, based on the ARC's expert advice. The journals lists will still be of great utility and importance, but the removal of the ranks and the provision of the publication profile will ensure they will be used descriptively rather than prescriptively. “

Update for ERA II

- **Refinement of the journal quality indicator to remove the prescriptive A*, A, B and C ranks**
- **Introduction of a journal quality profile, showing the most frequently published journals for each unit of evaluation**
- **Increased capacity to accommodate multi-disciplinary research so articles with significant content from a given discipline are assigned to that discipline, regardless of where it is published**
- **The low volume threshold to 50 outputs (bringing peer-reviewed disciplines in line with citation disciplines, up from 30 outputs)**
- **The modification of fractional staff eligibility requirements to 0.4 FTE (up from 0.1 FTE)**



So.....

Where to now with ERA II ...?

and III...??

A decorative graphic in the top-left corner consisting of several overlapping, semi-transparent shapes in various colors (green, blue, yellow, red, grey) arranged in a circular pattern.

Key Strategies for ANZAM Board and IMs in 2011

- Engagement of members, including through Special Interest Groups and regional activities
- Recruitment of more management academic and doctoral students
- Collaborative activities with other Academies
- Review of the *arinex* contract for conference PCO
- Review of the *JMO* contract and ranking correction.

Key issues for ANZAM Institutional Members:

- assist ANZAM developing a closer alignment with the regions
- make ANZAM more relevant to its current and future members and provide greater value to its current members
- assist in making the management discipline more active and engaged, for example in government HE policy and ARC matters.