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The Context

ERA is excellent at measuring research quality
but does not measure engagement

ATSE, ATN, Go8 and others have expressed concern that ERA inadvertently deters engagement with industry and community

Australian Government consistently expresses concern
“Boosting the commercial returns from research” 2014
Annual government research budget
OECD data on Australian research collaboration

Innovative firms collaborating with higher education or public research institutions (%)

Large firms  SMEs

Enhancing Australia’s prosperity through technological innovation
Policy background

Two aspects affecting Australia’s ability to translate research into broad benefits for the nation are:

– Ensuring high levels of engagement between Australia’s university researchers and research end-users
  • across the private and public sectors

– Fostering an entrepreneurial university research culture capable of creating
  • new and innovative industries
  • highly skilled job growth.
Research impact

Discussion to date focussed on measuring research ‘impact’

– RQF, trial by ATN in 2012, UK REF etc.

– Limited by methodological difficulties
  • attribution of impacts
  • establishing causal links between research and broader impacts
  • expense of case studies
  • Lagging indicator
Research engagement

• Engagement is a forward indicator of innovation and ultimately impact

• Easily identifiable, broadly common across disciplines and already collected
  – funding from partner organisations
  – joint research projects with private and public sector partners
  – commercialisation income
  – international income
REAg – Research Engagement for Australia

Conceived in August 2014 by ATSE

REA measures engagement and commercialisation
to encourage increased collaboration between Australia’s universities and research end-users

Practical considerations

- **metric based:** to minimize judgment calls
- **pragmatic:** use already reported data
- **cooperative:** new metric proposed to work alongside ERA, not instead of ERA
  - to ensure that collaboration is appropriately recognised
  - does not imply a loss of value of basic, curiosity-driven research
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- RUN
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- BCA leadership
- CRC leadership
REA Proposal

• ATSE began work on REA Proposal in October 2014
• Support from
  – Department of Education and Training
  – Department of Industry and Science
  – ARC
• Scope of REA Proposal
  – define key terms (research engagement, collaboration, etc.)
  – construct a matrix of what measures exist, or could be developed, mapped across all individual discipline areas
Data used in REA Proposal

• 2-digit (FoR) ERA data is used throughout as best level of granularity
  – Comparison between universities is *within disciplines*

• ARC provided de-identified ERA 2012 data under strict privacy provisions
Proposed Metrics

Constant numerator

Relevant ERA/HERDC income data (Relevant Cat 1, Cat 2, Cat 3, Cat 4 & commercialisation)

Three denominators

Research FTE  

Share of income for discipline  

University operating income

Engagement per FTE (M1)

Share of National Engagement Activity (M2)

Engagement Intensiveness (M3)
REA Proposal metrics compared for Medical and Health Sciences (FoR 11)

Clusters for ratings?
REA Proposal metrics compared for Medical and Health Sciences (FoR 11)
REA Proposal metrics compared for Medical and Health Sciences (FoR 11)

Determine cluster boundaries
REA Proposal metrics compared for Medical and Health Sciences (FoR 11)
Findings – REA Proposal

• There is sufficient data to identify engagement income

• It is feasible to create meaningful research engagement metrics

• Results for each metric can be sorted into ordered lists to create rankings

• Alternatively, use multidimensional mapping and clusters to create ratings
Research Engagement for Australia – Pilot

• Following the release of the REA Proposal, ATSE received additional support from South Australian and Queensland State governments to conduct a Pilot of REA:

  – *To demonstrate that universities can participate in REA without creating additional resourcing burdens; and*

  – *To work with South Australian and Queensland universities to refine the REA metrics and methods for future use.*
Outline of REA Pilot

• Pilot Exercise using REA metrics on ‘live’ data from SA and QLD universities (ERA 2012 and 2015 data)

• Recommendations
  – Incorporate additional financial inputs such as Rural Research and Development Corporation (RRDC) income and relevant ‘research extension income’;
  – Include explanatory vignettes to assist in interpreting the outcomes of REA;
QLD Universities Pilot – HASS

Share of National Engagement Activity (M2)

1 = National FoR average
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QLD Universities Pilot – HASS

Engagement Intensiveness (M3)

1 = National FoR average
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REA – Research Engagement for Australia

- Proposal
- Pilot
- Deployment
- Mark II
REA Deployment

• Next year? Will require adoption by Australian Government

• What drivers for behaviour modification?
  – Reputation
  – Financial
REA – Research Engagement for Australia
REA Deployment Mark II?

What would we do if there was an appetite for collecting more data?

Research benefits beyond research engagement?

- financial metrics. income from professional publications, income from professional development courses (non-credit bearing), income from outreach activities/public events, number of active license agreements

- non-financial metrics: eg, number of university researchers on government committees or industry boards, in-kind contributions
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