

GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETION OF CASE STUDIES IN ATN/Go8 EIA IMPACT ASSESSMENT TRIAL

June – August, 2012

Contents

1 Overview and Context of the EIA Impact Assessment Trial	3
1.1 Purpose of the EIA Trial.....	3
1.2 Definition of Research.....	3
1.3 Definition of Impact	4
1.4 General Principles of the EIA Trial	4
1.5 Disciplines for Evaluation	5
1.6 The Framework for Assessment	6
1.6.1 Time period for Assessment.....	6
1.6.2 Demonstrated Impact vs Potential Impact.....	6
1.6.3 Excellence threshold	6
1.7 Timetable for the EIA Trial	6
1.8 Use of Information.....	6
2 Submissions.....	7
2.1 Eligibility of Impact Case Studies for Submission	7
2.2 Units of Evaluation.....	7
2.3 Number of Submissions	7
2.4 Content of Submission	8
2.4.1 Impact Case Study Template	8
2.5 Process for Submission and Closing Date	10
2.6 Verification of Impact Claims	10
3 Evaluation	11
3.1 The Process for Evaluating Submissions	11

3.2 Scoring Index	11
3.3 Multi-Disciplinary Research.....	12
4 Further Information.....	12
4.1 Confidentiality of Information.....	12
4.2 Contact officers.....	13
Appendix 1 – EIA Research Impact Template	16
Appendix 2 - Examples of outcomes which may constitute Research Impact	19
Appendix 3 - Certification Statement (modified from ERA 2012 Certification requirements, ARC, 2012).....	23

The ATN and Go8 acknowledge that these EIA submission guidelines heavily draw on – with permission - the guidelines and supporting materials for the Research Excellence Framework (REF) to be conducted by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE). The ATN and Go8 are grateful for the assistance of HEFCE in the preparation of the EIA and in particular to HEFCE Director (Research, Innovation and Skills), David Sweeney.

An electronic version of this document may be downloaded from either:

- the Go8 website: <http://go8.edu.au/university-staff/programs- and -fellowships-1/atngo8-excellence-in-innovation-for-australia-trial-excellence-in-innovation-for-australia-eia>
- the ATN website: <http://www.atn.edu.au/eia/index.htm>

1 Overview and Context of the EIA Impact Assessment Trial

The transfer of knowledge between universities, industry and the community, and the impact of that knowledge on the development of new technology, new policy and economic, cultural, environmental or societal outcomes is an important focus for many Australian universities.

The recent Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) exercises (2010 and 2012) included applied measures but did not include the capability to adequately capture the end-user benefits of research. Excellence in both research and innovation are crucial aspects of Australia's research efforts. Both the Australian Technology Network of Universities (ATN) and the Group of Eight (Go8) Universities consider that an Excellence in Innovation for Australia (EIA) assessment exercise, complementary to, but separate from, ERA is required to provide a complete picture of the research performance of Australian universities.

The value of assessing the innovation outcomes of research is increasingly gaining recognition in an international context. In particular, the UK's new Research Excellence Framework (REF) has explicitly included an impact component within its upcoming 2014 assessment. The REF approach is based on the outcomes of a 29 institution pilot exercise conducted in 2010 which aimed to test the feasibility of an impact assessment, and developed the method of assessment for use in the REF. It was heavily modelled on work previously undertaken in this area within Australia (the 2006 ATN/Murdoch Research Quality Framework Impact Trial). This EIA Trial in Australia will, in turn, draw heavily on learnings from the REF trial and the planned REF approach.

Within the broader Australian research setting, one of the recommendations of the *Focusing Australia's Publicly funded Research Review* undertaken by the federal Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education (DIISRTE) in 2011 and accepted by the Government is to undertake a feasibility study into possible approaches to develop a rigorous, transparent, system-wide Australian research impact assessment mechanism, separate from ERA, to evaluate the wider benefits of publicly funded research. It is expected that this EIA Impact Trial will play an important role in informing the feasibility study.

1.1 Purpose of the EIA Trial

The primary purpose of the EIA Trial is to identify and demonstrate the contribution that high quality research has made to the economic, social, cultural and environmental benefit of society. Implicit in this goal is the purpose to investigate the means by which these benefits may best be recognised, portrayed and assessed by institutions and government.

1.2 Definition of Research

For the purposes of the EIA, research is defined in the same way as for ERA, i.e. 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), one that recognises research 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”.

Adoption of this definition of research would normally imply that the research underpinning impact claimed in an Institution’s submission has generated an ERA eligible output, or some other demonstrable and tangible research output.

1.3 Definition of Impact

For the purpose of the EIA, impact is defined in a similar way as for the UK REF, i.e. “an effect on, change, benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life beyond academia. It includes, but is not limited to, an effect on, change or benefit to:

- The activity, attitude, awareness, behaviour, capacity, opportunity, performance, policy, practice, process or understanding
- Of an audience, beneficiary, community, constituency, organisation or individuals
- In any geographic location whether locally, regionally, nationally or internationally.

It includes the reduction or prevention of negative effects including the harm, risk or cost arising from negative effects.

It does not include impact on research or the advancement of academic knowledge, nor impacts on students, teaching or other activities within the submitting institution. It may include impacts within the higher education sector, including teaching or students where they extend significantly beyond the submitting higher education institution (slightly modified from UK REF, Assessment Framework and Guidance on Submissions, Annex C, July, 2011).

1.4 General Principles of the EIA Trial

Following on from the purpose of the EIA Trial (Section 1.1 above) the EIA Trial aims to demonstrate and communicate the beneficial outcomes of research to government, business and the community by:

- Identifying good research outcomes;
- Justifying the claims being made by institutions of good outcomes, and
- Identifying the research underpinning the outcomes/impact.

It is recognised that this EIA Trial will operate independently of other assessment mechanisms such as ERA. ERA seeks to measure the quality of research undertaken within institutions; the EIA Trial will seek to assess the impact of research undertaken within institutions and also examine whether a link exists between demonstrated impact and the quality of underpinning research.

The Trial will be underpinned by the following general principles:

1. The development of the EIA should look to leverage the work performed in developing the UK REF where appropriate
2. The EIA will be retrospective rather than prospective

3. There be no explicit excellence threshold for submissions but the impact should show a link to underpinning research. Assessment Panels will examine the quality of underpinning research through information provided on the template in Appendix 1 and will also seek to assess any link between research quality and demonstrated impact.
4. The EIA should take a verifiable approach to evidence in submissions (as opposed to verifying all evidence)
5. Impact will be primarily assessed by means of case-studies for all disciplines. Performance data for the underpinning research will also be included in the impact submissions and Assessment Panels will seek to investigate any systematic links between the impact and underpinning research performance data.
6. Research underpinning a submitted impact should be attributed to the institution(s) at which the research was generated regardless of any subsequent change in affiliation of researchers involved (including where academics have retired or left academia). It is important to note that the focus of this Trial is to demonstrate the assessment of impact through case studies and not the assessment of individual institution's impact.

These principles are aimed at minimising the effort required by individual institutions to participate in the Trial whilst ensuring that the methodologies employed are robust, compatible with current practice elsewhere and able to deliver the purpose of the EIA Trial.

1.5 Disciplines for Evaluation

This EIA Trial will use the same cluster groupings contained within Socio-Economic Objective (SEO) Classifications maintained by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS).

The four broad SEO clusters for evaluation in this Trial are:

- Sector A - Defence
- Sector B – Economic Development
- Sector C – Society
- Sector D – Environment

Each Sector contains multiple additional classifications at two digit SEO divisions with two digit divisions being further split into multiple four digit classifications. Some are further divided to six digit classifications.

The fifth broad SEO cluster is Sector E – Expanding Knowledge. This will not be used for evaluation in this Trial as the expansion of knowledge is assessed through other mechanisms such as ERA. The assessment in the EIA Trial will be of the impact, not the research in underlying fields. Thus, it is important to note that all disciplines included within Sector E are eligible to be submitted in this Trial if their impact occurs in areas listed under Sectors A-D. For example, 970114, Expanding Knowledge in Economics could have a resultant impact claimed under several SEO Codes in Sectors A-D including, 91, Economic Frameworks, 9204, Public Health amongst many possibilities.

Institutions are invited to make submissions according to four digit SEO classifications contained within these four Sectors. It is expected that each submission will be encapsulated primarily within one four digit SEO classification however provision is made on the application form for up to three

SEO classifications. A list of the four digit SEO classifications may be found at <http://www.abs.gov.au/Ausstats/abs@.nsf/Latestproducts/CF7ADB06FA2DFD69CA2574180004CB82?opendocument>.

1.6 The Framework for Assessment

1.6.1 Time period for Assessment

Institutions should submit, on the template provided in Appendix 1, information on research impacts which have occurred in the period 1st January, 2007 – date of submission (ie, roughly five and a half years). Recognising that in some cases, impact may occur quickly and in others that it may take considerable time for impacts of research to be demonstrated, the impacts submitted should relate to research which occurred during the impact period, or in the 15 year period preceding the claimed impact, ie 1st January, 1992 – 31st December, 2006.

Exceptions to this time frame may still be allowed if justified in the application.

1.6.2 Demonstrated Impact vs Potential Impact

Whilst much research may lead to future, as yet unrecognised, or only partly recognised impact, the focus for this Trial is on demonstrated impact, i.e. impact that has occurred within the reference period above.

Examples of what may constitute demonstrated impact are contained in Appendix 2. These lists are not comprehensive and are provided only as examples. Applicants are free to use other examples or explanations which they consider may demonstrate research impact.

1.6.3 Excellence threshold

There is no excellence threshold for submissions to the EIA. The differing timing of ERA vs the EIA Trial, the likelihood that that staff may have moved institutions within the 20 year assessment period and the differing units of assessment for ERA and the EIA Trial, all combine to render impossible any ERA derived quality threshold for claimed EIA Trial impacts. However the Assessment Panels will be keen to examine whether, on the information provided to them, it is possible to discern any connection between research quality and impact for the case studies submitted.

The EIA Trial template in Appendix 1 contains a section requiring applicants to describe the quality of the research underpinning the claimed impact. This section will be used by Assessment Panels to assess whether there is high impact research which is not underpinned by research excellence.

1.7 Timetable for the EIA Trial

Final EIA Trial Guidelines will be released in May, 2012 and institutions will be given till 31st August, 2012 to prepare submissions. Note that individual institutions may set an earlier closing date for submissions, i.e. prior to 31st August. Assessment of submissions will occur through September, 2012. Results are expected to be released to institutions in November, 2012.

1.8 Use of Information

Following assessment, results will be used in three ways:

1. A consolidated assessment report will be prepared for each institution on results for those units submitted from their own institution;

2. A summary report of results spanning all institutions will be made available to each participating institution, and
3. A summary EIA Trial report will be prepared for the peak EIA Governance Group and released to the public following endorsement. This report will evaluate the process of the EIA Trial and make recommendations concerning its potential more widespread adoption.

In addition to these uses, the Assessment Panels, the Project Steering Group and the Development Advisory Board for the EIA will be seeking to identify issues which may need to be considered in any future widespread impact assessment through the Higher Education sector, including the feasibility study likely to be undertaken by DIISRTE as mentioned in Section 1.

2 Submissions

2.1 Eligibility of Impact Case Studies for Submission

The basic element of submission for the EIA Trial is the case study of research impact. The impact must be related to underpinning research. Consequently institutions should submit case study examples for assessment where they can demonstrate that the research underpinning the impact was undertaken at their institution.

In cases where the research underpinning the claimed impact was undertaken by staff at two different institutions (ie staff involved in the underpinning research changed employing institutions through the 20 year reference period) then both institutions may claim a proportion of the impact. The template in Appendix 1 provides for an apportioning of impact. In such cases it would be incumbent on each submitting institution to clearly demonstrate the link between the research undertaken at their institution and the claimed impact.

2.2 Units of Evaluation

Unlike ERA where the primary Unit of Evaluation is the research discipline in the institution, in the EIA Trial the Unit of Evaluation is the impact as represented by the case study. The attribution of the outcome is for the institution to determine -this may be School, Research Centre or Institute, or some combination of researchers working across institutional boundaries.

As noted in Section 1.5, each submission may be assigned up to three four digit SEO codes, with one being assigned as the primary SEO code. Note that it is not necessary for all case studies to be assigned three SEO Codes. It is expected that in many cases, impact may occur in one SEO code only.

2.3 Number of Submissions

As noted above in Section 1.5 there are four Sectors for evaluation. The EIA Trial is seeking a sufficient number of case studies across the four SEO Sectors in order to demonstrate a range of impacts and to assess any underlying link between quality of research and impact. Ideally each institution would submit a maximum of five case studies in each of the four Sectors, i.e. 20 case studies. However, it is understood that not all institutions will have research or impacts in all of the four Sectors, e.g., Defence. Other factors such as size or age of institution may also affect the number of impacts that may have arisen from an institution's research. Therefore a maximum and minimum number of case studies will apply for each institution:

- A maximum of five case studies for each of the four SEO Sectors (i.e. 20 in total)
- A minimum of two case studies in three of the four SEO Sectors (i.e. 6 in total).

2.4 Content of Submission

Submissions should consist of research impact case studies made on the template in Appendix 1. The information contained in this template should be sufficient to allow the Assessment Panel to make a judgement on the research impact – no further reading should be required.

The template is provided as a Word document and contains headings as described in 2.4.1 below. Within each heading are suggestions as to points which submitting institutions may wish to emphasise in completing each section. These are in no way prescriptive and are provided as examples which may assist institutions in considering how to portray high value research impact. The Assessment Panels recognise that high value impact may arise in a variety of settings and via differing pathways – each submission will be evaluated on the basis of information provided and the quality of the case made.

Note that it is possible for an individual case study to have multiple impacts. For example, a new medicine may have impact in both health and economic outcomes; a new environmental assessment standard may have economic, environmental and cultural impacts. In such cases the multiple impacts should be described within the single case study, not submitted as separate case studies.

2.4.1 Impact Case Study Template

Question 1: Institution – This is the name of the submitting institution within the EIA Trial.

Question 2: Unit of Assessment – This is the four digit SEO code which best classifies the research impact in the case study presented. There is provision for one primary and two secondary SEO codes. These codes will be used to determine which Assessment Panel considers the research impact case study.

Question 3: Title of Case Study – This is the title describing the research impact case study. As far as is possible this should be in layperson’s language and free from jargon or language which may be understood only by those within the unit being evaluated. The title may be used in further promotion of the EIA Trial and thus should be understandable to a wide range of persons.

Question 4: - Context – This question provides for inclusion of background or contextual information that may assist Assessment Panels understand the significance of the research impact, i.e. how the problem to be solved was identified, the nature of contact with end-users or beneficiaries etc. It should not be more than 200 words; neither should it repeat any information given elsewhere in the template.

Question 5: Summary of the Case Study Impact – This section should be a brief statement of the specific impact described in the case study and the link to the underlying research. It should not repeat information contained elsewhere in the submission.

Question 6: - Details of the Impact – This section should provide a discussion of the how the research in the following Questions (7 and 8) led to the claimed impact. As well as drawing the link between the research and the impact this discussion should also explain the process whereby the research was adopted, incorporated or otherwise used to produce impact for the claimed beneficiaries. The discussion should further outline the reach and significance of the impact.

It should also describe the impact within the wider body of research leading to the impact showing the research groupings specific contribution.

Further detail of information that should be included in this section is included on the template in Appendix 1.

Question 7: Research underpinning Impact: - This section should outline the key research findings that underpinned the impact. It should provide details of what research was undertaken, over what time period and the people involved – other than the primary contributors listed in question 9(b). Whilst a timeline of the research undertaken can be included, this section should not be simply a chronology of events but should detail key research findings and progress of ideas that resulted in the impact.

Question 8: - Research outputs from research underpinning impact – This section should provide full references to the key outputs arising from the research outlined in Question 7. Up to 10 references may be included. These may include references spanning the full range of ERA eligible outputs including creative works, patents etc. where relevant to a case study. The references will be a key factor enabling the Assessment Panels to assess the quality of research underpinning the impact. All outputs must be capable of being sourced by the Assessment Panel, or if difficult to access, must be available to the Panels on request.

Question 9: -Additional information

(a) Validation of the impact – The EIA Trial will take a “verifiable approach” to validating claimed impact, rather than a “verified” approach; that is, claims should be capable of being verified through references and material provided in this section. This section should therefore list sources that could, if required, provide evidence to support the impact claims. These could include beneficiaries who could be contacted by Assessment Panels to corroborate claims, reports or other material in the public domain which would support impact claims and/or confidential reports which could be provided by the institution to the Assessment Panel to corroborate impact claims.

(b) People – This section should contain the names and positions of the staff who have made a primary contribution to the research impact case study. A primary contribution may come from employed staff, adjunct staff, HDR students and end-users or beneficiaries of the research. It is not meant to be an exhaustive list but sufficient to validate their link to the institution and the claim to impact. It should include details of their years of employment at the institution during the 20 year assessment period on the project underpinning the case study. Where it is possible to outline the contribution of each person to the research impact case study (their part in the research rather than percentage of contribution) this should also be included.

Higher Degree by Research (HDR) students should be listed at this question with similar details as for staff above.

- (c) Research and Investment Income** – Research income obtained to prosecute the research or the research impact should be listed at this question as should any further investment income used to realise the impact, e.g. university or external investment associated with technology development or transfer, patent and Intellectual Property costs. Recognising that income may have been received over the 20 year period of assessment, a standard table has not been provided for income received. This should be listed in free format, i.e. table, series of dot points, but in a manner which makes it clear to the Assessment Panel what income has been received to support the research and its impact.

The template in Appendix 1 contains word limits for each question. Whilst these are to be taken as a guide, each case study should be no more than 15 pages including the additional material contained in question 9.

The underlying purpose of these questions is for the submitting institution to provide the Assessment Panels with sufficient, self-contained information to enable a reasonable assessment of the reach and significance of the claimed impact, the link to underlying research conducted by the research grouping and the research grouping's contribution to the claimed impact within the wider body of research.

If further clarification is required concerning completion of the template in Appendix 1 it should be sought in the first instance from the institutional contact listed in Section 4.2 of these Guidelines.

2.5 Process for Submission and Closing Date

Completed submissions should be provided to each institution's Research Office. Internal processes for submissions, including internal deadlines and names of receiving officers for submissions will be determined by each institution.

Each institution will send their submissions to the ATN Office by 5.00pm Eastern Standard time, 31st August, 2012. Submissions should be a zip file comprising pdf documents for each case study submitted.

Each institution's EIA Submission should be accompanied by a signed Statement from the Vice Chancellor (or delegate) certifying (a) that all reasonable efforts have been made to verify that the information submitted as part of the submission is correct, accurate, and sufficiently comprehensive, (b) that the Submission has been prepared in accordance with the EIA Trial Guidelines and (c) granting permission for the Submission material to be used by relevant parties for the purpose of the EIA Trial.

The Certification Statement is contained in Appendix 3.

2.6 Verification of Impact Claims

The Assessment Panels realise that providing data to conclusively verify each claim of high value research impact would impose a large administrative overhead for institutions and could result in submissions which are excessively lengthy. The emphasis in Submissions for this EIA trial will

therefore be on data and claims which *are verifiable* rather than data or claims which *are verified* in the Submission text.

The Certification Statement in Appendix 3 includes a statement to the effect that institutions have the data, testimonies, material or other information as relevant, to verify claims made in Submissions and would be able to produce such information should they be so required to do.

The ATN/Go8 EIA trial will seek to build on the considerable material and examples gathered by the UK REF providing possible evidence of impact¹. Examples of impact for many of the disciplines within this trial are contained in Appendix 2. Note that these examples are provided as a guide to the range of potential impacts which may be used in case studies. The lists are not exhaustive or exclusive and do not imply rank order. Submissions are not expected to be aligned with these examples and it may be possible for a case study to demonstrate more than one type of impact from, or in addition to those examples provided.

Institutions should also satisfy themselves that they have obtained all necessary consents for the use of information contained in the submissions.

3 Evaluation

3.1 The Process for Evaluating Submissions

There will be two Assessment Panels for each of the four broad Sectors. Each Panel will comprise a mix of end-user representatives with expertise in the broad range of disciplines represented by the cluster and academic staff with disciplinary expertise. The end-users will constitute the majority of the Assessment Panel and shall also provide the Chair for each Assessment Panel. The Assessment Panels will be constituted to ensure, as far as possible, that the membership reflects the broad range of disciplines covered within the Sector – particular attention will be paid to Sectors B and C (Economic Development and Society) which cover a larger number of disparate disciplines.

Following receipt of Submissions, the ATN and Go8 Offices will distribute them to each Assessment Panel along with guidelines on evaluation research impact submissions. These guidelines will point Assessment Panel members to the range of possible impacts as provided in Appendix 2.

3.2 Scoring Index

Each Case Study will be assessed according to the Reach and Significance of the impact. This is in keeping with the UK's REF Impact Assessment Criteria with the following definitions:

- Reach: The spread or breadth of influence or effect on the relevant constituencies;
- Significance: the intensity of the influence or effect.

The Assessment Panel will assess each Case Study against overall Reach and Significance rather than assessing each component separately. Following assessment, a rating will be assigned to each Case Study according to the following scale:

¹ See REF 2014 Panel Criteria and Working Methods, Sections A3, B3, C3 and D3
http://www.hefce.ac.uk/research/ref/pubs/2012/01_12/

- A = Outstanding impacts in terms of reach and significance. 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 = Very considerable impacts in terms of their reach and significance. 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 = Considerable impacts in terms of their reach and significance. Adoption of the research has produced new policies, products, attitudes, behaviours and/or outlooks in the end-user community.
- D = Recognised but modest impacts in terms of their reach and significance. There has been engagement of researchers with the end-user community to address a social, economic, environmental and/or cultural issue, regionally within Australia, nationally or internationally.
- E = The research impact is of limited reach or significance. Research has had limited or no identifiable social, economic, environmental and/or cultural outcome, regionally within Australia, nationally or internationally.
- Not classified – The impact was not underpinned by research or the link between the research and the claimed impact has not been demonstrated to the Assessment Panel's satisfaction.

3.3 Multi-Disciplinary Research

The structuring of submissions around SEO Codes (as opposed to more disciplinary focussed FOR Codes) is expected to assist the assessment of research which is inter-disciplinary and multidisciplinary. However, in cases where Assessment Panels do not consider that they have the breadth of expertise to adequately assess submissions and where they feel the submission may be more accurately assessed in another panel they may refer it to a different Assessment Panel for consideration. In cases where the submission spans the expertise of more than one Assessment Panel it will be referred to a meeting of the Chairs of Assessment Panels for evaluation.

4 Further Information

4.1 Confidentiality of Information

Given that some material contained in Impact Case Studies may be commercial in confidence to the submitting unit or may contain intellectual property or other sensitive information, members of Assessment Panels will be required to sign a Confidentiality Agreement as a condition of panel membership. This will include an undertaking that information contained in submissions may be used by Assessment Panel members only for the purpose of the EIA Trial.

Submissions shall not be disclosed during the assessment period to any other person except Assessment Panel members and the EIA Trial project team. All reasonable steps shall be taken to ensure that other people do not have access to the submissions.

4.2 Contact officers

Whilst information on the Trial will be maintained on the EIA Trial website, each participating institution has a designated contact officer from whom further information can be obtained (listed below).

Charles Darwin University:

Jenny Carter
Director, Office of Research & Innovation
Jenny.Carter@cdu.edu.au
08 8946 6708

Curtin University:

Charlie Thorn
Director Office of Research and Development
C.Thorn@curtin.edu.au
08 9266 9062

Queensland University of Technology:

Michael McArdle
Director, Office of Research
m.mcardle@qut.edu.au
07 3138 5376

RMIT University:

Lois Fitz-Gerald
Executive Director, Office for Research
lois.fitz-gerald@rmit.edu.au
03 9925 4603

University of Melbourne:

Shane Wood
Manager, ERA Project Team
woos@unimelb.edu.au
03 8344 2072

University of New South Wales:

Murray Green
Deputy Director & Senior Data Analyst ERA Office
murray.green@unsw.edu.au
02 9385 8035

University of Newcastle:

Lyn McBriarty
Director, Research Services
lyn.mcbriarty@newcastle.edu.au
02 4921 5300

University of Queensland:

Ian Harris
Director, Research Partnerships
i.harris@research.uq.edu.au
07 3365 3559

University of South Australia:

Tracey Swift
Director, Research and Innovation Services
tracey.swift@unisa.edu.au
08 8302 3471

University of Tasmania:

Mark Hochman
Senior Advisor, Research Policy and Strategy
mark.hochman@utas.edu.au
03 6226 6371

University of Technology, Sydney:

Jeffrey Francis
Director, Research and Innovation Office
Jeffrey.Francis@uts.edu.au
02 9514 1253

University of Western Australia:

Elizabeth Przywolnik
Senior Project Officer, Research Assessment Unit
elizabeth.przywolnik@uwa.edu.au
08 6488 4714

In addition to individual institution contact officers, further information can also be sought from:

ATN Directorate:

Matthew Brown
Senior Policy Analyst – Research
matt.brown@atn.edu.au
08 8302 7610

Group of Eight Secretariat:

Ian McMahon
Director Research
ian.mcmahon@go8.edu.au
02 6239 5488

EIA Trial Program Manager:

Mark Hochman
mark.hochman@atn.edu.au

Appendix 1 – EIA Research Impact Template

1. Institution
2. Unit of Assessment Primary SEO Code: Secondary SEO Code (if needed): Secondary SEO Code (if needed):
3. Title of Case Study
4. Context
5. Summary of the Case Study Impact (indicative maximum 100 words) This section should briefly state what specific impact is being described in the case study and the link to the underlying research.
6. Details of the Impact (indicative maximum 750 words) This section should provide a narrative, with supporting evidence, to explain: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How the research underpinned (made a distinct and material contribution to) the impact.• The nature and extent of the impact. The following should be provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A clear explanation of the process or means through which the research led to, underpinned or made a contribution to the impact (for example, how it was disseminated, how it came to influence users or beneficiaries, or how it came to be exploited, taken up or applied).• Where the submitted unit’s research was part of a wider body of research that contributed to the impact (for example, where there has been research collaboration with other institutions), the case study should specify the particular contribution of the submitted unit’s research and acknowledge other key research contributions.• Details of the beneficiaries – who or what community, constituency or organisation has benefitted, been affected or impacted on.• Details of the nature of the impact – how they have benefitted, been affected or impacted on.• Evidence or indicators of the extent of the impact described, as appropriate to the case being made.• Dates of when these impacts occurred.

7. **Research Underpinning Impact** (indicative maximum 500 words)

This section should outline the key research insights or findings that underpinned the impact, and provide details of what research was undertaken, when, and by whom. References to specific research outputs that embody the research described in this section, and evidence of its quality, should be provided in section 8.

Details of the following should be provided in this section:

- The nature of the research insights or findings which relate to the impact claimed in the case study.
- An outline of what the underpinning research produced by the submitted unit was (this may relate to one or more research outputs, projects or programmes).
- Dates of when it was carried out.
- Any relevant key contextual information about this area of research.

8. **Research Outputs from Research Underpinning Impact** (maximum of ten references)

This section should provide references to key outputs from the research described in the previous section, and evidence about the quality of the research. These may also include references spanning creative works, patents etc where relevant to a case study.

Include the following details for each cited output:

- Author(s).
- Title.
- Year of publication.
- Type of output and other relevant details required to identify the output (for example journal title and issue).
- Details to enable the panel to gain access to the output, if required (for example, a DOI or URL) or can be supplied by the institution on request.

All outputs cited in this section must be capable of being made available to panels.

Evidence of the quality of the research must also be provided in this section.

9. **Additional Information**

a) **Validation of the Impact** (indicative maximum of 10 references)

This section should list sufficient sources that could, if audited, corroborate key claims made about the impact of the unit's research. These could include, as appropriate to the case study, the following external sources of corroboration (stating which claim each source provides corroboration for):

- Reports, reviews, web links or other documented sources of information in the public domain.
- Confidential reports or documents (if listed, these must be made available by the institution if audited).
- Individual users/beneficiaries who could be contacted by the Assessment Panel to corroborate claims.
- Factual statements already provided to the institution by key users/beneficiaries, that corroborate specific claims made in the case study and that could be made available to the Assessment Panel by the institution if audited.

b) **People**

i. **Staff**

ii. **Others** (including research students, end-users or beneficiaries of the research)

c) Research and Investment Income

This section is free format but the following should be provided for each grant or source of income used to prosecute the research or the impact:

- Who the grant was awarded to.
- The grant title.
- Sponsor.
- Period of the grant (with dates).
- Value of the grant.

This template is modelled on a combination of REF3A and REF5A templates from the 2014 UK REF. Their use for this EIA Impact Trial is acknowledged.

Appendix 2 - Examples of outcomes which may constitute Research Impact

The template of examples in Appendix 2 draws heavily on examples of research impact drawn from the UK REF, Panel Criteria and Working Methods (REF 01.2012) at <http://www.ref.ac.uk/pubs/2012-01/> In particular these examples are taken from Sections A3, B3, C3 and D3 of the referenced document and consolidated under the broad SEO Sectors to be used in the EIA Trial.

Any researchers wishing further information on impact assessment within the 2014 UK REF are referred to the above referenced document and also to the Assessment Framework and Guidance on Submissions (REF 02.2011) <http://www.ref.ac.uk/pubs/2011-02/>

In considering the examples in Appendix 2 the following points should be borne in mind.

These examples are:

- A guide to the range of potential impacts that may be eligible in case studies;
- Illustrative rather than prescriptive;
- A set of examples rather than a comprehensive listing;
- An attempt to “best fit” examples given for the four panels of the UK REF into the EIA’s four SEO sectors.

These examples are not:

- An exhaustive or exclusive list;
- Mutually incompatible, ie one case study may result in a range of impacts – included in this list or additional to this list;
- Indicative of a rank order of impact.

The Assessment Panels recognise that research impact(s) can occur in a variety of ways and a variety of settings, and may have single or multiple beneficiaries. Impact can take many forms and the Assessment Panel encourages case studies that describe impacts of a societal, cultural, economic or environmental nature whether they follow the examples given or not.

Institutions should submit their strongest case studies for assessment rather than provide a range of case studies of varying impact.

SECTOR A: DEFENCE

Impacts where the beneficiaries are the government, industries or other organisations or agencies connected with national security. Examples of impacts may include:

- Technologies or products which are used in defence related industries.
- Software or algorithms which enable detection or interception of malware or hostile signals.
- Development of technical standards which influence policies, designs or protocols.
- Understandings of international relationships, including historical analysis, which enhance diplomatic relationships.
- Development of communications technologies or protocols or standards which find broader application within the wider community.
- Health outcomes that have broader application in the wider community.
- Waste management and contaminant remediation that have broader application in the wider community.

Further specific examples may be found in many other particular sectors and the above sectors are chosen only with the intention of demonstrating some specific examples of impact.

SECTOR B: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually industries or industry sectors, either new or established, or other types of organisation which undertake activity that creates wealth. Examples of research impact may include:

- The performance of an existing business has been improved through the introduction of new, or the improvement of existing, products, processes or services; the adoption of new, updated or enhanced technical standards and/or protocols.
- The strategy, operations or management practices of a business have improved.
- Jobs have been created or protected.
- Improved business performance measures, for example, sales, turnover, profits or employment associated with new or improved products, processes or services.
- Improved effectiveness of workplace practices.
- A new business sector or activity has been created.
- Performance has been improved, or new or changed technologies or processes adopted, in companies or other organisations through highly skilled people having taken up specialist roles that draw on their research, or through the provision of consultancy or training that draws on their research.
- Potential future losses have been mitigated by improved methods of risk assessment and management in safety or security critical situations.

The examples above are general in nature and relate to many industry sectors. More specific examples in particular industry sectors may include the following:

In agriculture

- Production, yields or quality have increased or level of waste has been reduced.
- Decisions by regulatory authorities have been positively influenced
- Costs of production, including food, have been reduced.
- Husbandry methods have improved.
- Management practices in production businesses have resulted in improved efficiency or animal welfare.

In the health sector

- Policies have been introduced which have had a positive impact on economic growth or incentivising productivity.
- The costs of treatment or healthcare have reduced as a result of evidence based changes in practice.
- Gains in productivity have been realised as a result of evidence based changes in practice.
- The roles and/or incentives for health professionals and organisations have changed, resulting in improved service delivery.

In the professional services sector

- Professional standards, guidelines or training have been influenced by research.
- Practitioners/professionals have used research findings in conducting their work.
- The quality or efficiency of a professional service has improved.

Further specific examples may be found in many other particular sectors and the above three sectors are chosen only with the intention of demonstrating some specific examples of impact.

SECTOR C: SOCIETY

Impacts on society may be many and varied in nature. Some impacts in selected areas of society are given below as examples or guides of what may constitute impact in Sector B, Society.

Impacts on health and welfare

Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals and groups whose quality of life has been enhanced (or potential harm mitigated)

- Public health and well-being has improved.
- A new clinical or lifestyle intervention (for example, drug, diet, treatment or therapy) has been developed, trialled with patients, related or other groups (for example, prisoners, community samples), and definitive (positive or negative) outcome demonstrated.
- A new diagnostic or clinical technology has been adopted.
- Disease prevention or markers of health have been enhanced by research.
- Care and educational practices have improved.
- Clinical, dietary or healthcare guidelines have improved.
- The control of diseases has been improved.
- The costs of treatment or healthcare have reduced.

Impacts on society, culture and creativity

Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose knowledge, behaviours have been influenced

- Beneficial changes to social policy or practice have been informed by research.
- Enhancements to heritage preservation, conservation and presentation; the latter including museum and gallery exhibitions.
- Production of cultural artefacts, including for example, films, novels and TV programmes.
- Public or political debate has been shaped or informed; this may include activity that has challenged established norms, modes of thought or practices.
- Enhanced cultural understanding of issues and phenomena; shaping or informing public attitudes and values.
- Developing stimuli to tourism and contributing to the quality of the tourist experience.

- Contributing to processes of commemoration, memorialisation and reconciliation..
- The awareness, attitudes or understanding of (sections of) the influenced public have been informed, and their ability to make informed decisions on issues improved, by engaging them with research.

Impacts on public policy and services

Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually government, public sector, and charitable organisations and societies, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society, through the implementation of policies

- Policy decisions or changes to legislation, regulations or guidelines have been informed by research evidence.
- The implementation of a policy (for example, health, environment or agricultural policy) or the delivery of a public service has been enhanced.
- The quality, accessibility, acceptability or cost-effectiveness of a public service has been improved.
- The public has benefitted from public service improvements.

Impacts on practitioners and services

Impacts where beneficiaries are organisations or individuals, including service users involved in the development of and delivery of professional services

- Professional standards, guidelines or training have been influenced by research.
- Practitioners/professionals have used research findings in conducting their work.
- The quality or efficiency of a professional service has improved.
- New or modified professional or technical standards and codes of practice.
- There has been a positive influence on professional standards, guidelines or training.
- Expert and legal work have been informed by research.

Further specific examples may be found in many other particular sectors and the above sectors are chosen only with the intention of demonstrating some specific examples of impact.

SECTOR D: ENVIRONMENT

Impacts on the environment

Impacts where the key beneficiary is the natural or built environment

- The environment has been improved through the introduction of new product(s), process(es) or service(s); the improvement of existing product(s), process(es) or services; or the enhancement of strategy, operations or management practices.
- New methods, models, monitoring or techniques have been developed that have led to changes or benefits.
- Policy debate on the environment, environmental policy decisions or planning decisions have been informed or changed by research evidence.
- The management or conservation of natural resources, including energy, water and food, has been positively influenced or improved.
- Planning decisions have been informed by research.
- Sales of new products or improvements in existing products that bring quantifiable environmental benefits.

Further specific examples may be found in many other particular sectors and the above sectors are chosen only with the intention of demonstrating some specific examples of impact.

Appendix 3 - Certification Statement (modified from ERA 2012 Certification requirements, ARC, 2012)

This Certification Statement must be signed Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) or equivalent of each participating institution certifying that:

1. The person signing the Certification Statement has made all reasonable efforts to verify that the information submitted as part of the submission is correct, accurate, and sufficiently comprehensive.
2. The submission complies with the ATN/Go8 EIA Trial Guidelines
3. In compiling its submission, the institution has complied with relevant privacy requirements and taken reasonable steps to ensure awareness of the inclusion in the submission of relevant information and of its use in the EIA Trial process on the part of:
 - a. all eligible researchers referred to in the submission who maintain any continuing affiliation with the institution; and
 - b. to the maximum extent feasible, all eligible researchers referred to in the submission who no longer maintain an affiliation with the institution.
4. The institution grants to the ATN/Go8 Peak Governance Group a permanent, irrevocable, non-exclusive licence to use the material submitted as part of the EIA Trial, for the purposes of Trial and for any subsequent policy or program development.
5. The institution acknowledges and agrees that outcomes of the EIA Trial evaluation will be distributed and published in the manner described in the EIA Guidelines.
6. The institution has in its possession such material as may be required to verify claims of impact as contained in the institution's Submission(s) to the EIA Trial.

.....
Signature of DVC (Research) or equivalent

.....
Name of DVC (Research) or equivalent