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Preparatory work

Two trial runs for the RQF already completed –

- 2005 – 2 schools (research presented electronically via Web pages)
- 2006 – 14 schools, 1 centre (research presented electronically via UQ eSpace repository)

UQ working party set up with staff from –

- Office of DVC (Research)
- Office of Research and Postgraduate Studies
- Library staff
- Academic staff in schools being assessed
- Support staff in schools

8 November, 2006
2005 trial - workflow

- Library staff designed research reporting templates for schools
- Academics entered citation data on to templates
- Templates included
  - Full citation details
  - Statement explaining the rationale for the specific work’s inclusion
  - Research area for which academic was being assessed
2005 trial - workflow

- Library staff
  - created a separate Web page for each citation
  - added DOIs or links to online material for each citation, if possible
  - scanned and uploaded any non-electronic material and linked this material to citations

- Citations were listed alphabetically by title, listed under School names and grouped by research area
**2005 trial - workflow**

- Only assessors could log in to the Web pages
- Authentication done once
- Log ins linked to the research areas being assessed
- Assessors either viewed a local electronic file or viewed material online at journal or conference sites
- Library staff provided books to assessors by a variety of methods
  - loans from assessor’s home institution’s library
  - loans from UQ Library collections
  - loans from author of research being assessed
- Discussion forums for each research area
Pros

• Easy for assessors to follow links from Web pages to items, either locally or remotely
• Clear labelling and presentation of material
• Easy to provide onward link from items to discussion forums

Cons

• Large workload for library staff
• Schools did not fully ‘own’ process
• Data was double-handled
• Data was not easily re-usable
• Separate system for assessor discussions
• No online system can deliver print material such as books
Workflow issues considered by UQ’s 2006 research assessment working party

- What research gets included?
- Which academics take part in the exercise?
- Who decides what academic work is ‘best’?
- Who enters the citation data?
- Who checks it for completeness and accuracy?
- Who ensures compliance of academics with the process?
- How is the project kept on track and to timetable?
- What about copyright?
- Who handles queries?
- Who documents the system, and where is documentation and help available?
- How do assessors access material for review?
- How do assessors communicate with each other?
- How is assessor compliance monitored?
2006 trial - workflow

- UQ eSpace repository the mechanism for electronic delivery of research
- New content models were created for each publication type, and included these fields –
  - Full citation
  - Pre-loaded look-up tables for
    - Author names (tied to log in)
    - Research groups (tied to log in)
    - RFCD codes (to tag material for specific panels)
  - Submitting author field
  - Rationale for inclusion
  - Link either to local file or to a DOI / robust URL
  - Author keywords (optional)
- Staff in the Office of the DVC (Research) provided a Help Desk with Library staff as backup
2006 trial - workflow

- Data entry staff from schools logged in to specific collections to enter data
- They entered citations and supporting statements into UQ eSpace and ‘published’ completed entries, i.e.
  - Records with full citation + DOI
  - Records with full citation + link to local electronic file
- School liaison librarians checked accuracy of ‘unpublished’ entries, added any missing data, and added DOIs/URLs to complete and ‘publish’ records
2006 trial - workflow

- Library staff scanned non-electronic material and uploaded it to UQ eSpace
- Library staff provided books to assessors by a variety of methods
  - loans from assessor’s home institution’s library
  - loans from UQ Library collections
  - loans from author of research being assessed
- Once all data entry was completed and checked, the material was signed off for assessors
- Assessors were given log ins to UQ eSpace that linked them to their specific review collections
Pros

- Assessors logged straight in to their specific review collections
- Data entry was simplified by pre-populating forms with drop-down choices for author names, research groups, and RFCD codes
- Schools and centres had input to process
- Data in repository now available for reuse / repurposing

Cons

- New system took time to bed down
- Assessor discussions occurred elsewhere
- No online system can deliver print material such as books
Conclusions

The repository solution had several benefits over a Web page model:

- Forms for publication types were created specifically for the research assessment process.
- Forms could be changed (added to, remodelled) without loss of data even after data entry had commenced.
- Incorrect data such as misnamed research groups could be fixed globally.
- Data quality was checked in daily data dumps.
- Daily statistics could be produced on the number of papers entered, from where, and so on, facilitating project management and compliance tracking.
Benefits of repository solution

- Data already gathered can be repurposed for RQF 2008
- Existing HERDC data can be exported to the repository, reducing the workload for RQF 2008
- Existing forms can be remodelled when RQF reporting requirements are finalised
- The same data can easily be displayed in different ways and combinations and can belong to more than one collection
- The repository software is under constant development and will deliver additional functionality such as comment / annotation by reviewers by 2008
- Data entered can be repurposed for CVs, annual reports, research reporting, etc.
Research assessment collections only visible after log in – not otherwise visible

Allocated log in privileges govern who sees what
### Sample browse listing – author, title, publication type, date, research group, link to full record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publication Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Research Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex Park and Stephen Bell</td>
<td>The Problematic Metagovernance of Networks: Water Reform in New South Wales</td>
<td>Journal Article</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Bellamy</td>
<td>No Pain, No Gain? Ethics and Torture in the War on Terror</td>
<td>Journal Article</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Bellamy</td>
<td>Humanitarian Responsibilities and Interventionist Claims in International Society</td>
<td>Journal Article</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Bellamy</td>
<td>A Responsibility to Protect or a Trojan Horse? The Crisis in Darfur and Humanitarian Intervention After Iraq</td>
<td>Journal Article</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Hindmoor</td>
<td>Rational Choice</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title of article</strong></td>
<td>No Pain, No Gain? Ethics and Torture in the War on Terror</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link to Full Text (DOI)</strong></td>
<td>10.1111/j.1468-2346.2006.00518.x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journal name</strong></td>
<td>International Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>2006-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volume</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pages</strong></td>
<td>121-149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale for inclusion</strong></td>
<td>International Affairs is the journal of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. It is one of the most widely read journals outside the US. Although published recently, this article has already had impact. In February 2006 it was specifically and approvingly cited (and UQ specifically named) in the British House of Commons by Tony Baldry MP in a House debate on the war on terror.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DOI direct link – routed through our ezproxy to handle once-only authentication**

**Specific fields requested for research assessment exercise**

**DOI entered here – we programmed the system to extract the DOI from here and add leading code to create a working link**
Specific fields requested for research assessment exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keyword(s)</td>
<td>Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting Author</td>
<td>Ditrich, Tamara, 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Ditrich, Tamara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of chapter</td>
<td>Indological Studies in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor(s) of book</td>
<td>Sarbajna Bhata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of book</td>
<td>Indology:Past, Present and Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter no.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page nos.</td>
<td>51-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Publication</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Sahitya Akademi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of publication</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Fields, Courses and Disciplines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale for inclusion

The main focus of these publications is research and critical analysis of ancient Hindu and Buddhist texts, exploring various methodological approaches in the contemporary Indian studies (publication 2), especially philological method. Two publications (1, 3) analyse texts in Sanskrit, and (4) in Classical Tibetan. Publication 1 contributes to the new field of scholarly research, i.e. mothering, publications 3 and 4 demonstrate innovative approach to the research of classical religious texts.

Attached Files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>MIMEType</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Link to locally scanned and uploaded file
Without logging in, users can only browse publicly available communities. The RQA collections are only available to specific log ins.
Once a user logs in, a new button ‘My UQ eSpace’ appears. All collections to which user has rights appear in that space.
**How My UQ eSpace looks to a user**

All items ‘published’ – no records left to check

Log ins tied to specific collections – user only sees relevant collections
A collection with some items still not ‘published’ – 3 records left to check

User may be associated with more than one collection
Checklist of RQF functionality

✔ Support RQF data model
  • UQ eSpace data models can be customised to meet RQF metadata and reporting needs

✔ Support complex or non-text items
  • UQ eSpace can support any format of item. New formats can be easily created

✔ Facilitate workflow for academics and administrators
  • UQ eSpace’s workflow can be customised to suit different scenarios and workflow models, including editorial control

✔ Manage groups and access
  • UQ eSpace administration allows
    • Active Directory/LDAP authentication
    • Log ins for individual users or groups (created and managed via an administrative Web interface)
    • Federated authentication using Shibboleth and eduPerson attributes
Checklist of RQF functionality

✓ Enable communication and automated reporting
  • UQ eSpace comment/annotation system will allow assessors to discuss research within the system
  • UQ eSpace security will protect this material from being seen by any but those authorised
  • Statistics and data dumps can assist with project tracking and milestones

✓ Liaise with the research office
  • UQ eSpace can allocate ‘admin’ privileges for Research Office staff to facilitate RQF project management
Conclusions

- It’s a bigger project than you think
- It takes a lot longer than you think
- So …
  - Identify ALL the stakeholders and get them together SOON
  - Design the workflow and work out a schedule to manage it well in advance
  - Each ‘stage’ must be closely monitored
  - Someone (Project Manager?) needs to keep schools ‘on track’
  - All documentation and instructions must be online and easily accessible
  - Data entry instructions must be foolproof
  - You need a Help Desk
How can you become RQF-ready?

1. Do a trial
2. Find a system that can
   - Do the job
   - Make data entry as easy as possible
   - Allow data re-use afterwards
   - Export data in XML