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Monash and ARROW (or, Why I am here)

- My disclaimer: I don’t work for Monash, but I do “live” there and have worked there for a long time.
- Monash is a member of the ARROW Community
- Monash used VITAL tools to load items to the repository
- ARROW used Monash’s Mock RQF as a study in how the RQF might work in the repository context
The ARROW Solution

- VITAL – proprietary repository software co-developed by ARROW and VTLS Inc. (www.vtls.com), based on the Open Source Fedora platform (www.fedora.info)
- Technical support and maintenance by VTLS
- ARROW Community for information sharing and advice
- Not a hosting solution – talk to our friends at RUBRIC
University Management
- ASAP

- Need to appoint an oversight body
  - Size and membership will vary by institution
  - Will probably need a project team
Project team
- Begin ASAP, ongoing input to process

- Responsible for:
  - Analysis and recommendations
  - Communications plan
  - Timetable
  - Budget
  - Ethical considerations
    - What use will the results be put to?
  - Tracking the groupings and academics
  - Advise on evidence requirements for the portfolios
  - Advise on expectations for impact/context statements
Research Office - ASAP

- Will need to review current research information held to determine:
  - Missing Records – through use of tools such as Web of Science or Scopus
  - Inaccuracies – through comparison of data found with other tools – BIG JOB!
- Consultation with academics/faculty
  - Is this all your work?
  - Which is your best work?
  - What RFCD codes does it belong to?
- Enter this data into a Research Management Recording tool
  - Could be Research Master or Excel spreadsheet
Faculty/ Academics
- once Research Office have assembled data

- Verify records sent to them by Research Office
- Inform Research Office of any omissions or errors
- Identify their best work (6 rather than 4 in Mock)
- Identify relevant RFCD codes
- Establish Research Groups
  - This may be done at a higher level in some universities
  - Each university will need to make a call on how they want to manage this, it will be controversial
- Write context and/or impact statements, based on advice of Project Team and Assessment Panels
University administration - ASAP

- Assemble relevant income and student information
  - Grants
  - Completions
  - HDRs
  - Etc
- Must be to be attached to individuals
IT services
- ASAP once DEST export format decided

- Need to create a tool to assemble the data:
  - Research outputs
  - Links to outputs in repository
  - Income and student information

- This tool could be any electronic document:
  - Bespoke system (e.g. TARDIS)
  - Access Database
  - Excel Spreadsheet
  - Delimited text file

- Need to advise on how to prepare and export this data to meet DEST specifications
  - RAE accepts all of the above

- Need to provide secure access to the repository to DEST specifications
Repository - Set up ASAP, but don’t fill until outputs are settled

- Any “repository” must be:
  - Online
  - 24 x 7
  - Monitored
  - Mirrored on Disaster Recovery System?
- Secure
  - Research outputs accessible only by DEST Assessors
- Able to offer exportable, stable links to outputs for sending to the data assembly tool
  - Some outputs may need to be stored outside the repository
Evidence Collection Team - needs to wait for finalised outputs list

- Research office supplies list of evidence required
- Can source these from:
  - Publisher sites (subject to copyright)
  - Past collection exercises
  - Other parts of library collection
  - Other libraries
  - Academics
- For the evidence collection ONLY
  - Monash Library estimates: 28 minutes and $14 per article
  - Team of 2, with 2 casuals, plus other library input
- Once article is added to repository link is passed back to data assembly tool
The end result of (at least) 10,000 hours work

- 7300 items in the repository
- Multiple content types and creative works
- Every one of them read and rated by assessors
- Substantially cleaned up database of research output
- New understanding of the research conducted at the University, and of individual strengths
- Agreement that future data collection will need to incorporate the repository and the RQF – this should incorporate HERDC
Challenges for 2007

1. Technical help
   - Set up the repository
   - Training
   - Support

2. Thinking through multiple repository uses
   - Access control rules etc.

3. Metadata
   - Information sheets, templates, consultation with DEST and Community

4. Copyright
Challenges for 2007

5. Ingest advice
   - Workflows, research reporting systems etc

6. Software development to allow export for DEST standard
   - IRRA for RAE supports DSpace, ePrints
   - Need similar tool for VITAL/Fez/Fedora
Thank you

- Questions?