You work in research...but are your systems truly smart? Do they guide you and enhance research outcomes or easily demonstrate the exacting ethics standards you maintain?

WE BRING
GOOD
RESEARCH
TO LIFE

Intelligent and ethical Research Management Systems
In 1996, three guys started an IT company to help government departments and organisations with their IT requirements. They named the company, F1 Solutions after the ‘help key’.

We have come a long way since these humble beginnings. Today we help translate cutting edge research into commercially viable products that benefit millions of lives and ensure it’s done ethically. We believe that ‘technology’ should have purpose, so we built a custom engineered, research platform called OmniStar. Our vision is to leverage grants and ethics for the good of the research industry and meet the exacting high standards of the community we serve.

OmniStar powers the NSW eHealth Research Ethics and Governance Information System (REGIS). The system has delivered significant benefits reducing the average time required for site governance applications by 40% with an average 32% time saving for an ethics application.

Our solid software engineering core competencies have been powering our client’s growth and success for over 23 years. We make technology simple and intelligent so that it enriches citizens daily lives. We help businesses stay competitive with disruptive ideas that change the world. At our core, we bring ‘good technology to life’.

OmniStar
Intelligent and ethical Research Management Systems
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Welcome to Adelaide, the city of Churches for the 20th Annual Conference of the Australasian Research Management Society.

Adelaide is a beautiful and vibrant city surrounded by fabulous scenery and excellent wineries. The Universities of Adelaide, Flinders, and South Australia have excellent reputations worldwide and continue to add to the wealth of information generated from quality research. Also, the Adelaide based South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute (SAHMRI) and CSIRO are two key institutes with a research focus, making this city a hub for research managers. The organising committee has included tours to some of these sites, amongst others, into the program and you are encouraged to make the most of these opportunities.

ARMS 2019 will explore how our members support and develop our researchers to maximise quality research outcomes and impact of their research. ARMS continues to be an excellent forum for showcasing our members achievements, supporting the community to innovate, while providing opportunities for networking, collaboration and capacity building.

The Program Committee have built an exciting and engaging program for you, including plenary and keynote addresses that outline the higher-level strategies at play, both institutionally and internationally. These addresses will be supported by oral and poster presentations from delegates, industry exhibitions, ARMS Foundation Level Accreditation modules and a range of professional development workshops.

We would also like to acknowledge and thank the many sponsors for their generous support of this meeting. Likewise, the many exhibitors also in attendance for their support towards this event.

On behalf of ARMS, and our conference committee colleagues, we hope you thoroughly enjoy the conference in Adelaide.

Andrew Beveridge and Hannah Clarke,
Conference Co-Convenors, ARMS 2019

Welcome to the 20th year celebration of the Australasian Research Management Society (ARMS) and to the 20th annual conference of ARMS on the topic of Research Management Excellence and Impact: It’s our Business.

It’s no co-incidence that the conference is being held in Adelaide this year, because it was in 1999 in this city that we agreed to establish the Society and so it is appropriate we came back to this place to reflect and celebrate our achievements.

This year’s conference theme is particularly relevant given the national and international focus on research quality and impact, and both the Organising and Program Committees are to be congratulated on developing such an exciting program.

Please take every opportunity to network with colleagues, to share experiences and to learn from one another. After all, this is what makes ARMS such a vibrant community.

Dr Campbell Thomson
President, ARMS
GENERAL INFORMATION

Welcome to Adelaide
Adelaide is bursting with culture, flavours, events and entertainment. South Australia’s capital city is a gateway to some of Australia’s best wine country as well as historic buildings, lush parklands, stunning restaurants and some of the country’s best beaches.

Conference Venue
Adelaide Convention Centre
North Terrace, Adelaide

Registration Desk
The Conference Registration Desk will be situated in Foyer M at the Adelaide Convention Centre and will be staffed as follows:

- **Tuesday 17 September 2019**
  8.00am (Pre-Conference Module Registration ONLY)
  3.00pm Conference Registration Open

- **Wednesday 18 September 2019**
  8.00am – 5.00pm

- **Thursday 19 September 2019**
  8.00am – 5.00pm

- **Friday 20 September 2019**
  8.00am – 2.30pm

Name Badges
Your name badge is your official pass to the conference sessions, the welcome reception, the dinner, the exhibition and catering areas. Ensure you wear your name badge at all times and if misplaced, please see the staff at the registration desk, as soon as possible, for a replacement.

Dress Code
Recommended dress for the conference and welcome reception is smart casual and cocktail attire for the conference dinner.

Mobile Phones
Please ensure mobile phones are switched to silent while sessions are in progress.

Parking
The Convention Centre offers two undercover car parking options with a North Terrace and Riverbank car park. The Riverbank car park is accessible from Morphett Street/Festival Drive.

Wireless Internet
For free internet access throughout the venue, sign in to ‘ARMS2019’ using your device.

Announcements and Changes
General announcements and program changes will be made on the conference app.

Disclaimer
The information is correct at the time of providing. However, the organisers reserve the right to change the information where necessary without notice.

Personal Insurance
Delegates shall be regarded in every aspect as carrying their own risk for loss or injury to person or property, including baggage, during the conference. The organisers are in no way responsible for any claims concerning insurance.

Privacy Clause
In registering for this conference, relevant details will be incorporated into a delegate list for the benefit of all delegates (name, organisation, state/country only – in accordance with the Australian Privacy Amendment Act 2000) and may be made available to parties directly related to the conference. By completing the registration form, you have acknowledged that the details supplied by you may be used for the above purposes.
ARMS 2019 CONFERENCE APP

The ARMS 2019 Conference App is compatible with iPhones, iPads and Android phones and tablets.

The App is the best way for conference delegates and attendees to get the most out of their conference experience and all in the palm of your hand. The App runs on Apple and Android devices and features:

- the full conference program for sessions and speakers
- bookmarks that delegates can use to plan out their day
- venue details with maps
- ability to participate in exhibitor passport competition and win prizes
- exhibitor directory
- partner listings that delegates can browse and be directed to a company’s specific web page, and
- conference news and last minute notices

How to Access the ARMS 2019 Conference App:

DOWNLOAD THE APP

Available to download straight to your mobile device, you’ll have access to the latest news and event updates as they happen.

To download:

Search for Elements Event Portal in your applicable app store.

Don’t forget to accept push notifications to ensure you get real time updates on everything happening during the event.

ACCESS THE APP

After opening the ARMS 2019 Conference App, just enter the event code below, and then your custom USERNAME • PASSWORD which will be emailed to you prior to the event to log in.

EVENT CODE: ARMS2019
ResearchMaster’s Project Costing and Pricing Management Solution allows researchers to determine the project cost and price based on individual funding guidelines. Designed for researchers this fully automated web-based costing tool provides the ability to recast and audit, minimise data entry, maximise accuracy and allow for variances at project and fund source level.

For further information, please call us on +61 3 9320 9003 or visit data.com.au/researchmaster
Research changes the world and we’re changing the way research is managed. Our research management system gives you the data management, collection and reporting tools you need to manage all aspects of higher education research more efficiently and effectively.

For further information, please call us on +61 3 9320 9003 or visit data.com.au/researchmaster
SOCIAL FUNCTIONS

Welcome Reception
Date: Tuesday 17 September 2019
Time: 5.30pm - 7.30pm
Location: Conference Exhibition Hall, Adelaide Convention Centre
Dress: Smart casual

Conference Gala Dinner
Date: Thursday 19 September 2019
Time: 7.00pm – 11:00pm
Location: William Magarey Room, Adelaide Oval
Dress: Cocktail Attire
In 1996, three guys started an IT company to help government departments and organisations with their IT requirements. They named the company F1 Solutions after the ‘help key’.

We have come a long way since these humble beginnings. Today we help translate cutting edge research into commercially viable products that benefit millions of lives and ensure it’s done ethically. We believe that ‘technology’ should have purpose, so we built a custom engineered, research platform called OmniStar. Our vision is to leverage grants and ethics for the good of the research industry and meet the exacting high standards of the community we serve.

OmniStar powers the NSW eHealth Research Ethics and Governance Information System (REGIS). This state-of-the-art solution seamlessly integrates the National Health and Medical Research Council’s HREA application and helps NSW and ACT public health organisations to manage ethics compliance and multi-site governance approvals of research projects.

Our solid software engineering core competencies have been powering our client’s growth and success for over 23 years. We make technology simple and intelligent so that it enriches citizens daily lives. We help businesses stay competitive with disruptive ideas that change the world. At our core, we bring ‘good technology to life’.

Platinum Partner

F1Solutions

OmniStar powers the NSW eHealth Research Ethics and Governance Information System (REGIS). This state-of-the-art solution seamlessly integrates the National Health and Medical Research Council’s HREA application and helps NSW and ACT public health organisations to manage ethics compliance and multi-site governance approvals of research projects.

Our solid software engineering core competencies have been powering our client’s growth and success for over 23 years. We make technology simple and intelligent so that it enriches citizens daily lives. We help businesses stay competitive with disruptive ideas that change the world. At our core, we bring ‘good technology to life’.
Gold Partners

ResearchMaster

ResearchMaster Pty Ltd is Australasia’s leading research management solution provider. ResearchMaster Enterprise (RME) is the most comprehensive product on the market, enabling the management of an organisation’s complete research lifecycle. It is backed by the largest and most active user community in Australasia.

RME is a collaborative cloud based system, enabling the collection, storage and management of the full breath of research activity information across your organisation, including research projects, ethics applications, postgraduate research and higher degree research reviews. RME provides an intuitive, configurable interface that is easy to use, with powerful security and permission settings.

Our cutting edge Online Forms and Workflow technology enables research administrators to develop and customise online forms for multiple domains, reducing complexity, automatically reusing existing data and saving valuable time.

Our dedicated services team ensure proactive management of your customer experience; agile software development allows solution growth and adaptability; and extensive training and support materials ensure users are confident with the research management solution from day one.

With more than 20 years’ experience, ResearchMaster is committed to engaging closely with our clients in both implementation and innovative development to enable your success.

For more information contact us on +61 3 9320 9003 or visit www.data.com.au/researchmaster

The University of Melbourne

“Showcasing the diverse and far reaching impact our profession has on the advancement of the research enterprise including benefits to society, culture, our environment and the economy.”

At the University of Melbourne, everyone is encouraged to stretch their passion for inquiry, learning and making a difference.

As a globally-engaged, comprehensive research institution, we’re proud to be part of the ARMS community and championing the Society Value of research management being integral to research enterprise.

We know and understand that on any given day our dedicated research management professionals can be operating as negotiators, communicators, research performance analysts, interpreters, strategic planners, compliance officers and even facilitators.

It is because of this fervent dedication to their craft, that our institution is able to deliver excellence in research at a local level across multiple campuses and academic divisions, as well as nationally and internationally.

The University of Melbourne is delighted to be the 2019 Annual Conference Gold Partner and joining in the 20-year anniversary celebrations.

Congratulations to everyone involved.

unimelb.edu.au
PARTNERS

Bronze Partners

Australian Research Council

The Australian Research Council (ARC) is a Commonwealth entity within the Australian Government. The ARC’s purpose is to grow knowledge and innovation for the benefit of the Australian community by funding the highest quality research, assessing the quality, engagement and impact of research, and providing advice on research matters.

Deakin University

At Deakin University, we’re solving global challenges and making a positive impact on the world.

With over 1700 research students, expert academics and state of the art facilities - our world-class R&D capabilities make a real difference in industries as diverse as health, engineering, machine learning, artificial intelligence, IT and renewable energy.

Session Partner

Macquarie University

Name Badge and Lanyard Partner

Western Sydney University
The trade exhibition will be located in the Exhibition Hall, Hall L.

EXHIBITION DAYS
Tuesday 17th September
Wednesday 18th September
Thursday 19th September
Friday 20th September

OPENING HOURS
5:30pm – 7:30pm
8:00am – 5:00pm
8:00am – 5:00pm
8:00am – 2:30pm

EXHIBITORS:

BOOTH 1 & 2
FiSolutions
Gustad Boman
T: 02 6245 7999
E: Gus@fisolutions.com.au
W: https://www.fisolutions.com.au

BOOTH 3
University Office
Clayton Powell
T: 0413 240 092
E: sales@universityoffice.com.au
W: https://universityoffice.com.au

BOOTH 4
InfoEd Global
Damian Davini
T: +61 433 797 906
E: eRAAustralia@infoedglobal.com
W: http://infoedglobal.com

BOOTH 5
Research Professional
Rene Logan
T: +61 410 651 539
Linda Dalton
T: +61 417 684 462
E: salesand@researchresearch.com
W: www.researchresearch.com

BOOTH 6
Nature Research
Lisa Truong
T: 0429 803 796
E: Lisa.Truong@springernature.com
W: https://www.springernature.com

BOOTH 7
Emerald Publishing
John Eggleton
T: +44 1274 777700
E: realworldimpact@emeraldgroup.com
W: emeraldpublishing.com

BOOTH 8
Web of Science Group
Benjamin Clark
T: +6101 504 223
E: Benjamin.clark@clarivate.com
W: http://www.webofsciencegroup.com/

BOOTH 9
ResearchMaster
Matthew Rowe
T: +61 3 9320 9003
E: info@researchmaster.com.au

BOOTH 10
Endpoint IQ
Michael Creevey
T: 07 3362 0200
E: hello@endpointiq.com.au
W: www.endpointiq.com.au

BOOTH 11
Elsevier
Macy Lee
T: +61 2 9422 8590
E: Mac.lee@elsevier.com
W: https://www.elsevier.com/en-au
BOOTH 12
Grow Kudos
Charlie Rapple
T: +44 1865 872527
E: info@growkudos.com
W: www.growkudos.com

TABLE 13
Australasian Research Management Society (ARMS)
Maria Zollo
T: +61 8 8201 5592
E: arms.adminofficer@flinders.edu.au
W: www.researchmanagement.org.au

TABLE 14
Process Pathways
Gord McDonald
T: 0403 457 1960
E: info@processpathways.com
W: http://www.processpathways.com/

TABLE 15
Epigeum – Part of Oxford University Press
T: +614991906
E: Ronan.Grimes@oup.com
W: https://www.epigeum.com/

TABLE 16
The GrantEd Group
Lyn Airey
T: +61 33 558 188
Kirsten Bartlett
T: +61 38 150 673
E: hello@thegrantedgroup.com.au
W: www.thegrantedgroup.com.au

TABLE 17
Vertigo Ventures
Patrick Robinson
T: +61 404 444 251
E: hello@vertigoventures.com
W: vertigoventures.com

TABLE 18
Infonetica
Brendan Soo
T: +61 (0) 2 9037 8040
E: enquiries@infonetica.net
W: www.infonetica.net

TABLE 19
Outside Opinion
Professor Denise Meredyth
T: 0410 569 393
E: director@outsideopinion.com.au
W: www.outsideopinion.com.au

TABLE 20
Haplo
Jennifer Summers
T: +64 48 318 800
E: hello@haplo.com
W: https://www.haplo.com/

TABLE 21
Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (ANZCTR)
Matthew Wynn
T: +61 02 9562 5333
E: info@actr.org.au
W: www.anzctr.org.au

TABLE 22
Digital Science
Anne Harvey
E: a.harvey@digital-science.com
W: digital-science.com

TABLE 23
SkillsForge
Stuart Loose
T: +61 08 8366 6510
E: enquiries@skillsforge.com.au
W: https://skillsforge.com.au

TABLE 24
INORMS 2020
INORMS 2020 Hiroshima
(hosted by RMAN-J)
Congress Secretariat
E: inorms2020@convention.co.jp
W: https://inorms2020.org/
HOW ANIMALS TEACH US THAT BOYS DON’T HAVE TO BE BOYS

CUTTING-EDGE RESEARCH AND INSIGHTFUL COMMENTARY BY WORLD-LEADING EXPERTS

Discover more at pursuit.unimelb.edu.au
Dr Andy Cope
Art of Brilliance

Dr Andy Cope describes himself as a qualified teacher, author, happiness expert and recovering academic. Andy’s Loughborough University PhD was 12 years in the making and while he appreciates that his ‘Dr of Happiness’ label is terribly cheesy it does afford him an important media platform. In times of rising depression and an epidemic of ‘busyness’, Andy believes there has never been a more appropriate time to raise the wellbeing agenda. Andy is lucky enough to work with some very large businesses, including Microsoft, DHL, Kellogg, Hewlett Packard, Astra Zeneca and Marriott Hotels. Recently, he has tailored his workshops to meet the needs of children and teachers and now delivers to audiences from age 8 upwards! Andy is also a best-selling author. ‘The Art of Being Brilliant’, ‘Shine’, ‘The Little Book of Emotional Intelligence’ and ‘Leadership: The Multiplier Effect’ have all been best-sellers. ‘Happiness Route Map’ was nominated as The Independent’s best self-help book of 2018. In an attempt to bring the messages to a younger audience Andy has also penned ‘The Art of Being a Brilliant Teenager’ and ‘Diary of a Brilliant Kid’. ‘The Little Book of Being Brilliant’ is scheduled for release in Spring 2019. Andy is a sought-after keynote speaker and authority on employee engagement, wellbeing and human flourishing. He’s done numerous TV and radio appearances as well as being featured in The Telegraph, Daily Mail and Esquire. As for genuinely interesting asides, Andy is also a best-selling children’s author. His ‘Spy Dog’ series has sold in excess of a million copies worldwide (he bigs himself up by telling everyone he is world famous, if you’re 7) Andy was born in the same year that England won the football world cup, he has pet pigs and has set up the hugely successful 2%ers club, the UK’s first, foremost and...err...only society for happy people. His ambition is to be able to surf, brilliantly! www.artofbrilliance.co.uk

Lisa A. Bero, PhD is an expert in examining how science can be influenced and translated into clinical practice and health policy. She directs the Evidence, Policy and Influence Collaborative Research Program at the Charles Perkins Centre, with Research nodes in Bias, Evidence Synthesis and Pharmaceutical Policy. Professor Bero is Chair of Medicines Use and Health Outcomes, Faculty of Medicine and Health, School of Pharmacy, The University of Sydney. She was Co-Chair, The Cochrane Collaboration, from 2014-2018. She has developed and validated methods for assessing bias in the design, conduct and dissemination of research on pharmaceuticals, tobacco, chemicals, and complex public health interventions. Prof. Bero has also conducted analyses to examine the dissemination and policy implications of research evidence. Her international activities include member and chair of the World Health Organization (WHO) Essential Medicines Committee and Cochrane Collaboration liaison to WHO. Prof. Bero serves on several committees related to conflicts of interest, evidence and decisions, such as the Institute of Medicine Committee on Conflict of Interest in Medical Research, Education and Practice and the National Academy of Science Committee to review the Environmental Protection Agency Integrated Risk Information System Process.
**KEYNOTE SPEAKERS**

**Sue MacLeman**  
Chair and Non-Executive Director, MTPConnect

Sue MacLeman has more than 30 years’ experience as a pharmaceutical, biotechnology and medical technology executive having held senior roles in corporate, medical, commercial and business development. Sue has also served as CEO and Board member of several ASX and NASDAQ listed companies in the pharmaceutical sector and is currently Chair of MTPConnect (MTPII-GC Ltd), Chair of Anatara Lifesciences Ltd (ASX:ANR), Chair of Novita Healthcare Ltd (ASX:NHL), Non-Executive Director of TPI Enterprises Ltd (ASX:TPE), Non-Executive Director of Oventus Medical Ltd (ASX:OVN) and Non-Executive Director of veski. Sue is also appointed to several academic and government advisory committees.

**Heather D’Antoine**  
Division Leader of Education and Capacity Building and Associate Director for Aboriginal Programs, Menzies School of Health Research

Heather D’Antoine has 25 years of experience in health services as a registered nurse and midwife and as a health service manager in both Aboriginal health services and general health services across Western Australia. In the last 12 years, Heather has worked in health research: eight years at the Institute for Child Health Research and two years at the Menzies School of Health Research. She has clinical qualifications in general nursing and midwifery and academic qualifications in health economics. Heather’s research interest is in maternal and child health. She is particularly focused on the area of fetal alcohol spectrum disorders (FASD) and other birth defects. Heather has worked with a research team on a number of projects in this area including describing what health professionals and women know and do about alcohol and pregnancy and FASD. She has been involved with developing and evaluating resources for health professionals and developing a model of care for FASD in Western Australia.

**Catherine Wood**  
Chief Executive Officer/Chief Investment Officer, ARK Invest

Catherine Wood registered ARK Investment Management LLC (‘ARK’) as an investment adviser with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission in January 2014. Focused solely on disruptive innovation, ARK aims to identify large-scale investment opportunities in the public markets resulting from technological innovations centered around genome sequencing, robotics, artificial intelligence, energy storage, and blockchain technology. Prior to ARK, Cathie spent twelve years at AllianceBernstein as Chief Investment Officer of Global Thematic Strategies where she managed over $5 billion. Cathie joined Alliance Capital from Tupelo Capital Management, a hedge fund she co-founded which, in 2000, managed $800 million in global thematic strategies. Prior to her tenure at Tupelo Capital, she worked for 18 years with Jennison Associates as Chief Economist, Equity Research Analyst, Portfolio Manager and Director. She started her career in Los Angeles, California at The Capital Group as an Assistant Economist. Cathie received her Bachelor of Science, summa cum laude, in Finance and Economics from the University of Southern California in 1981. In 2018, editors at Bloomberg acknowledged Cathie by selecting her to its second annual Bloomberg 50 list of people across business, entertainment, finance, politics, technology, and science who have defined global business. Additionally, Fortune named Cathie to its exclusive roundtable of experts in the annual Fortune Investors Guide: The Best Investing Advice for 2019 From Fortune’s Experts. In 2016, Cathie received the “Women in Finance – Outstanding Contribution Award” from Market Media, and she was a featured speaker at the World Economic Forum (China) in 2016 & 2017, and the World Strategic Forum (Miami) in 2017. www.ark-invest.com
INVITED SPEAKERS

Professor Tara Brabazon
Dean of Graduate Research, Flinders University

Simon Brennan
Executive Director, Research Services Branch, The University of Adelaide

Professor Pat Buckley
Dean of Graduate Studies, University of South Australia

Jodieann Dawe
Director, Research Development and Support, Flinders University

Janet Dibb-Leigh
Jdl Advisory

Professor Gary Evans
MBIE Chief Science Advisor

Dr Cathy Foley
CSIRO Chief Scientist

Wayne Harvey
Non-Executive Director

Dr Mark Hochman
ARMS Business Consultant, Australasian Research Management Society

Professor Michael Khor
Director, Talent Recruitment And Career Support (TRACS) Office and Bibliometrics Analysis, Nanyang Technological University

Professor Joe Luca
Dean, Graduate Research School, Edith Cowan University

Professor Caroline McMillen
Chief Scientist for South Australia

Dr Ross McLennan
Director of Research and Innovation Services, University of South Australia

Professor Caroline Miller
Director, Health Policy Centre, SAHMRI

Dr Tony Peacock
CEO, CRC Association

Professor Rachel Spronken-Smith
Dean, Graduate Research School, University of Otago
The Australian Research Council (ARC) is a Commonwealth entity within the Australian Government. The ARC’s purpose is to grow knowledge and innovation for the benefit of the Australian community by funding the highest quality research, assessing the quality, engagement and impact of research and providing advice on research matters.

The ARC funds research and researchers under the National Competitive Grants Program (NCGP). The NCGP consists of two elements—Discovery and Linkage—under which the ARC funds a range of complementary schemes that provide funding for basic and applied research, research training, research collaboration and infrastructure. The majority of funding decisions under the NCGP are made on the basis of peer review.

The ARC evaluates the quality of research undertaken in higher education institutions through the Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) program. ERA is an established evaluation framework that identifies research excellence in Australian higher education institutions by comparing Australia’s research effort against international benchmarks. ERA assesses quality using a combination of indicators and expert review by research evaluation committees. The fourth round of ERA was conducted in 2018.

The ARC is also responsible for developing and implementing an Engagement and Impact (EI) assessment, announced by the Australian Government in December 2015 as part of the National Innovation and Science Agenda (NISA), which assesses the engagement of researchers with end-users, and shows how universities are translating their research into economic, social, environmental and other impacts. The inaugural round of EI was conducted in 2018.

For more information on the ARC, visit www.arc.gov.au.

The ARC is proud to sponsor the 2019 ARMS Conference.

More than a university

Deakin University is a global leader in advanced manufacturing innovation.

With cutting edge technologies and world class research, Deakin can take your idea from proof of concept to product development while supporting capacity for increased output and efficient supply.

Uniquely positioned to support the next generation of manufacturing, our experience makes us the ideal partner for businesses large and small.
# THEME LEADER PRESENTERS

## Ethics & Integrity
- Dr Susan O’Brien, The University of Queensland  
  (Concurrent Session 1)
- Dr Ted Rohr, UNSW Sydney  
  (Concurrent Session 14)

## Next Practice
- Martin Lloyd, UTS  
  (Concurrent Session 13)
- Dr Simon Kerr, La Trobe University  
  (Concurrent Session 18)

## HDR Matters
- Petra Van Nieuwenhoven, The University of Melbourne  
  (Concurrent Session 2)
- Lena Caruso, UNSW Sydney  
  (Concurrent Session 7)
- Claire Jackson, UniSA  
  (Concurrent Session 12)
- Dr Faith Welch, University of Auckland  
  (Concurrent Session 16)

## Creating, Recording and Communicating Engagement and Impact
- Janice Besch, NHMRC National Institute For Dementia Research  
  (Concurrent Session 21)

## Research Evaluation
- Dr Megan Power, Monash University / Warwick University  
  (Concurrent Session 19)
- Dr Daniel Owens, UNSW Sydney  
  (Concurrent Session 24)

## Research Projects Development
- Dr Tsharni Zazryn, Monash University  
  (Concurrent Session 20)

## Managing Research Contracts and Agreements
- Dr Tania Bezzobs, Swinburne University of Technology  
  (Concurrent Session 4)

## First Nations Research
- A/Prof. Clair Andersen, University of Tasmania  
  (Concurrent Session 3)

## Managing Research Projects
- Connie Mogg, Monash University  
  (Concurrent Session 5)

## Researcher Development
- Prof Rachel Spronken-Smith, University of Otago  
  (Concurrent Session 8)
- Marina Delpin, Flinders University  
  (Concurrent Session 17)
- Prof. Gayle Morris, G Morris Consulting  
  (Concurrent Session 22)
PRE-CONFERENCE ACTIVITIES

ACCREDITATION MODULES

Accreditation Module 1.1-Aus: National Research and Innovation System in Australia
Date: Tuesday 17 September 2019
Time: 9:00am – 12:30pm
Venue: Riverbank Room 5
Presenter: ARMS Training Fellow Tara McLaren

Accreditation Module 2.3: Research Finance
Date: Tuesday 17 September 2019
Time: 9:00am – 12:30pm
Venue: Riverbank Room 6B
Presenter: ARMS Training Fellow A/Prof Tam Nguyen

Accreditation Module 3.3: Higher Degree by Research Candidature Management
Date: Tuesday 17 September 2019
Time: 9:00am – 12:30pm
Venue: Riverbank Room 6A
Presenter: ARMS Training Fellow Fiona Zammit

Accreditation Module 3.4: Higher Degree by Admissions and Completions
Date: Tuesday 17 September 2019
Time: 1:30pm – 5:00pm
Venue: Riverbank Room 6A
Presenter: ARMS Training Fellow Fiona Zammit

Accreditation Module 6.1: Working with Industry
Date: Tuesday 17 September 2019
Time: 1:30pm – 5:00pm
Venue: Riverbank Room 5
Presenter: ARMS Training Fellow Shubhra Roy

PRE-CONFERENCE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS

Professional Development Workshop: The Art of Being Brilliant
Date: Tuesday 17 September 2019
Time: 9:00am - 12:30pm
Venue: River Bank Room 8A
Presenters: Dr Andy Cope, Art of Brilliance

Professional Development Workshop: University rankings 101: A primer to understanding and analysing rankings
Date: Tuesday 17 September 2019
Time: 9:00am – 12:30pm
Venue: Riverbank Room 8B
Presenters: Daniel Owens, UNSW and Thomas Chow, UNSW

Professional Development Workshop: Aspiring to be a senior leadership in research administration
Date: Tuesday 17 September 2019
Time: 1:30pm - 5:00pm
Venue: Riverbank Room 6B
Presenters: Denise Clark, University of Maryland College Park

Professional Development Workshop: Helping Researchers develop their research impact narrative
Date: Tuesday 17 September 2019
Time: 1:30pm – 5:00pm
Venue: Riverbank Room 8A
Presenters: Wade Kelly, La Trobe University and Tamika Heiden, Research Impact Academy

Professional Development Workshop: Research Integrity: Exploring Procedural Fairness and Conflict of Interest in Research
Date: Tuesday 17 September 2019
Time: 1:30pm – 5:00pm
Venue: Riverbank Room 8B
Presenters: Dr Ted Rohr & Dr Karolyn White, Convenors ARMS Ethics & Integrity SIG, Elise Grosser (Chair Go8 Ethics & Integrity Group), Bronwyn Greene, Professor Lisa Bero, University of Sydney, Dr Elizabeth Visser, University of Auckland
ARMS COMMITTEES/ SIG MEETINGS

Wednesday 18 September

ARMS SIG Meeting: Ethics and Integrity SIG
Ted Rohr and Karolyn White (Co-Convenors)
Riverbank Room 5
12:45 – 13:45

ARMS SIG Meeting: Health and Medical Research SIG
Hannah Clarke and Tam Nguyen (Co-Convenors)
Riverbank Room 6
12:45 – 13:45

Arms Meeting: ARMS Training Fellows Meeting
Mark Hochman
Room L2
12:45 – 13:45

Thursday 19 September

ARMS SIG Meeting: Research Funders SIG
Jane Hobson, Merrilyn Larusson (Co-Convenors)
Riverbank Room 5
13:00 – 14:00

ARMS SIG Meeting: Research Impact SIG
Faith Welch and Tamika Heiden (Co-Convenors)
Riverbank Room 6
13:00 – 14:00

ARMS NETWORK Meeting: Australasian Research Training Network
Lucy Jones (Convenor)
Riverbank Room 7
13:00 – 14:00

ARMS SIG Meeting: Research Information and Reporting SIG
Michelle Duryea (Convenor)
Riverbank Room 5
14:00 – 15:00

ARMS CHAPTERS

Monday 16 September

ARMS Chapter Meeting: ACT Networking Event
Marie-Helene Rousseau
Lady Burra Brewhouse
20:00

Wednesday 18 September

ARMS Chapter Meeting: NZ & Pacific Islands Chapter
Heather Thomas (Acting Convenor)
Riverbank Room 7
12:45 – 13:45

ARMS Chapter Meeting: VIC Chapter
Fiona Cromarty
Riverbank Room 8
12:45 – 13:45
THE WORLD’S BEST YOUNG UNIVERSITY IS LOOKING FOR THE WORLD’S MOST PROMISING RESEARCH TALENT

Pursue your highest aspirations at Nanyang Technological University, Singapore (NTU Singapore), ranked among the world's top universities. NTU is recognised globally for its excellence in education and research including being ranked the world's best young university by Quacquarelli Symonds for six consecutive years.

**Nanyang Assistant Professor**

- Applicable to all disciplines at NTU
- Tenure-track appointment with an attractive remuneration package and a start-up research grant

Early-career researchers (postdoctoral fellow or equivalent) who obtained their PhD within the last 10 years and are ready to lead a research group independently, may apply for the 2020 Nanyang Assistant Professorship at [www.ntu.edu.sg/nap](http://www.ntu.edu.sg/nap).

**Presidential Postdoctoral Fellow**

- Applicable to all disciplines at NTU
- 2-year appointment at NTU with an attractive remuneration package and a start-up research grant for independent research

**Wallenberg–NTU Presidential Postdoctoral Fellow**

- Applicable to emerging areas: Artificial Intelligence, Autonomous System, Software and Security
- 1 year of research at NTU followed by a year on the Wallenberg Autonomous Systems and Software Programme in Sweden

Early-career researchers who obtained their PhD within the last 5 years and are ready to conduct independent investigations, may apply for the NTU Presidential Postdoctoral Fellowship or Wallenberg-NTU Presidential Postdoctoral Fellowship at [www.ntu.edu.sg/ppf](http://www.ntu.edu.sg/ppf).

[www.ntu.edu.sg](http://www.ntu.edu.sg)
ARMS Accreditation Programs

ARMS Advanced Level Accreditation Program

The Advanced Level Accreditation Program is designed for mid to senior research managers who wish to enhance their leadership, management and content skills to become more effective research leaders in the rapidly evolving research and innovation sector.

The Society is pleased to announce the three cohorts of Accredited Research Managers (Advanced) or ARMs (formerly Accredited Research Managers (Professional) or ARMPs) have successfully completed the program. We congratulate the following ARM(P)s on their achievements:

**2016 Cohort**
- Judy Alexander, The University of Newcastle
- Tania Bezzobs, Swinburne University of Technology
- Anne Louise Bulloch, The University of Queensland
- Christine Casey, The University of Western Australia
- Annette Harris, Charles Sturt University
- Caroline Pratt, The University of Auckland
- Maya Roberts, Flinders University
- Anders Wennstrom, formerly The University of Melbourne (now Umeå University)
- Claire White, Griffith University

**2017 Cohort**
- Emily Brennan, Macquarie University
- Monique O’Callaghan, The University of Melbourne
- Helen Partridge, Monash University
- Natalie Precians, Australian Catholic University
- Robert Roche, University of Western Australia
- Bryony Wakefield, The University of Melbourne
- Lisa Yen, ARC Centre for Excellence in Cognition and its Disorders, Macquarie University
- Tsharni Zazryn, Monash University

**2018 Cohort**
- Gabrielle Bright
- Emma Evans, Southern Cross University
- Rosemary Keogh, Murdoch Children’s Research Institute
- Carina Marshall, University of Western Australia
- Tara McLaren, Telethon Kids Institute
- Christiane Rupp, The University of Auckland
- Liesel Senn, University of Technology Sydney
- Ragini Singh, Australian National University
- Chris Spargo, Menzies
- Muriel Swijghuisen Reigersberg, The University of Sydney
- Lisa van den Berg, Queensland University of Technology
- Annie Xiao, The George Institute for Global Health

ARMS Foundation Level Accreditation Program

The Foundation Level Accreditation Program provides a series of training modules that cover many of the basic areas of research administration and management at a foundation level of knowledge.

Since the inception of this program in 2013, there have been over 363 candidates achieve status as an ARMS Accredited Research Manager (Foundation) or ARMF. We congratulate the following ARMFs on their achievement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date of Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Schrader</td>
<td>Australian Catholic University</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Worsley</td>
<td>Australian Catholic University/Macquarie</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Wilks</td>
<td>Australian Catholic University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Thorpe</td>
<td>Australian Catholic University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lihong Kong</td>
<td>Australian Catholic University</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ARMS Accreditation Programs

### ARMS Foundation Level Accreditation Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date of Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chung Yan (Cherry) Yu</td>
<td>Baker IDI Heart and Diabetes Institute</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Erlich</td>
<td>Baker IDI Heart and Diabetes Institute</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndsey Wright</td>
<td>Bushfire Cooperative Research Centre</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Hanley</td>
<td>Central Queensland University</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynette Browning</td>
<td>Central Queensland University</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyn Vargas</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Bird</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eve-Marie Cranmer</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Quintner</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemali Seneviratne</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazi Naimal Bari</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekshmi Sobhana</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia Richardson</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Fauntleroy</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanne Ramsey</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Kalinowsky</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlasta McCartney</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YuHui (Mark) Li</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Moseley</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Shepherd</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Harris</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chontelle Dailey</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Munns</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Dunlop</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonie Worley</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa McLean</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Hooper</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Penny</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Geltch</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Barkley</td>
<td>CSIRO</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrilyn Larussan</td>
<td>CSIRO</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Soleil</td>
<td>CSIRO</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Robertson</td>
<td>CSIRO</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anneli Robbshaw</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda Northeast</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carly Fleming</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Gangell</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Pestell</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Pryor</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Liew</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date of Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deepa Sharma Acharya</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Lamont</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Apr-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jananee Raguragavan</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Liddle</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiji George</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khyati Ananthram</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeline Roe</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Griffith</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Carrol</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mun Yin Cheong</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Lee</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Hirschi</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Pokonski</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuie Liu</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Clarke</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanha Mahjabeen</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Chambers</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teena Bowman</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Williams-Constantinou</td>
<td>Deakin University</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Brocklebank Proud</td>
<td>Deakin University</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey McInerney</td>
<td>Deakin University</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Blankley</td>
<td>Edith Cowan University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce De Lucia</td>
<td>Edith Cowan University</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie Rudrum</td>
<td>Edith Cowan University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Dunbar</td>
<td>Edith Cowan University</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichole Kemp</td>
<td>Edith Cowan University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sallyann Webster</td>
<td>Edith Cowan University</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Green</td>
<td>Edith Cowan University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Middleton</td>
<td>Edith Cowan University</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elanor Mahon</td>
<td>Federation University of Australia</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Wade</td>
<td>Federation University of Australia</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Eltringham</td>
<td>Federation University of Australia</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Boatman</td>
<td>Federation University of Australia</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Davis</td>
<td>Federation University of Australia</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodie Parkinson</td>
<td>Federation University of Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Donnelly</td>
<td>Federation University of Australia</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Drohan</td>
<td>Federation University of Australia</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raimond Placidi</td>
<td>Federation University of Australia</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebekah Bailey</td>
<td>Federation University of Australia</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Read</td>
<td>Federation University of Australia</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date of Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thembelihle Dube</td>
<td>Federation University of Australia</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina D’Urbano</td>
<td>Federation University of Australia</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Noblet</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Cazneaux</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Weeks</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Lang</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Willson</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linn Kaing</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Delpin</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lyons</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nima Nezhad</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Tham</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Vaughan</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Mathews</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Sneddon</td>
<td>Independent Freelance Research Administrator</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneha Abraham</td>
<td>Individual member</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivienne Pearson</td>
<td>Institute for Breathing and Sleep, Austin Hospital</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Nunn</td>
<td>James Cook University</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan McGrath</td>
<td>James Cook University</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trudi Raptis</td>
<td>James Cook University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Maplesden</td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Pearson</td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Manzano</td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindus Conlan</td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa Ward</td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sejal Kendal</td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boris Sarcevic</td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerryn Westcott</td>
<td>Ludwig Institute for Cancer Research</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Quinn</td>
<td>Macquarie University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances Thorp</td>
<td>Macquarie University</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Cousins</td>
<td>Macquarie University</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruolan Lan</td>
<td>Macquarie University</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Magira</td>
<td>Melbourne Health</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Spargo</td>
<td>Menzies</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Reedy</td>
<td>Menzies</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmina Sesar</td>
<td>Menzies</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Girling</td>
<td>Menzies</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Wong</td>
<td>Menzies</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodie Ellis</td>
<td>Menzies</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### ARMS Foundation Level Accreditation Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date of Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anh Chau</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athena Bangara</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Farmer</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela Khoury</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarrad Cogle</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Steen</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Despard</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Walker</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Wisniewski</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katharine Cox</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke McAvaney</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Stendera</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Armstrong</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Daniels</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saman Fernando</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Oliver</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirin Jambhulkar</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanalyssa Ly</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade Moore</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrissandra Zagami</td>
<td>Murdoch Childrens Research Institute</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Ciavarella</td>
<td>Murdoch Childrens Research Institute</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Donker</td>
<td>Murdoch Childrens Research Institute</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia Vargiu</td>
<td>Murdoch Childrens Research Institute</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Cheng</td>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla De Gois</td>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinke van Gelder</td>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janine Blake</td>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Radford</td>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Derrett</td>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Brooks</td>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiloshni Hahn</td>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misty-Lee Palmer</td>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi Arbon</td>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicola Barlow</td>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siobhan Hodge</td>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarnisha Mohd</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>May-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambar Widiastuti</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>May-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Chan</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bee hua Quek Tan</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>May-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng Peng Woon</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>May-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ARMS ACCREDITATION PROGRAMS

### ARMS Foundation Level Accreditation Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date of Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christina Liaw</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huey Shan Lew</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jie Ying Au Yong</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyceelyn Tang</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Mei Lim</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krisnan Kumutha</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>May-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poh Ling Chiam</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riduan Bin Mazlan</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>May-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl Yong Puay Fen</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Ho</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>May-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tan Ching Ong</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Wai Kuan Loh</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Sung</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>May-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei Chin Wang</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaoping Chen</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne Ng</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>May-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zahra Hassim</td>
<td>National Institute of Education</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Farrington</td>
<td>Queensland University of Technology</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Shield</td>
<td>Queensland University of Technology</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Kenny</td>
<td>Queensland University of Technology</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Barnsbee</td>
<td>Queensland University of Technology</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Hegarty</td>
<td>RMIT University</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Rogerson</td>
<td>RMIT University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachael Dunstan</td>
<td>RMIT University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Nowotnik</td>
<td>RMIT University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Standing</td>
<td>Royal District Nursing Service</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Wolstenholme</td>
<td>Southern Cross University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Ryan</td>
<td>Sunshine Coast Hospital and Health Service</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai Yoshida-Parisi</td>
<td>Swinburne University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Sarna</td>
<td>Swinburne University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Gaeth</td>
<td>Swinburne University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antionette Goh</td>
<td>Swinburne University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astrid Nordmann</td>
<td>Swinburne University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhanushka Dodangollegama</td>
<td>Swinburne University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatma Mohammed</td>
<td>Swinburne University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lachlan Doughney</td>
<td>Swinburne University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Weaver</td>
<td>Swinburne University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Reay</td>
<td>Swinburne University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Bower</td>
<td>Swinburne University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Hamilton-Brown</td>
<td>Swinburne University</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ARMS Accreditation Programs

### ARMS Foundation Level Accreditation Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date of Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Schoof</td>
<td>Telethon Kids Institute</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Czank</td>
<td>Telethon Kids Institute</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giuliana D’Alerio</td>
<td>Telethon Kids Institute</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leanne Scott</td>
<td>Telethon Kids Institute</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narelle Mullan</td>
<td>Telethon Kids Institute</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela McKeegan</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle (Ling) Ma</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Hughes</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy Paterson</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Piper</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Knox</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ragini Singh</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Downes</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzy Hainsworth</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelene Auyong</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda Hofmeyr</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Bressanutti</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lane</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimity Evans</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliette Dupre Husser</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Blasioli</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Graham</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristie Matthews</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Willingham</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wright</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Loew</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Yeh</td>
<td>The University of New South Wales</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luc Legeret</td>
<td>The University of New South Wales</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Legeret</td>
<td>The University of New South Wales</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakia Bolt</td>
<td>The University of New South Wales</td>
<td>Apr-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiao (Jacky) Niu</td>
<td>The University of New South Wales</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Koppers</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Hales</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela McPherson</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda Peden</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Cameron</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Graham</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodi McLean</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Beentjes</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Hayes</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ARMS ACCREDITATION PROGRAMS

### ARMS Foundation Level Accreditation Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date of Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katrina King</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie Hugo</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Maloney</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naama Hasson</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>Apr-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Vikash Singh</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>May-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Ford</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>Jun-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Savy</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>Jul-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anys Price</td>
<td>The University of Notre Dame Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahareh Badrian</td>
<td>The University of Notre Dame Australia</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise McLinden</td>
<td>The University of Notre Dame Australia</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayley Coppinger</td>
<td>The University of Notre Dame Australia</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Clarke</td>
<td>The University of Notre Dame Australia</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Mayhew</td>
<td>The University of Notre Dame Australia</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Jones</td>
<td>The University of Notre Dame Australia</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Giles</td>
<td>The University of Notre Dame Australia</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen Buttery</td>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gunders</td>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Nicholls</td>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxanne Jemison</td>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Davis</td>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandrine Kingston-Ducrot</td>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariette Le Roux</td>
<td>The University of Sydney</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monika Dzidowska</td>
<td>The University of Sydney</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Telleria Teixeira</td>
<td>The University of Sydney</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Panther</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Cleaver</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Tongue</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animesh Ghosh</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernadette Ferns</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caixia Li</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina Marshall</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deirdre Bourke</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Arnott</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evenda Dench</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Miotti</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Dixon</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanh Tran</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Gordon</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ieuan Linck</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Heystek</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ARMS Accreditation Programs

### ARMS Foundation Level Accreditation Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date of Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Grant</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Foster</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Muir</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Dalby</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Croker</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katina Toufexis</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Wragg</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laila Simpson</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara DeLacour</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah Simeon</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonisa Manea</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leylani Taylor</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Melvin</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Wedlock</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Davies</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maruf Razzaq</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Vukmirovic</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Genevieve</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Lindeman</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monika Mathyssek-Kilburn</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique Fountain</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolette Stewart</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Miller</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Benton</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosanna Marchesani</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Mitchell</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sina Mesiti</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sohini Haldar</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Mandel</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky Johnstone</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Stead-Wynne</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Au Yeung</td>
<td>Unitec Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Scerra</td>
<td>Uniting Care Children Young People and Families</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Pratt</td>
<td>University of Auckland</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briahna McGregor</td>
<td>University of New England</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Orr</td>
<td>University of New England</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kath Dougall</td>
<td>University of New England</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrina Vardanega</td>
<td>University of New England</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby Magann</td>
<td>University of New England</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Frizell</td>
<td>University of New England</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Date of Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Leonard</td>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma McLennan</td>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy Dolman</td>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie Aston</td>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Chen</td>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Thewlis</td>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn Hicks</td>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Brogan</td>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shona Ellison</td>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Curtis</td>
<td>University of Southern Queensland</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adra Anthony</td>
<td>University of Technology Sydney</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Gomez</td>
<td>University of Technology Sydney</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priya Nair</td>
<td>University of Technology Sydney</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Burbury</td>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Dwyer</td>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Ryrie</td>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Taylor</td>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Robinson</td>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julianne O'Reilly Wapstra</td>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Vincent</td>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandy Pink</td>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicola Hodgman</td>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Blundell</td>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Grant</td>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Burke</td>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittney Duffy</td>
<td>University of Waikato</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Evans</td>
<td>University Office</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny McKellar</td>
<td>Victor Chang Cardiac Research Institute</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cora Ng</td>
<td>Victoria University</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li He</td>
<td>Victoria University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Cook-Johnson</td>
<td>Walter and Eliza Hall Institute</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Elliott</td>
<td>Western Sydney University</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin Brown</td>
<td>Western Sydney University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manijah Hakim</td>
<td>Western Sydney University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moufid Atme</td>
<td>Western Sydney University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niru Ramanathan</td>
<td>Western Sydney University</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng Yue Pan</td>
<td>Workplace Safety and Health Institute, Singapore</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Kwan</td>
<td>Yale-NUS</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xinlei Hong</td>
<td>Yale-NUS</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TUESDAY 17 SEPTEMBER 2019
### Pre-Conference Professional Development Workshops, Accreditation Modules

*Please note: all Pre-Conference activities must be booked prior to attendance.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Pre-Conference Workshop Registration</th>
<th>TUESDAY 17 SEPTEMBER 2019</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0800 - 0900</td>
<td>Foyer M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 0900 - 1030 | Module 1.1-Aus: National Research and Innovation System in Australia  
Presented by ARMS Training Fellow, Tara McLaren | Module 3.3: Higher Degree by Research Candidature Management  
Presented by ARMS Training Fellow, Fiona Zammit | Module 2.3: Research Finance  
Presented by ARMS Training Fellow, A/Prof Tam Nguyen | Workshop: The Art of Being Brilliant  
Dr Andy Cope, Art of Brilliance | Workshop: University rankings 101: A primer to understanding and analysing rankings  
Daniel Owens, UNSW and Thomas Chow, UNSW |
| Riverbank Room 5 | Riverbank Room 6A | Riverbank Room 6B | Riverbank Room 8A | Riverbank Room 8B |
| 1030 - 1100 | MORNING TEA |  |  |
| 1100 - 1230 | Module 1.1-Aus: National Research and Innovation System in Australia (cont.) | Module 3.3: Higher Degree by Research Candidature Management (cont.) | Module 2.3: Research Finance (cont.) | Workshop (cont.) | Workshop (cont.) |
| Riverbank Room 5 | Riverbank Room 6A | Riverbank Room 6B | Riverbank Room 8A | Riverbank Room 8B |
| 1230 - 1330 | LUNCH |  |  |
### TUESDAY 17 SEPTEMBER 2019

**Pre-Conference Professional Development Workshops, Accreditation Modules**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Workshop/Module</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1330 - 1500 | Module 6.1: Working with Industry  
Presented by ARMS Training Fellow, Shubhra Roy          | Module 3.4: Higher Degree by Admissions and Completions  
Presented by ARMS Training Fellow, Fiona Zammit | Workshop: Aspiring to be in senior leadership in research administration  
Denise Clark, University of Maryland College Park | Workshop: Helping researchers develop their research impact narrative  
Wade Kelly, La Trobe University and Tamika Heiden, Research Impact Academy | Workshop: Research Integrity: Exploring Procedural Fairness and Conflict of Interest in Research  
Dr Ted Rohr & Dr Karolyn White, Convenors ARMS Ethics & Integrity SIG, Elise Groser (Chair Go8 Ethics & Integrity Group), Bronwyn Greene, Professor Lisa Bero, University of Sydney, Dr Elizabeth Visser, University of Auckland |
| 1500 - 1530 | AFTERNOON TEA                                                                                 |
| 1530 - 1700 | Module 6.1: Working with Industry (cont.)  
Riverbank Room 5 | Module 3.4: Higher Degree by Admissions and Completions (cont.)  
Riverbank Room 6A | Workshop (cont.)  
Riverbank Room 6B | Workshop (cont.)  
Riverbank Room 6B | Workshop (cont.)  
Riverbank Room 8A | Workshop (cont.)  
Riverbank Room 8B |

**Pre-Conference Site Tours, Registration and Welcome Reception**

*Please note: all Pre-Conference activities must be booked prior to attendance.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>900 - 1700</td>
<td>Barossa Valley Winery Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 - TBA</td>
<td>SAHMRI/Tonsley Innovation District Tour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1500 onwards | CONFERENCE REGISTRATION  
Registration desk will be open for delegates wishing to register early  
Foyer M |
| 1730 - 1930 | WELCOME RECEPTION  
Registration Desk Open - Foyer M  
Reception in Exhibition Hall - Hall L |
## Conference Program

**Wednesday 18 September 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0800 -</td>
<td><strong>REGISTRATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0830</td>
<td>Foyer M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0830 -</td>
<td><strong>Move to Plenary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0845 -</td>
<td><strong>CONFERENCE OPENING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0920</td>
<td><strong>PLENARY SESSION 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0920 -</td>
<td>Dr Andy Cope, Art of Brilliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td><strong>PARTNERSHIP &amp; EXHIBITION FORUM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 -</td>
<td>This session provides an opportunity for delegates to learn about a range of partners and exhibitors who will be present throughout the conference. Participating partners and exhibitors will have a 3 minute presentation each.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Program is subject to change at discretion of the conference organisers. Only lead submitting author currently listed within program.*
**WEDNESDAY 18 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**Conference Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Concurrent Session 1</th>
<th>Concurrent Session 2</th>
<th>Concurrent Session 3</th>
<th>Concurrent Session 4</th>
<th>Concurrent Session 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1130 - 1245</td>
<td>Ethics &amp; Integrity Chair: Dr Ted Rohr, UNSW Sydney Hall M</td>
<td>HDR Matters Chair: Dr Megan Dean, University of Tasmania Riverbank Room 5</td>
<td>First Nations Research Chair: Tania Tambiah, RMIT University Riverbank Room 6</td>
<td>Managing Research Contracts and Agreements Chair: Merrilyn Larusson, CSIRO Riverbank Room 7</td>
<td>Managing Research Projects Chair: Louise Townsin, Torrens University Riverbank Room 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130 - 1200</td>
<td>Dr Susan O’Brien, The University Of Queensland Conflict of interest: A digital solution for training, assessment, declaration, and registration in a research intensive university</td>
<td>Petra Van Nieuwenhoven, The University Of Melbourne ‘PhD Without Tears: How Graduate Research Administrators Use Innovative Work Practices To Facilitate Successful Completion’ Theme Leader</td>
<td>A/Prof. Clair Andersen, University Of Tasmania Sharing a Story of Place Theme Leader</td>
<td>Dr Tania Bezzobs, Swinburne University Of Technology From zero to hero (?) – improving contracts processes and systems in the fast lane Theme Leader</td>
<td>Connie Mogg, Odilia Teoh, Monash University Paradise by the Dashboard Light – A new online finance dashboard for researchers at Monash Theme Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 - 1215</td>
<td>Dr Adrian W. Chew, University Of New South Wales, Sydney Research Data Management online Training (RDMoT): What does it mean to me? Theme Leader</td>
<td>Rachel Bageas, UniSA Implementing and upscaling the oral defence at UniSA Theme Leader</td>
<td>Dr Gabrielle Hine, University Of Otago The Unique Contribution of Te Ao Māori An Overview of New Zealand’s Vision Mātauranga Policy Framework Theme Leader</td>
<td>Stefan Delfgou, Lucas Hughes, University Of Wollongong Accelerating research implementation: a team based approach to streamline and expedite contracting Theme Leader</td>
<td>Dr Roy Mcburney, The University Of Sydney How can the Research Office support complex research programs with Industry linkages to successful outcomes Theme Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215 - 1230</td>
<td>Rachel Salby, Rebecca Clark, La Trobe University Benefits of a collaborative approach to embedding data management into ethics</td>
<td>Cheryl Law, Unsw Sydney Transformation from the ground up: enacting a continuous improvement culture in HDR Admissions</td>
<td>Jaylene Wehipeihana, Dr Faith Welch, The University Of Auckland Removing the anxiety around indigenous engagement conversations</td>
<td>Judi Burtneshaw and Matt Bowden, Australian National University Forming a centralized Research Contracts Officer – a journey of self-discovery</td>
<td>Lawrence Hogan, Monash University Why are Research Managers spending half their time answering questions that an expert in Customer Service can do for them?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conference Program

**WEDNESDAY 18 SEPTEMBER 2019**

#### 1230 - 1245

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1230 - 1245</th>
<th>Dr Paul Wong, Australian Research Data Commons</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>Dr Dani Milos, Flinders University</th>
<th>122</th>
<th>Mandy Downing, Curtin University</th>
<th>139</th>
<th>Adrian Cilmi, La Trobe University</th>
<th>107</th>
<th>Helen Partridge, Monash University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better Data Management Practice: a Shared Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>The benefits and efficiencies of Inspire - Flinders University's new HDR Online Candidature Management system</td>
<td></td>
<td>An insight into the decolonisation of research ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Language of Love? – The Marriage of Research and Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Network for Research Entity Managers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LUNCH**

POSTER SESSION 1* see below program for full poster listing

Exhibition, Hall L

**1245 - 1345**

**OPTIONAL LUNCH SESSION**

**RAAAP: Research Administration As A Profession - Second Survey - A Discussion**

Dr Bryony Wakefield, The University of Melbourne & ARMS Board Member

RAAAP – Research Administration As A Profession. Find out about the key skills, attitudes and behaviours of successful research administration leaders. In 2018, INORMS, the International Network of Research Management Societies created an international TaskForce (INORMS RAAAP) to revisit the 2016 RAAAP survey questionnaire in order to start collecting longitudinal data about our profession. Learn how you can contribute to this longitudinal study.

Hall M

**OPTIONAL ARMS LUNCH SESSIONS**

**ARMS SIG MEETING**

Ethics and Integrity SIG

Ted Rohr and Karolyn White (Co-Convenors)

Riverbank Room 5

**ARMS SIG MEETING**

Health and Medical Research SIG

Hannah Clarke and Tam Nguyen (Co-Convenors)

Riverbank Room 6

**ARMS CHAPTER MEETING**

NZ & Pacific Islands Chapter

Heather Thomas (Acting Convenor)

Riverbank Room 7

**ARMS CHAPTER MEETING**

VIC Chapter

Fiona Cromarty

Riverbank Room 8

**ARMS MEETING**

ARMS Training Fellows Meeting

Mark Hochman

Room L2

Move to Plenary

*Program is subject to change at discretion of the conference organisers. Only lead submitting author currently listed within program.*
PLENARY SESSION 2
Professor Lisa Bero PhD, Charles Perkins Centre, The University of Sydney

“Hidden And Not So Hidden Bias In Research”

Bias in research is a problem that concerns researchers, consumers, policy makers and other users of evidence. Researchers strive to reduce bias in their research and make it transparent, but research conflicts of interest create a risk of bias. A variety of methods have been used to identify bias - the systematic error or deviation from the true results of a study. Bias related to funding sources or investigator conflicts of interest can be introduced throughout the entire research process (questions asked, design, conduct or publication). Global transparency initiatives have enabled the detection of previously hidden financial ties between researchers and pharmaceutical companies. Professor Bero will discuss a number of ongoing efforts aimed at identifying conflicts of interest and reducing bias in clinical research and practice.

PLENARY SESSION 3
The Great Debate

“Research Management is harder now than way back when…”

This session will encourage friendly debate between former and current Research Office Directors of the three South Australian universities. The session will look to hear some war stories and anecdotes about life in a Research Office back in 1999 when ARMS was being established, and how times have changed now it’s 2019... or not as the case may be!

Facilitator:
Dr Campbell Thomson, ARMS President

Panellists:

Former:
Janet Dibb-Leigh - former Director, The University of Adelaide
Wayne Harvey - former Director, Flinders University
Dr Mark Hochman - former Director, University of South Australia

Current:
Simon Breman - Executive Director, Research Services Branch, The University of Adelaide
Jodieann Dawe - Director, Research Development and Support, Flinders University
Dr Ross McLennan - Director: Research and Innovation Services, The University of South Australia
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Chair(s)</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1600 - 1700  | CONCURRENT SESSION 6                        | Ethics & Integrity                                                       | Lena Caruso, UNSW Sydney  
Managing Great Expectations: the pitfalls of establishing industry sponsored PhD scholarships  
Theme Leader Presentation |
|              | CONCURRENT SESSION 7                        | HDR Matters                                                              | Prof. Rachel Spronken-Smith, University Of Otago  
Could Micro-Credentials be a Game Changer in Better Preparing Doctoral Graduates for Career Opportunities?  
Theme Leader Presentation |
|              | CONCURRENT SESSION 8                        | Researcher Development                                                   | 91 Jade Hurst, Transport Accident Commission  
Streamlining Research Contract Establishment: Making Research Easier  
Theme Leader Presentation  
Dr Huong Nguyen, Swinburne University Of Technology  
Doctoral research internships: Key capabilities that doctoral interns should acquire to succeed  
67 Charlotte Ferrier, UniSA  
Building a case for EDGE: UniSAs approach to HDR skills development  
76 Mandy Pink and Dana Slaven, University of Tasmania  
Negotiating the complex landscape of creative arts funding contracts  
101 Sally Mcneill, University Of Wollongong  
University Global Partnership Network: A framework for International Collaborative Research |
| 1600 - 1615  | ARC/NHRMC Joint Session                     | Research Integrity – building a strong foundation for Australia          | Justin Withers, ARC, and Jillian Barr, NHMRC  
Lena Caruso, UNSW Sydney  
Managing Great Expectations: the pitfalls of establishing industry sponsored PhD scholarships  
Theme Leader Presentation |
| 1615 - 1630  |                                             |                                                                          | 91 Jade Hurst, Transport Accident Commission  
Streamlining Research Contract Establishment: Making Research Easier  
Theme Leader Presentation  
Dr Huong Nguyen, Swinburne University Of Technology  
Doctoral research internships: Key capabilities that doctoral interns should acquire to succeed  
67 Charlotte Ferrier, UniSA  
Building a case for EDGE: UniSAs approach to HDR skills development  
76 Mandy Pink and Dana Slaven, University of Tasmania  
Negotiating the complex landscape of creative arts funding contracts  
101 Sally Mcneill, University Of Wollongong  
University Global Partnership Network: A framework for International Collaborative Research |
| 1630 - 1645  |                                             |                                                                          | 91 Jade Hurst, Transport Accident Commission  
Streamlining Research Contract Establishment: Making Research Easier  
Theme Leader Presentation  
Dr Huong Nguyen, Swinburne University Of Technology  
Doctoral research internships: Key capabilities that doctoral interns should acquire to succeed  
67 Charlotte Ferrier, UniSA  
Building a case for EDGE: UniSAs approach to HDR skills development  
76 Mandy Pink and Dana Slaven, University of Tasmania  
Negotiating the complex landscape of creative arts funding contracts  
101 Sally Mcneill, University Of Wollongong  
University Global Partnership Network: A framework for International Collaborative Research |
### WEDNESDAY 18 SEPTEMBER 2019

#### Conference Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Dr Megan Dean, University Of Tasmania</td>
<td>Candidature Wins through Institutional Change: transitioning candidature variations to an eForm platform</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Dr Joanna Cobley, University Of Canterbury</td>
<td>Paradox, dilemma &amp; uncertainty: shaping an ‘academic me’ in a performance-driven research world</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Q&amp;A time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td></td>
<td>ARM(A), ARM(F) &amp; ARMS TRAINING FELLOWS NETWORKING EVENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regatta's Bar &amp; Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All ARM(A), ARM(F) and Training Fellows welcome- invitation to be sent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THURSDAY 19 SEPTEMBER 2019

#### Conference Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0800 - 0845</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Foyer M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0845 - 0900</td>
<td>Move to Plenary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900 - 1000</td>
<td><strong>PLENARY SESSION 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heather D’Antoine, Division Leader of Education and Capacity Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Associate Director for Aboriginal Programs, Menzies School of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Excellence and Impact in Aboriginal Health Research in a Changing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a place for research to address the adverse health outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population. However,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for research to have an impact, it needs to be conducted in a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meaningful, authentic partnership with the Aboriginal community. I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aim to illustrate what that might look like in research landscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that is constantly changing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hall M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 - 1100</td>
<td><strong>PLENARY SESSION 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Scientist Panel Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Facilitator:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Ross McLennan, ARMS President Elect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Panellists:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Cathy Foley, CSIRO Chief Scientist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Caroline McMillan, Chief Scientist for South Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Gary Evans, MBIE Chief Science Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hall M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 - 1130</td>
<td>MORNING TEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exhibition - Hall L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Program is subject to change at discretion of the conference organisers. Only lead submitting author currently listed within program.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Partner</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie University</td>
<td>Hannah Clarke, ACT Health</td>
<td>Creating, Recording and Communicating Engagement and Impact</td>
<td>Riverbank Room 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSW Sydney</td>
<td>Dr. Johanna Barclay,</td>
<td>HDR Matters</td>
<td>Riverbank Room 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dr. Campbell Thomson,</td>
<td>Next Practice</td>
<td>Riverbank Room 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Dr. Connie Mogg,</td>
<td>Ethics &amp; Integrity</td>
<td>Riverbank Room 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SmartSat CRC</td>
<td>Andrew Beveridge,</td>
<td>Working in Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1130 - 1145**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joann Cattlin, University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Building engagement from the ground up: international perspectives on supporting research engagement and impact assessment</td>
<td>Riverbank Room 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Jackson, UniSA</td>
<td>Measuring the Impact of PhD Mentoring: delivering a sector-led evaluation tool for IMNIS programs</td>
<td>Riverbank Room 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Lloyd, UTS</td>
<td>Beyond Boundaries: taking a Team of Teams approach to research support</td>
<td>Riverbank Room 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Ted Rohr, University of Western Sydney</td>
<td>The International Landscape of Research Integrity, Ethics and Compliance</td>
<td>Riverbank Room 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Christian, Federation University</td>
<td>Are less desirable characteristics of workplaces prevalent in the STEMM environment in spite of efforts to address needs for diversity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1145 - 1200**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Barker, ICRR</td>
<td>Assessing research impact within government: collaborative university-governments approach to developing a best-practice research impact assessment framework</td>
<td>Riverbank Room 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lachlan Smith, Cloud Chamber Ltd</td>
<td>LGBT Researchers in international environments: a discussion on diversity and real-life experiences</td>
<td>Riverbank Room 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Thursday 19 September 2019

## Conference Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Dr Mark Hochman</td>
<td>Research Management Resources: Developing a pragmatic, institutional engagement strategy that works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215</td>
<td>Andrea Walisser and Francesca Baruzzi, University Of New South Wales</td>
<td>Stop, Revive, Survive: Improving the HDR “Show Cause” Process at the University of New South Wales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215</td>
<td>Eleanor Colla, Sarah Brown, University of New England</td>
<td>Acknowledging the Venn: Turning the forgotten space between Research Management and Librarianship into best practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215</td>
<td>Mandy Downing, Curtin University</td>
<td>Institutional Barriers that Aboriginal Researchers Face when Conducting Human Research, and Why it Needs to Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215</td>
<td>Yuen Chang, Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Tania Tambiah, RMIT University</td>
<td>Fifty Shades of Epidermis: Diversity beyond gender - Panel Session (1 hour)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td>Peta Humphreys, University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Research Impact and the University of Melbourne Library: Evolution and Revolution!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245</td>
<td>Dr Mark Dixon, The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Contract Cheating – detection and response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245</td>
<td>Laura Dan, Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>Best practice in community engagement: The Carnegie Community Engagement Classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245</td>
<td>Dr Dani Milos, Flinders University</td>
<td>Producing highly skilled and career-ready HDR students through an embedded and individualised skills training program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Rachel Ramsdale, University of Melbourne</td>
<td>The Rise of the ThirdSpacer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Elise Grosser, Rebecca Griffin, The University Of Sydney</td>
<td>Rating the seriousness of research code breaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315</td>
<td>Dr Tobias Schoep, Tara McLaren, Telethon Kids Institute</td>
<td>Progress: The right currency for impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315</td>
<td>Prof. Roslyn Cameron, Australian Institute Of Business</td>
<td>Articulating transferrable skills through Doctoral Graduate Attributes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315</td>
<td>Dr Paul Daniels, Monash University</td>
<td>Automating Grant Application Compliance and Eligibility Checking: Experiences and Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td>Dr Dani Milos, Flinders University</td>
<td>Producing highly skilled and career-ready HDR students through an embedded and individualised skills training program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td>Melanie Gentgall, Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies</td>
<td>Ethics in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research: what does it mean in practice?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>Melanie Gentgall, Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies</td>
<td>Ethics in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research: what does it mean in practice?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Program is subject to change at discretion of the conference organisers. Only lead submitting author currently listed within program.*

*Conference Program*
### THURSDAY 19 SEPTEMBER 2019

#### Conference Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1300 - 1400</td>
<td><strong>OPTIONAL ARMS LUNCH SESSIONS</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>ARMS SIG MEETING</strong>&lt;br&gt;Research Funders SIG&lt;br&gt;Jane Hobson, Merrilyn Larusson (Co-Convenors)&lt;br&gt;Riverbank Room 5&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>ARMS SIG MEETING</strong>&lt;br&gt;Research Impact SIG&lt;br&gt;Faith Welch and Tamika Heiden (Co-Convenors)&lt;br&gt;Riverbank Room 6&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>ARMS NETWORK MEETING</strong>&lt;br&gt;Australasian Research Training Network&lt;br&gt;Lucy Jones (Convenor)&lt;br&gt;Riverbank Room 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Thursday 19 September 2019

## Conference Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Theme Leader</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1530 – 1700  | **Concurrent Session 16** Creating, Recording and Communicating Engagement and Impact  
Chair: Tara McLaren, Telethon Kids Institute  
Hall M  
Session Partner - Macquarie University | Dr Faith Welch, University Of Auckland  
A Case Study in Canada: 'Putting the cart before the horse - why impact shouldn't be assessment-driven.' | Riverbank Room 5     | Marina Delpin, Flinders University  
Flinders Research Fast Start Program – an action-learning orientation and induction to mitigate research lag | Dr Simon Kerr, La Trobe University  
Does research management have a future? How we can stay relevant when everything changes | Dr Megan Power, Monash University / Warwick University  
Does network-making count?: Inter-institutional relationships and their impact on Australia’s research aspirations. | 59 Dr Megan Power, Monash University / Warwick University  
Planning for a new funding world: Supporting the transition of Monash researchers to a new health and medical funding landscape | 95 Dr Tsharni Zazryn, Dr Wade Moore, Monash University  
Planning for a new funding world: Supporting the transition of Monash researchers to a new health and medical funding landscape | 87
|              | **Concurrent Session 17** Researcher Development  
Chair: Denise Greenwood, University of Auckland | Emily Brennan, Macquarie University  
Mind the Gap: growing and sustaining a university-wide community for ECR support | Riverbank Room 6     | Dr Paul Wong, Australian Research Data Commons  
The Future Demands of Research Support Facilitating Data Intensive Research | Dr Sam Shokravi, University Of Melbourne  
How can we use research data to inform research strategy? | 48 Dr Sam Shokravi, University Of Melbourne  
How can we use research data to inform research strategy? | 26 Dr Ken Choong, The University Of Melbourne  
A big picture approach to research funding | 133
|              | **Concurrent Session 18** Next Practice  
Chair: Dr Ross McLennan, University of South Australia | Ken Knight, Murdoch Children’s Research Institute  
What does it take to build organizational capacity for research impact? | Riverbank Room 7     | 93 Emily Brennan, Macquarie University  
Mind the Gap: growing and sustaining a university-wide community for ECR support | 70 Dr Paul Wong, Australian Research Data Commons  
The Future Demands of Research Support Facilitating Data Intensive Research | 48 Dr Sam Shokravi, University Of Melbourne  
How can we use research data to inform research strategy? | 26 Dr Ken Choong, The University Of Melbourne  
A big picture approach to research funding | 133
|              | **Concurrent Session 19** Research Evaluation  
Chair: Michelle Duryea, Edith Cowan University | | Riverbank Room 8     | 87 | 26 Dr Ken Choong, The University Of Melbourne  
A big picture approach to research funding | 133
|              | **Concurrent Session 20** Research Projects Development  
Chair: A/Prof Tam Nguyen, St Vincent’s Hospital | | | | | | |

*Program is subject to change at discretion of the conference organisers. Only lead submitting author currently listed within program.*
# Conference Program

## THURSDAY 19 SEPTEMBER 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Presentation Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1615 -</td>
<td>Wade Kelly, La Trobe University Supporting Humanities and Social Science Scholars' Engagement and Impact Needs</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Supporting Humanities and Social Science Scholars' Engagement and Impact Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Dr Johanna Barclay, University Of New South Wales The role of the Research Strategy Office in developing long-term strategies for sustained research funding in a complex landscape</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>The role of the Research Strategy Office in developing long-term strategies for sustained research funding in a complex landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Dr Susan O'Brien, The University Of Queensland Research Management Business Transformation: Creating and implementing digital solutions to transform future research experience at The University of Queensland</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Research Management Business Transformation: Creating and implementing digital solutions to transform future research experience at The University of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Zoe Mounsey, Fire And Emergency New Zealand Demonstrating research impact in Fire and Emergency New Zealand</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Demonstrating research impact in Fire and Emergency New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Narmon Tulsi, Flinders University Opportunity knocks: Case study of a successful grant development approach during a change management process</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Opportunity knocks: Case study of a successful grant development approach during a change management process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Dr Anna Thomas, RMIT University A Best Practice Approach to Supporting the Creation and Reporting of Impact</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>A Best Practice Approach to Supporting the Creation and Reporting of Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Dr Amy Harington, University Of Tasmania Learning our AB-Cs: Supporting Early Career Researchers'</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Learning our AB-Cs: Supporting Early Career Researchers'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Melroy Almeida, Australian Access Federation Visualising Institutional Collaboration using ORCID Data and Research Graph</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Visualising Institutional Collaboration using ORCID Data and Research Graph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Dr Jacqueline Woerner, Transport Accident Commission Returning to the challenge of measuring return on investment in research: The development of The TAC ROI Framework</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Returning to the challenge of measuring return on investment in research: The development of The TAC ROI Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Christina Spargo, Jen Girling, Menzies School of Health Research Making it work: how to stay current in a world of chaos</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Making it work: how to stay current in a world of chaos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Additional Q&amp;A time</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Dr Angela McGuire, University of Tasmania What does the track record of a typical ARC Laureate recipient look like and are there differences between the genders?</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>What does the track record of a typical ARC Laureate recipient look like and are there differences between the genders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Nirmala Devarajan, Monash University Investment in Quality Assurance: Where does the value lie in research infrastructure development?</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Investment in Quality Assurance: Where does the value lie in research infrastructure development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Prof. Michael Khor, Nanyang Technological University The Long and Winding Road: Key Lessons from 10 Years of Research Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>The Long and Winding Road: Key Lessons from 10 Years of Research Performance Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Mandy Pink, University Of Tasmania Simple steps to improving researcher engagement</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Simple steps to improving researcher engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>ARMS Launch of Global Chapter Following by ARMS AGM</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>ARMS Launch of Global Chapter Following by ARMS AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>CONFERENCE DINNER</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>CONFERENCE DINNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800-0845</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0845-0900</td>
<td>Move to Plenary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900-1000</td>
<td><strong>PLENARY SESSION 7</strong> Perpetual Investment Panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catherine Wood, Chief Executive Officer/Chief Investment Officer, ARK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investment Management LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Investing in Disruptive Innovation”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1100</td>
<td><strong>PLENARY SESSION 8</strong> Research Panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitator: Dr Tony Peacock, CRC Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panellists: Professor Caroline Miller, SAHMRI, Nanyang Technological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University, Professor Michael Khor, Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catherine Wood, Chief Executive Officer/Chief Investment Officer, ARK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investment Management LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100-1130</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exhibition – Hall L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 - 12:00</td>
<td><strong>Panel Session</strong>&lt;br&gt;Facilitator: Fiona Zammit, Director of Edu Management and Consulting&lt;br&gt;Panellists:&lt;br&gt;- Professor Tara Brabazon, Dean of Graduate Research, Flinders University&lt;br&gt;- Professor Pat Buckley, Dean of Graduate Studies, University of South Australia&lt;br&gt;- Professor Joe Luca, Dean, Graduate Research School, Edith Cowan University&lt;br&gt;- Professor Rachel Spronken-Smith, Dean, Graduate Research School, University of Otago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 12:15</td>
<td><strong>Session Partner - Macquarie University</strong>&lt;br&gt;Dr Daniel Owens, UNSW Sydney&lt;br&gt;Bring balance to the university (not leave it in darkness) through an informed, transparent, metricated culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 12:15</td>
<td><strong>Theme Leader Presentation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Prof. Gayle Morris, G Morris Consulting&lt;br&gt;Career Path Researcher Development: Women in STEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 - 12:30</td>
<td><strong>Session Partner - Flinders University</strong>&lt;br&gt;Dr David Junsong Huang, National Institute Of Education, Singapore&lt;br&gt;Developing collaborative researchers in the network era</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 - 12:30</td>
<td><strong>Theme Leader Presentation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Dr Joseph Toltz, The University Of Sydney&lt;br&gt;The measurement of value in NTRs: ERA, EI, the place of peer evaluation and issues of metric measurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 - 13:00</td>
<td><strong>Session Partner - Monash University</strong>&lt;br&gt;Dr Amanda Smith, La Trobe University&lt;br&gt;Accessing tender opportunities through panel arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 - 13:00</td>
<td><strong>Theme Leader Presentation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Dr Melinda Laundon, QUT&lt;br&gt;Researcher Development in Impact and Engagement: Establishing a Rationale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 - 13:00</td>
<td><strong>Theme Leader Presentation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Dr Joseph Toltz, The University Of Sydney&lt;br&gt;The measurement of value in NTRs: ERA, EI, the place of peer evaluation and issues of metric measurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 - 13:00</td>
<td><strong>Theme Leader Presentation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Dr Melinda Laundon, QUT&lt;br&gt;Researcher Development in Impact and Engagement: Establishing a Rationale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 - 13:30</td>
<td><strong>Session Partner - University Of Newcastle</strong>&lt;br&gt;Dr Frank Anastasopoulos, The University Of Melbourne&lt;br&gt;Investigator Grants at The University of Melbourne Top Tips for implementing effective support for a new grant scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 - 13:30</td>
<td><strong>Theme Leader Presentation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Dr Gabrielle Callander, Monash University&lt;br&gt;Frontiers of Research: Tales from the MRF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FRIDAY 20 SEPTEMBER 2019

#### Conference Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker and Institution</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1230 - 1245</td>
<td>Louise Barnsbee, Queensland University of Technology</td>
<td>Researchers' attitudes and perceptions of demonstrating research impact: implications for management of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245 - 1300</td>
<td>Anneka Ferguson, University of Tasmania</td>
<td>What can we learn from Local Government about engagement and impact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300 - 1345</td>
<td>ARMS 2019 Co-Convenors Close</td>
<td>ARMS 2019 Closing Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345</td>
<td>LUNCH/Close</td>
<td>Exhibition - Hall L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Program is subject to change at discretion of the conference organisers. Only lead submitting author currently listed within program.*
# POSTER SESSION 1

**Wednesday 18 September - Lunch Break**

| Poster 1 | Dr Paul Wong - WITHDRAWN  
Australian Research Data Commons | Qualitative Analysis of the UK Impact Case Studies: Understanding Research Data Contribution to Impact Narratives | 47 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Poster 2 | Julia Tresidder, Alex Aitkin  
National Health and Medical Research Council | NHMRC Long Term Impact Case Studies | 147 |
| **Higher Degree Research Matters** |  |
| Poster 3 | Rose Walker  
University Of Tasmania | Lifecycles of Joint Higher Degrees by Research: ensuring quality and flexibility when one size does not fit all | 50 |
| Poster 4 | Charlotte Ferrier  
UniSA | Postcards from the EDGE: introducing an integrated user platform to support PhD skills development at UniSA. | 75 |
| **Managing Research Projects** |  |
| Poster 5 | Shirin Jambhulkar  
Monash University | Going beyond the norm of basic grant management | 125 |
| **Next Practice** |  |
| Poster 6 | Annette Harris  
Charles Sturt University | ARMS NSW Chapter leading by example: Demonstrating the feasibility of online professional development via a webinar series | 45 |
| Poster 7 | Siobhann Mccafferty  
ArcC | PIDs for Purpose: Persistent Identifiers and the Research Life Cycle | 126 |
| Poster 8 | Christiane Rupp  
University of Auckland | When change comes to research management: the case for a pre-mortem | 144 |
| **Partnership in Research and Commercialisation** |  |
| Poster 9 | Denise Redfern  
Griffith University | Partner attraction in research collaboration: from engagement to long-term commitment | 22 |
## POSTER SESSION 2

**Thursday 19 September - Lunch Break**

### Research Evaluation

| Poster 10 | Nerida Gibb  
CSIRO | Investing returns from great discoveries into the discoverers of tomorrow | 88 |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Poster 11 | Monique O’callaghan  
The University of Melbourne | The alchemy of evaluating research: active ingredients for a marvellous ME-Data-CINE | 142 |

### Research Projects Development

| Poster 12 | Heather Thomas  
The University Of Canterbury | A day on the farm: What do farming and research project development have in common? | 42 |
| Poster 13 | Melanie Horder  
The University Of Melbourne | Legacy, Leadership and Leap: the Laureate Peer Support Program at the University of Melbourne | 56 |
| Poster 14 | Dr Shannen Lau  
The University Of Melbourne | To support or not to support? - Let the data talk | 129 |
| Poster 15 | Lachlan Smith  
Cloud Chamber Ltd | An experiment in research culture development – reflections on two years supporting three small English universities with research grant proposals | 19 |

### Researcher Development

| Poster 16 | Katherine Christian  
Federation University Australia | How do early-career researchers in STEMM disciplines view the professional development opportunities available to them? | 30 |
| Poster 17 | Claire Jackson  
UniSA | Giving employers a voice in the development of PhD employability | 73 |
| Poster 18 | Jaylene Wehipeihana  
The University Of Auckland | Can we develop researchers and research support together? | 33 |

*Program is subject to change at discretion of the conference organisers. Only lead submitting author currently listed within program.*
Effective mechanisms for disclosing, assessing and managing conflicts of interest (COI) has arisen as a key risk within universities in recent years, particularly in relation to commercialisation of research. The significant drivers for this nationally include the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, the requirements of the NHMRC and ARC in funding research, the Engagement and Impact agenda arising from the NISA as well as local expectations from state based agencies such as the Crime and Corruption Commission (Qld) etc. Embedded within this is the challenge to not restrict or discourage the proper commercialisation of research.

After initial assessment of these challenges the University of Queensland (UQ) determined that separating research COI from other COI was neither effective nor practical. At UQ the following framework for managing COI is being implemented:

- Revised COI policy creating a single reference point for institutional expectations for research and non-research COI management
- Comprehensive online training for professional and academic staff
- Purpose-built digital workflows for assessment and declaration, management and registration of COI guided by six self-assessment questions (relationships with students or staff, procurement, research, secondary employment, other)

The challenges, successes and outcomes of implementing this ambitious, enterprise wide solution will be presented with particular focus on the impact and management of research related COI. The comprehensive, digital system developed by UQ is a first in Australia. The methodology is adaptable and could be successfully applied within both similar large research intensive universities and smaller institutions.
121: Benefits of a collaborative approach to embedding data management into ethics

Ms Rachel Salby, Rebecca Clark, Dr Jordane Malaterre, Ms Ceira Barr, Ms Eva Fisch

1La Trobe University, Bundoora, Australia, 2Monash University, Caulfield, Australia

The newly revised National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research states that researchers should inform participants about how their data will be managed and stored. While there is specific and detailed guidance on the types of information which should be available to potential participants, there is no requirement for researchers to develop a data management plan. In the post Cambridge Analytica world, we need to shift towards improved management practices in both the business world and in the research setting.

La Trobe University’s Research Data Management Policy mandates the use of data management plans for all research projects. While researchers adhere to the policy, until recently little effort went into working with researchers on data management plans and data management options and responsibilities. A recent successful pilot programme highlighted the challenges in managing research data consistently across the organisation. The programme involved integrating expertise from Library and Data Management services in the Human Ethics review process and delivering coordinated, context driven, data management recommendations to researchers. The project also provided a valuable opportunity for us to interrogate university wide practices in research data management. The integrated model has now been adopted as part of the ongoing research management service at La Trobe.

This presentation will provide an introduction to the La Trobe University ethics/data management process model. It will then touch on some of the key improvements this partnership has granted the University as well as issues and threats it has exposed.

46: Better Data Management Practice: a Shared Responsibility

Dr Paul Wong

Australian Research Data Commons, Canberra, Australia

From a research integrity perspective, a growing concern is the disconnect between research data and scholarly publications. Vine et al (2014) estimated that the availability of research data declines rapidly with article age, roughly at 17% each year. If this trend continues, we’ll arrive at an untenable future in which scholarly works published now would be available in a decade time, but there would only be a 16% chance that the data required to substantiate the research findings would also be available. Without the underlying data, the research published today will not have the same level of reliability in the future.

In response to this growing concern, the international community, including funders, academies, discipline and scholarly societies etc. are proposing a number of data management frameworks to ensure that research data is preserved along with published scholarly works for the long term. Examples include FAIR data principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable) and the Five Safes framework (for sharing sensitive data). Both of these have been adopted widely. In light of these frameworks and international best practices, we’ll consider the Management of Data and Information in Research, a guide supporting the implementation of the 2018 Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research. A unique feature of the Guide is a shared responsibility model of data management, consistent with the framework of the new Code.

Going forward, research management professionals will have a critical role to play in facilitating the transformation needed to improve data management practices across the sector.
39:  ‘PhD Without Tears: How Graduate Research Administrators Use Innovative Work Practices To Facilitate Successful Completion’

Ms Petra Van Nieuwenhoven  
1The University Of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

The increased focus on service quality within the tertiary education sector means that innovation in work practices has become a core activity within the service environment and is designed to facilitate an increase in service efficiency and minimise costs. A more tailored approach is required to meet the needs of the graduate researcher who has more specific requirements in the areas of the student-supervisor relationship as the quality of that relationship contributes to a successful completion. Graduate researchers are also more likely to be carers or parents, often work for long hours on their own, and maintaining positive psychological wellbeing is a challenge for them at some point in their program. While it may be the responsibility of the supervisor to help them navigate through their study, not all supervisors are skilled to recognise signs of mental health difficulties and respond and suggest support.

Controls for mitigating the risk of psychological distress include appropriate research training management services, providing students with access to advice and guidance beyond their supervisory team, ensuring managerial oversight of supervision quality, and providing a comprehensive range of supervisor professional development.

Graduate research administrators who work in the space between supervisor and student contribute to ensuring the student’s health and wellbeing across the duration of their candidature. This requires an innovative approach and mindset to implement interventions and efficient processes that facilitate the relationship between student, supervisor and activities and resources within the institution to ensure a successful completion of the graduate research journey.

77:  Implementing and upscaling the oral defence at UniSA

Ms Jenni Critcher 1, Mrs Rachel Bageas 1  
1University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia

In an Australian first, the University of South Australia introduced a mandatory oral defence for all PhD candidates commencing from 1 January 2016 as part of the Transformed PhD (tPhD) initiative. Through international benchmarking and analysis led by a cross-university project team, the university defined an oral defence model with the purpose of ensuring a high quality examination process and experience; that it is conducted fairly for all parties involved; and enabling the candidate to be the best they can be. Over a period of 18 months the project team developed the roles, responsibilities, processes, polices and systems needed to enable the oral defence. In 2017, the project team were recognised for the successful implementation of the oral defence at UniSA with a Vice Chancellor’s Professional Staff Excellence Award.

In advance of the first wave of mandatory oral examinations, candidates have opted-in for an oral defence examination which has enabled testing and refining of processes to optimise the experience for candidates, Chairs, supervisors and the local area ‘case managers’ who support organisational aspects. This has included the creation of a suite of resources and a dedicated oral defence venue to provide an environment with conditions appropriate for examinations to take place.

As the 2016 commencing PhD cohort reach their thesis submission dates, the focus is on upscaling for the individual management of approximately 200 candidates a year. This poster presents an overview of the oral defence implementation and the process of upscaling while ensuring a high quality candidate experience.
57: Transformation from the ground up: enacting a continuous improvement culture in HDR Admissions

Ms Cheryl Law

1UNSW Sydney, Australia

The UNSW Higher Degree by Research (HDR) Admissions and Scholarships Team leads the recruitment of high-quality candidates. Through the UNSW 2025 strategic plan, new HDR initiatives have been implemented including a high-profile scholarship program, industry doctoral training, and increase in strategic global collaborations and partnerships. This has resulted in an increase of HDR applications by 53% over a three-year period. The increased workload in a high volume multi-transactional environment and complex processes associated with these schemes have impacted our core service: providing timely responses and outcomes. Our stakeholders have highlighted this as a major issue as delays have resulted in losing high-quality candidates. With little change in staffing, there is urgent need for change.

To address this, a workshop was held to identify pain-points and areas for improvement resulting in Project Transform. A total of 82 initiatives were identified aiming to streamline work. These initiatives were divided into 7 streams with multiple initiatives completed across streams. Individual team members took ownership of these initiatives by identifying, trialling and recommending the best solution. Project Transform adopts agile principles, in which solutions are delivered and feedback sought from stakeholders in increments. To date, we have seen a rapid improvement in application turnaround times and enquiry resolution with further gains to come.

This case study of a ground up improvement project focuses on one strategy for fostering a continuous improvement culture in the team. Project Transform demonstrates when staff are empowered by taking ownership, they are driven to find the best solution.

122: The benefits and efficiencies of Inspire - Flinders University’s new HDR Online Candidature Management system

Dr Dani Milos, Ms Karen Jacobs, Ms Sally Mathews, Ms Natalie Hills, Ms Kate Willson, Ms Megan Prideaux

1Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia

It has been almost 18 months since Flinders University signed the contract with SkillsForge to deliver Inspire, an online candidature management interface. During this time, the Office of Graduate Research, in collaboration with Digital Research Services has delivered four releases:

Release 1: HDR Skills Training
Release 2: Degree Management Forms
Release 3: Milestones
Release 4: Examinations

The Office of Graduate Research, College HDR Coordinators, HDR supervisors and students have all seen the benefits and efficiencies of Inspire. These include a more streamlined process, quicker turnaround times, the creation of online forms and workflows and development of an individualised skills training program embedded into annual milestones. An initial analysis of the efficiencies and benefits of Inspire indicate that across the stakeholders, a cumulative benefit of 14 days has been realised, in comparison to previous methods for candidature management. Moreover, the University is meeting compliance protocols with respect to data integrity and document and data management, and there is no redundancy or repetition in the workflow. In this presentation, you will hear from each of the HDR teams – strategic operations, admissions, progression, examination, skills development and partnership – about the impact of the changes to the HDR candidature and the lessons learned so far.
This presentation will focus on a community engagement research project which aimed to provide access to information about the University locations and the link with palawa places to engage students and staff with the deep history of the island of Tasmania in Australia. Our goal was to research and prepare a palawa interpretation of both the traditional and contemporary aspects not only of the University and its campuses but, the lands occupied by the University, with a focus on Sandy Bay in the south and Burnie in the north of the island.

By intertwining historical perspectives we share that the sites are living, that there is language and a message to be heard. The voice of the land may have diminished, but signs of a transformation are evident, and a conciliation of these voices enables real listening to ancient insights and deeper participation with place.

This digital story of place project has revealed Aboriginal names, language and history of place to encourage greater understanding of the islands’ deep history. This presentation explores the research and processes involved to engage with community to create the digital resource to enhance learning for all.
28: Removing the anxiety around indigenous engagement conversations.  

Miss Jaylene Wehipeihana, Dr Faith Welch  
1The University Of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

In New Zealand the drivers for researchers to engage with indigenous communities are relatively weak and government-led. Policies such as ‘Vision Mātauranga’ and ‘Responsiveness to Māori’ encourage researchers to consider indigenous knowledge and engagement, but assessment of this is relatively light touch and the system doesn’t give much encouragement for organic buy-in.

In contrast, the reasons for researchers to engage with non-academic stakeholders in general are getting stronger and are primarily being driven by the impact agenda. Clear strategies and support, pre- and post-award assessment of impact and engagement, and increased funding in this area has led to more researchers looking beyond their immediate academic sphere to engage with broader stakeholders.

We have an opportunity to use the impact agenda to help drive the need for better indigenous engagement. But caution is clearly needed; indigenous engagement should be conducted based on its own merit and ability to enhance communities, research and research practice, not because the engagement might be counted or the impact on the indigenous community might be assessed in a future impact case study.

The presenters will discuss the mutually beneficial drivers for indigenous engagement and impact and how these can be used to remove the anxiety around talking to research about indigenous engagement. Our aim is to bring first nations research into a broader context.

139: An insight into the decolonisation of research ethics  

Mandy Downing  
1Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Research projects about topics which impact Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people have additional risks when undertaken by non-Indigenous researchers, and can lead to ethical concerns, particularly when, research projects are without an Indigenous Australian lens. Additionally, cultural deficit discourse plagues ethical review of human research, and the race paradigm remains under-represented by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. The National Health and Medical Research Council argues that mandating a need for an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person to be on a Human Research Ethics Committee is too difficult to manage. In light of this, how can we diversify the lens applied by ethical review guidelines? The presentation seeks to inform research practice through consideration of first-person accounts from two stakeholders involved in research and provide an insider’s perspective on the nature of collaboration between us: an Aboriginal Research Ethicist, and a non-Aboriginal Research Supervisor. The collaboration emerged when research topics examining reconciliation, racism, and diversity were stopped after a low-risk triage by an Aboriginal ethicist and elevated to high-risk ethical review. Together, we identified critical challenges facing research management: trust, timelines, and ethics, and, identified strategies for success. This collaboration was particularly unique; it is uncommon to have an Aboriginal Research Ethicist experienced in the design and conduct of Indigenous Australian research. The collaboration presents a unique opportunity to improve diversity in academies and highlights the value and necessity for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people involved not only in research but also in research management.
Swinburne University is a young, dynamic university on an ambitious growth trajectory across all elements of its research strategy. The need for improved processes for contracts management has long been recognised, but the journey towards improvement began in 2017. Within this presentation, we describe how Swinburne undertook a comprehensive process of review and consultation to improve documentation, processes and approvals for contract initiation, sign-off, legal review and project approval processes, 90% of which now occur in Swinburne Research Office. In parallel, web-based electronic record filing was also implemented as well as an online Contracts module in Research Master. This occurred against a backdrop of increased research income and contracting activity with growth rates of 20% plus per year, requiring us to implement while supporting a dynamic business as usual environment.

The new processes were implemented in October 2018 with subsequent review occurring in 2019. We describe how we dealt with and overcame challenges along the way, what we did well and not as well, lessons learned and future directions. We will also report on stakeholder, researcher and administrator feedback following a survey conducted in May 2019.

Throughout this period, Swinburne has diversified its research income base. We will also discuss our experiences working to ensure that there is a consistent institutional approach to contracting in relation to key legal terms of importance to the research enterprise (e.g. IP, publications, student terms) whilst aiming for a risk-based approach, and how we have attempted to improve project management.

This presentation reflects on a decade long journey that was undertaken by the Research Grants team at the University of Wollongong (UOW) Research Services Office to streamline and expedite the implementation of research grant agreements and related collaboration agreements.

In doing so, UOW re-allocated responsibility for contract negotiation across legal, para-legal, and professional staff and explored novel modes of working together as teams across the organisational boundaries of Legal Services, Commercialisation and the Grants Team.

The team based approach has demonstrated to be particularly effective for implementing large scale collaborative project and projects with end users in an efficient manner. It has also allowed for us to take ownership of negotiations from the application planning stage throughout the entire award and contract management life cycle.

The success of this approach has seen the referral rate to Legal drop 75% in absolute terms, whilst the Research Income (Cat1-4) grew 22%.

In 2018, the Australian National University implemented a single Research Contracts Office for the review and negotiation of research and research-related contracts with external parties. Previously, contracts had been reviewed by research administrators within College-based Research Offices.
As a centralised business unit, the ANU Research Contracts office is uniquely positioned to engage with multiple areas of university administration to strengthen and protect the university's position, and identify opportunities to deepen relationships with key partners. Within a changing global environment, universities need to be more aware of the role of, and best practice for, contract review and negotiation including due diligence to identify research partners and funders, understand international funders reporting requirements, intellectual property protection and international legislation as it relates to research practices.

The formation of a centralised team has had a far-reaching impact on the University – from a single process for submission, consistent negotiations with individual funds providers (and research staff) to identification of inconsistencies in internal policies, procedures, and risk profiles, and improved opportunities for collaboration between internal admin units and external funders.

This presentation will share the highs, the lows and all the in between challenges of forming a centralised team in a highly decentralised organisation, recruiting the right staff and being the nexus of numerous university policies.

**107: The Language of Love? – The Marriage of Research and Agreements**

*Mr Adrian Cilmi*

*La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia*

It can prove challenging to successfully marry legal concepts with the unique requirements of research. Often, this challenge materialises when trying to accommodate the specific needs of a research project within the legal framework required for agreements. In order to work with researchers and avoid them being blocked by legal terminology and other contractual complexities, articulating the same ‘language’ is the path to efficiently finalising agreements and, most importantly, facilitating the timely commencement of research. To address this challenge, La Trobe University utilises a centralised Contracts Team to arrange this delicate marriage. This presentation will explore a partnership model that is the basis of the University’s successful management of research agreements.
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3: **Paradise by the Dashboard Light – A new online finance dashboard for researchers at Monash.**

*Ms Connie Mogg, Ms Odilia Teoh*

*Monash University, Australia*

The cut back in government funding to universities, along with increased scrutiny from funding bodies have made timely, accurate, and easy to interpret financial information on research grants essential.

For the best part of a decade, one of the most common questions I get from researchers is “why can I see my banking online, and yet I have to try and interpret a large PDF report for my research finances”. In addition, the staff satisfaction survey indicated a high level of dissatisfaction with the format of the monthly PDF reports. Most researchers found them too large, and difficult to read. The information was also not live, it only gave a month end snap shot.

Towards the end of 2017 Research and Revenue Accounting Services at Monash University established a steering committee to oversee the development of a new finance dashboard. While there was input from research office, and finance staff from across the university, the primary focus was to create a dashboard designed by researchers, for researchers.

This presentation will cover:

- How the members of the steering committee were selected
- How researchers were engaged to be part of the project
- How the pilot was coordinated and run across a range of areas
- A demonstration of the final product
- Feedback from the researchers
96: How can the Research Office support complex research programs with Industry linkages to successful outcomes?

Dr Roy McBurney, Dr Pearly Harumal, Ms Julie Cameron, Mrs Kay Winton

1The University Of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

High value, highly complex Research Programs involving industry linkages by their very nature span institutions, across Australia and beyond. They represent a significant investment of time and money while offering numerous opportunities and benefits. Herein lies the main challenge, how can you support these initiatives such that their full potential is realised, PhD training is delivered, partner organisation objectives are met whilst transforming an industry and delivering benefits to Australia? Establishment of these Centres would often stall due to a lack of resources or understanding of the complexities involved. Existing Centres would be siloed, often viewed as separate to and isolated from regular University business. The result is almost a “lost year”, given the compound returns of successful research, the lost opportunity is greater still.

This issue is explored through a case study of ARC Training Centres and Research Hubs at University of Sydney. Major Research Grant Initiatives was setup to provide dedicated support in the post-award space; complementing the high level of pre-award support for these schemes. We have sought to overcome the inherent challenges posed by working across University units. Capturing issues from application stage we can get a head start on the establishment process. By bringing our Directors and Managers together in regular forums to share knowledge and discuss problems, we have begun to create a cohesive cohort of Centres. Operational issues have been identified, confronted and resolutions sought. This journey has been documented to provide the basis of an “Establishment Guide” for setting up a Centre.

83: Why are Research Managers spending half their time answering questions that an expert in Customer Service can do for them?

Mr Lawrence Hogan

1Monash University, Australia

Monash’s multi-tiered research support model was launched in July 2016, comprising:

- **Tier Zero**: Websites and online guides
- **Tier One**: Dedicated Customer Service team – Scrutinise Tier Zero for information to provide to Researchers
- **Tier Two**: Monash Central Research Teams Answer queries that Tier One can’t answer
- **Tier Three**: Provision of leadership, Technical and Vendor Support

Before the launch of the multi-tiered research support model in 2016, Research Management Professionals would answer all Research related queries. Spending half their time answering questions that could have been effectively answered by trained customer support staff, using information easily located on Monash Websites or provided by Research Management staff.

Why should highly trained, knowledgeable and experienced Research Professional staff answer basic Research related queries such as “When does this Grant Round Close?” Or “How do I start a Research Grant Application?” - when expert customer service staff can answer those questions?

Under Monash’s multi-tiered research support model, Tier One provides ‘Information not Advice’ and 60 to 65% of queries are answered at the first call or email. Time is saved for professional Research Managers, who can now better spend this time providing expert knowledgeable advice.

Researchers who can’t (or won’t) look up a Website, or read a FAQ guide, or who just prefer to initially ring or send an email...get an answer straight away!

In summary, everyone saves time and is happier for it! Satisfaction across all business areas with the support model is high, it’s been a great outcome for the University.
113: Knowledge Network for Research Entity Managers

Helen Partridge
'Monash University, Clayton, Australia

Complex research projects are increasingly more prevalent in our funding systems as Funders seek collaborations or consortiums to put their collective intellect to a complex research challenge. Often these involve a high number of collaborating organisations and/or investigators and $millions of funding. They can be inter-disciplinary, inter-university, inter-State/Territory, inter-country and inter-sector (Higher Education and industry/end-user).

Whilst the nominated Research Director has carriage, there is a need for a highly-skilled project manager to support the business end of things. History has shown us that people recruited to these roles:
• Are recruited to the vision of what the Research Director believes they need (wildly different)
• Have different tasks, responsibilities and accountabilities (wildly different)
• May or may not understand how to get things done within the University
• Are often a sole professional staff member amongst many academics.

This presentation will introduce you to a 2018 initiative launched by the Monash Research Office to create a community of practice within Monash University – a Knowledge Network for Research Entity Managers (KN-REM) – to help support Project Managers recruited into similar roles but whom otherwise have no formal connection.
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130: Managing Great Expectations: the pitfalls of establishing industry sponsored PhD scholarships

Ms Lena Caruso
'UNSW Sydney, Australia

Over the past five years there has been a strong push for greater university-industry engagement. This has been driven from the Government’s National Innovation and Science Agenda and a recognition that Australia needs to increase collaboration between industry and researchers to find solutions to real-world problems to create jobs and growth.

The role of Higher Degree Research training in the improvement of industry-university collaboration was highlighted in the 2016 ACOLA report. It went on to encourage both universities and industry to develop range of industry engagement models in research training.

At UNSW, we are developing an industry engaged HDR framework to create new opportunities for candidates to gain industry knowledge and experience. One of the components of this is the establishment of industry sponsored scholarships.

This presentation will discuss the key challenges in establishing industry sponsored PhD Scholarships. These include but are not limited to:
• Intellectual Property arrangements
• Ensuring the informed consent of the HDR candidate,
• The role of industry in defining the problem and providing guidance throughout the candidature
• The role of university supervisors and the responsibility of the university
• What happens when it goes wrong?
• Above all, the importance of relationship management and managing the expectations of an industry sponsor.
67: Doctoral research internships: Key capabilities that doctoral interns should acquire to succeed

Dr Huong Nguyen, Professor Bernadine Van Gramberg
Swinburne University Of Technology, Hawthorn, Australia

A Doctoral research internship defined as a temporary position with a research end-user where the doctoral student undertakes research and development related to their research, is an effective approach to facilitate doctoral research engagement for research impact and for employment opportunities beyond academia. Since 2018, the Australian Government has required universities to report on different forms of HDR industry engagement (of which HDR Research Internship is one) as part of their innovation agenda. Over four years from 2017, one of the government-funded programs, the APR.Intern program, plans to deliver 1,400 PhD student internships into industry across the country. In response, Australian universities must develop relevant strategies to enhance both the quantity and quality of research internships taken up by doctoral students. However, despite the recommendations in the 2016, ACOLA report, it remains unclear which key capabilities doctoral candidates should acquire to succeed in industry.

This paper reports on some initial outcomes of a project aiming to develop a suite of Work-Integrated Learning units offered to doctoral students at Swinburne University of Technology. Based on 25 semi-structured interviews conducted so far with industry managers PhD interns and academic mentors, we identify a set of capabilities that these three groups of stakeholders perceive as critical for doctoral interns to work effectively with industry. The findings, on the one hand, inform university leaders and supervisors on how to help PhD students most effectively develop these capabilities. On the other hand, such a list of capabilities enables future PhD interns and graduates to learn how best to translate these skills and their specific research knowledge into an industry context with impact.

51: Candidature Wins through Institutional Change: transitioning candidature variations to an eForm platform.

Dr Megan Dean, Dr Christopher Dunn, Mrs Shauna-Lee Ward, Professor Clive Baldock
University Of Tasmania, Australia

Candidature Management is often complex and time-consuming. The need to balance Quality Assurance and Governance criteria can often come at the cost of an effective and timely progression of candidature variations. Delays to variations can have a significant impact on a candidates’ progression and their wellbeing.

The Graduate Research Office (GRO) at the University of Tasmania continues to pursue a Continuous Improvement Strategy within the institutional Lean and Simplification strategy. Over a period of nine months from July 2018 to March 2019, GRO transitioned from paper-based candidature management and supervisory management forms, into an online platform called ServiceNow.

The first form to go-live was the Leave of Absence, and not-withstanding a few minor enhancements, was a success within the institution. Since then, a total of 12 candidate-led and seven academic-led forms were specified, developed and delivered into the platform over this time-period. Underpinning these 19 forms are five different workflows, which were developed to ensure that the appropriate sign-offs were received, without over-burdening the system.

Extensive consultation throughout the project was in the form of a Graduate Research Coordinator working group and a project board, chaired by the Dean of Graduate Research had oversight of the project.

Benefits and efficiencies gained include:

- Removing the requirement to print, scan and email HDR Post Commencement Candidate and Staff led forms, resulting in increased user satisfaction stakeholders.
- Significant decrease in shared inbox emails.
- Systemised work flow for tracking and approval of Post Commencement Candidate Forms.
- Improved data quality through validation of HDR Post Commencement online forms at the point of data entry resulting in reduced rework.
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**91: Could Micro-Credentials be a Game Changer in Better Preparing Doctoral Graduates for Career Opportunities?**

**Professor Rachel Spronken-smith**, Dr Kim Brown

*University Of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand*

With approximately half of PhD graduates entering careers beyond academia, it has become increasingly important for PhD candidates to develop a wider range of transferable and professional skills. In response to the broader outcomes required by doctoral candidates, there has been considerable change in the higher education sector, with, for example, the advent of Doctoral Training Centres in the UK, and some integrated programmes in Australia. However, for many universities, ad hoc approaches prevail for providing training in transferable and professional skills. Uptake by PhD candidates is patchy at best, despite a recognition on graduation that such programmes are beneficial, and perhaps should have been engaged with during candidature! In this session we discuss a novel approach to researcher development – education involving micro-credentials. Micro-credentials are small chunks of professional development, usually skills-focused, that lead to a digital badge. While they could be stackable into a qualification such as a postgraduate certificate, they can be standalone credentials. We will outline the planning for a suite of micro-credentials to support the professional development and career planning of PhD candidates, as well as providing insights from the early stages of implementation. We hope to engage the audience in a discussion of the potential value of micro-credentials for doctoral education. We believe that a micro-credentialing programme might be a game changer, enticing candidates into participating in much needed professional development and career planning.

**76: Building a case for EDGE: UniSA’s approach to HDR skills development**

**Ms Charlotte Ferrier**, Ms Claire Jackson, Prof Pat Buckley

*University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia*

In 2016, UniSA’s Transformed PhD initiative addressed the need for structured skills development in the PhD. Through a two-stage approach, a model was conceptualised, tested, and refined before a proposal for the university’s first institution-wide model for PhD skills development was given the green light to progress to a formal business case.

This paper describes the two stages of bringing EDGE (Enhancement of Doctoral Graduate Employability) to life. Commencing with the initial design of the model, extensive consultation with the University community engaged candidates, supervisors and end-user partners as key stakeholders in the approach; the insights gleaned through this consultation informed the distinctiveness of the EDGE design, to reflect the positioning of the institution as a University of Enterprise and recognising the array of careers PhD graduates have. Following initial endorsement of the model the second stage of the process involved the development of a detailed business case for funding.

Preparation of a compelling business case involved identification of the critical drivers for EDGE and the evidence required to support these claims; development of the proposed model to address those drivers in a way which reflects UniSA’s unique institutional persona; and establishment of partnerships to secure specific commitment to EDGE from key stakeholders within the University, to support its delivery to candidates. A key feature of the business case was the high-quality evidence it presented to support the need for EDGE, including extensive international benchmarking and undertaking UniSA’s first HDR graduate destinations survey.
This paper explores the concept of academic identity in research; more specifically the perceived tensions between researcher autonomy and the need for synchronicity balanced against the requirement to perform within national assessment frameworks. Structured around themes of paradox, dilemma and uncertainty this paper addresses three important questions (i) how national assessment frameworks drive researcher development (ii) finding evidence to demonstrate how researcher development develops researchers, and (iii) finding creative strategies to engage researchers in development. Paradox concerns the tensions that underpin the language of research assessment frameworks that reward and measure both performance and quality. Dilemma relates to the influence of national assessment frameworks on research cultures. Uncertainty is focused on the relationship between research assessment outcomes and impacts both now and in the future. I present a number of initiatives under development at the University of Canterbury, which includes engaging a community of mentors, to help researchers plan and understand their role within the New Zealand assessment framework (e.g. PBRF). These ideas have broader applications to other researcher developers as engagement is a vital component to shaping academic identity.
89: “Why will hospitals not take our money?” Experiences of agreement review processes for an implementation science study

Emily Hogden1, Gabriella Tiernan1, Priscilla Chan1, April Morrow1, Therese Burke1, Dr John Williams1, Dr Natalie Taylor2

1Cancer Council NSW, Woolloomooloo, Australia, 2Research in Implementation Science and eHealth (RISe) Research Group, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Sydney, Camperdown, Sydney, Australia

Implementation science researchers need to partner with health services and recruit locally-employed healthcare professionals to lead implementation research studies and co-develop intervention strategies aimed at improving care delivered to patients. In recognition of this, the Hide and Seek with Hereditary Cancer study was awarded funding by Cancer Institute NSW and Cancer Australia to compare two implementation approaches to improving referral practices for detection of a hereditary cancer condition, Lynch syndrome, in eight health services across New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia. A health service employee was identified at each site to be funded at 0.2FTE to lead the study and co-develop interventions as the ‘Implementation Lead’.

Standard agreements for implementation science research are not available. A services agreement was developed by the administering organisation’s General Counsel. In addition to terms well understood in the Australian research environment, this agreement included terms to facilitate payments to health services for Implementation Lead salaries.

We report on the research team’s experiences of contract review processes. Considerable variation in review processes was noted among study sites, and no clear review processes were in place in some. Complexity introduced by the need to coordinate between multiple health services departments (including research governance, human resources, business managers and legal services) led to costly resource use and considerable delays in the study timeline.

No streamlined processes for implementation science contract management exist, and this inhibits the ability of Australian implementation researchers to partner with health services to deliver high quality studies and improve healthcare quality.

101: Negotiating the complex landscape of creative arts funding contracts

Ruth Steel1, Mandy Pink1, Dana Slaven1

1University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia

Managing research funding contracts in the creative arts presents a number of challenges unique to those disciplines. To begin with, arts funding agencies exhibit a preference to fund art over research, or artists over researchers; this is embodied in eligibility and selection criteria for funding schemes and the preference (anecdotally) is expressed in the views of selection committee members. This creates barriers/restrictions on research organisations applying to arts funding bodies or acting as an auspicing organisation and is often based on a lack of understanding of the organisational support provided to the artist, and the role of indirect costs in providing this, and concerns around whether the artist retains their IP in commissioned creative works. These factors need to be carefully managed with all stakeholders during the funding application and contracting process. The complexities of negotiating this landscape can lead to a disengagement of creative arts researchers from the funding contracting process and a retreat to private art commissions.

This presentation will describe some principles that the University of Tasmania has used to develop a set of resources for the funding application and contracting process to enable and support a common understanding between creative arts researchers, contract and funding managers, and arts funding bodies.
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124: JCU CONNECT: Throwing open the doors to JCU’s research and innovation expertise

Ms Rochelle Finlay
James Cook University, Townsville, Australia

With three campuses located in Australia (Townsville & Cairns) and Singapore, James Cook University aims to be a catalyst for innovation and connection - using international networks and continuous learning opportunities to connect northern Australia to the global economy. In support of this vision, it is critical that JCU delivers value-added research services to industry (government, business & community) within our regions and beyond.

In order to grow and support genuine industry/university partnerships, and thrive in a market-driven research environment, JCU has invested significantly in resources and infrastructure, and in doing so has re-imagined the way that industry-led research and commercial activities are supported and managed at JCU.

Formerly known as Research Services, JCU CONNECT was launched in April 2019. More than just a name change JCU CONNECT is new way forward for research and innovation at JCU.

JCU CONNECT is

- the “front door” through which industry can now engage with the breadth and depth of JCU’s research and commercial expertise and resources. Linking industry with JCU research by establishing partnership opportunities for commercial research, professional consultancy, commercialisation, access to intellectual property and expertise, and to JCU’s unique facilities, research stations and innovation centres.

- a “one-stop-shop” for JCU researchers seeking assistance with grants for competitive funding, industry-led research partnerships, ethics, animal welfare, research data, and commercialisation of intellectual property.

JCU CONNECT is underpinned by robust processes, policies and tools designed to support research activities and collaborations.

In this session, I will share the journey from concept to launch including the strategies deployed in support of JCU’s commitment to growing and supporting national and global research collaborations through JCU CONNECT.

6: Enhancing approaches to Social Science Business Collaboration – lessons from mapping two UK doctoral partnerships

Mr Lachlan Smith
Cloud Chamber Ltd, Birmingham, United Kingdom

The social sciences have often had an uneasy relationship with the private sector with some researchers and disciplines reluctant to work with businesses who have profit as their main goal. As the impact agenda and government research and economic priorities have shifted towards encouraging more higher education and business collaborations, the social sciences have had to find ways to respond and adapt. One such way has been the promotion of business collaborations and partnerships at the start of an academic’s career through supporting doctoral research with businesses.

Cloud Chamber was commissioned by the Scottish Graduate School of Social Sciences (SGSSS) and the South East Network of Social Sciences (SeNSS) in the UK to map current levels of business collaboration amongst doctoral students and academics across their respective partnerships. This session presents the results of these mapping exercises with a particular focus on:

- Outlining the UK context and policy drivers impacting on the social sciences
- Differences between disciplines in the social sciences in respect of collaborations
- Understanding what motivates doctoral candidates and academics to collaborate
- Barriers to collaboration and overcoming them
- The importance of doctoral delivery models including moving away from one size fits all approaches
- How regional and local infrastructures impact on collaborations
- Providing perspectives on what makes a strong collaboration

The session concludes with a summary of key recommendations with a focus on those initiatives that are most relevant for Australian universities and wider HE and economic policy.
128: University Global Partnership Network: A framework for International Collaborative Research

Ms Sally McNeill
1University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia

The mission of the University Global Partnership Network (UGPN) is to develop sustainable world-class research, education and knowledge transfer through an active international network of selected universities collaborating in research, learning and teaching to benefit global society. Its members, since 2015, are North Carolina State University (NCSU), the University of São Paulo (USP), the University of Surrey (UOS) and the University of Wollongong (UOW). Engagement and collaboration among researchers at UGPN partner institutions is facilitated through an annual conference and grant scheme with the aim of supporting international activities leading to joint research bids to external funding agencies and industries. The framework of the UGPN will be presented and the successes and challenges of the network and engagement strategies to further international research projects will be discussed. In particular the complexities of working across different research governance models, institutional expectations and commitments and the difficulty in securing international funding.

71: The Small Business Innovation Research for Defence program: A Challenge-Based Innovation Initiative

Dr Craig Rogers
1Dst Group, Edinburgh, Australia

Small Business Innovation Research for Defence (SBIRD) is a program for research projects designed to be undertaken by the Australian Small-to-Medium Enterprises (SMEs) sector (including University start-ups) under one of the Next Generation Technologies Fund themes. SBIRD is an opportunity for researchers from DST, academia and industry, through active partnering, to leverage their collective creativity and innovative thinking to explore alternative approaches to future Defence requirements.

The SBIRD program is a merit-based competition where applicants submit proposals in response to a theme-based challenge call. The framework of the program is composed of two stages of research activity which address a pre-defined competition based challenge. The research challenge has direct application to a future Defence requirement as it is developed in direct consultation with the end user. Stage 1 proposals are intended to address the viability of a technology or idea for a future Defence application, with funding of up to $100k per project over 6–9 months. Stage 2 proposals will then seek to demonstrate that the proposed technology or idea has real potential as a technology solution, with funding of up to $750k per project over 12–24 months.

The SBIRD program is 100% government supported and can invest in a number of innovative (and potentially risky) alternative approaches to provide a challenge solution. It also encourages high quality research management and administration to maximise the quality of the outcomes. This presentation will briefly describe the SBIRD program, how it was developed, lessons learned, and early success stories.
108: Building engagement from the ground up: international perspectives on supporting research engagement and impact

Ms Joann Cattlin
1The University of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia

Australian universities can benefit from the experiences of other countries with more established initiatives and processes for supporting research engagement and impact and use these to enhance the capacity of Australian researchers to meet the requirements of the Engagement and Impact (EI) assessment exercise. Internationally practice and research in knowledge mobilization has identified that building relationships with the wider community, industry and stakeholders throughout research projects supports broader engagement and more effective translation of findings into practice. This involves purposeful activities which bridge the gap between researchers and the broader community, negotiating the boundaries between organisations and brokering exchanges of knowledge. These activities require skills and resources which can be at odds with the priorities and activities of many academics, but can be provided by professional staff working within faculties, research centres or as part of project teams. In Canada and USA knowledge mobilization and community engagement activities are highly developed within many universities and can provide valuable insights to support Australian universities. This presentation will feature case studies, developed during a study tour in Canada and USA, on the approaches to operationalising engagement and impact priorities at institutional, faculty, centre and project level. It will highlight the role of research management professionals in providing targeted support to researchers.

69: Assessing research impact in the real world: A collaborative university-government approach to developing a best-practice research impact assessment framework

Ms Samantha Barker, Professor Andrea de Silva1, 2, Ms Catriona Fraser2
1ISCRR, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia, 2WorkSafe Victoria, Geelong, Australia, 3School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

Across government and industry, research funders are increasingly seeking to better understand the impact of their research, and best practice ways for measuring this. Similarly, researchers submitting funding applications are required to develop comprehensive research translation plans and metrics for estimating and measuring the impact of their work. Within this context, the Institute for Safety, Compensation and Research (ISCRR) at Monash University is working collaboratively with WorkSafe Victoria to assist them to develop a best-practice Research Impact Framework to measure the impact of their significant research portfolio and new five-year Research Strategy. This project is adapting a Canadian model of impact assessment to the Victorian context, piloting the approach and providing a roadmap for embedding the processes within the government organisation. The project is a true university–government collaboration that will build systems and capacity in both organisations to promote the ongoing utilisation of the approach. The work builds on the learnings of several previous impact assessment projects conducted by ISCRR, particularly the key challenges in assessing the influence research can have on decision making and non-financial outcomes. While the final Framework will be specific to the WorkSafe Victoria context, the systematic and sequential methodology has been well documented and will have value for other government or industry organisations looking to develop new approaches to measuring research impact.
53: Developing a pragmatic, institutional engagement strategy that works

Dr Mark Hochman
Research Management Resources, Tasmania, Australia

The strategic plans of most Australian universities contain statements of commitment to engaging with business, government and community. Likewise, the recent EI2018 exercise saw participation from 40 of Australia’s universities, i.e. the vast majority of universities! However, following completion of EI2018 and the uncertainty of continuing EI national assessments, many universities do not have comprehensive, integrated engagement strategies for continued industry engagement.

It is common for universities to rely on individual researchers to develop linkages with external partners – through professional contacts, societies, friendships etc. However, an effective institution wide engagement strategy should include knowledge of the institution’s research strengths, knowledge of industry needs and effective linkage mechanisms supported by data, institutional policies, personnel, practices and culture.

This talk will draw on (a) the author’s experience as a consultant to 20 universities over the last nine years, reflecting on elements from different institutions that constitute good practice and which could be consolidated into an overall strategy and (b) lessons learned from UK universities as the author leads an ARMS Study Tour in June 2019 to learn how UK institutions are preparing for their forthcoming Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF).

A specific learning outcome from this talk will be to outline the elements that should constitute a workable institutional engagement strategy incorporating best practice observations from Australian and UK universities.

31: Research Impact and the University of Melbourne Library: Evolution and Revolution!

Ms Peta Humphreys
University of Melbourne, Australia

Researchers, funders, governments, and universities having been struggling for years to agree on standard and objective indicators of the quality and effectiveness of publicly funded research. Similarly, academic librarians have endeavoured to support their institutions’ researchers and research offices in using databases and other tools to compile publication, author and other metrics. The University of Melbourne Library, in 2012 introduced a new service: The Research Impact Library Advisory Service (RILAS) where trained and skilled librarians would compile detailed research impact reports. Citation counts, h-indexes, field weighted citation impact, journal impact factor, altmetrics and much more were all collated for individual researchers, research groups, and others on request. Librarians discussed in depth research outputs and outcomes with everyone from ECR’s applying for their first grant to very senior academics applying for multi-million dollar/multiyear research centres. This was a ‘Tier 3’ individualized and expert service that was very much appreciated by those who accessed it. However, by end of 2018 the library had implemented a very different model for this service, one that was identified as ‘self-help’ or ‘Tier 0’ comprising discipline appropriate online resources supported by a marketing and training program within each faculty. Librarians compiling detailed reports for individual researchers quickly became the exception and not the rule. This presentation will describe the evolution and revolution of Research Impact Library Advisory Service at the University of Melbourne; the challenges, milestones, decision points, and the current state and anticipated future direction of the service.
135: Progress: The right currency for impact

Dr Tobias Schoep, Ms Tara McLaren

Telethon Kids Institute, Perth, Australia

Universities and research institutions are under increasing pressure to demonstrate the impact of research activities to stakeholders such as funder, government and the community, often in the form of retrospective case studies. Given the long timeframes needed to translate research into impacts the case study approach fails to consider the contemporary aspects of the research, which is often what an organisation is seeking support for. At the Telethon Kids Institute we are expanding the impact conversation to include what we are doing now in addition to what we have already achieved. We are developing the system Momentum Empowering Impact to show how our research is progressing towards a real-world impact, as the research is happening.

Momentum has been used for two years at Telethon Kids to collect impact evidence from researchers, which they will link to steps in a pathway needed to solve a big research problem. As the research progresses the pathway to impact is populated with evidence to create an engaging, evidenced based narrative about progress towards impact. Momentum presents this narrative to stakeholders in the context of their investment, such that they can understand their return on investment or contribution. Taking a contemporary approach to understanding progress towards research impact also creates corporate knowledge for future reporting on research impact.

In summary we are developing an approach that enables research progress to be valued. We will present learnings from the implementation of Momentum, and how these informed ongoing system improvements.

146: Best practice in community engagement: The Carnegie Community Engagement Classification

Dr Laura Dan, Jamin Forbes

Charles Sturt University

The Carnegie Community Engagement Classification (Carnegie) has been the leading framework for recognising and describing institutional engagement in US higher education. There are currently 361 US campuses holding the Classification (from 2015 round). The first international pilot was conducted in Ireland (2015/16) and pilots are underway in Australia and Canada with possible expansion to Asia, Africa and the Middle East. Ten universities are participating in the Australian Pilot. From 2020, the Carnegie assessment will be available to all Australian Universities.

Carnegie defines Community Engagement as the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

The Australian Carnegie Pilot Group is led by Charles Sturt University and the University of Technology, Sydney. The group has been developing an Australian specific classification to highlight the unique role of university engagement with community, industry and government and to capture the existing engagement of a wide range of institutions in terms of type, size, student population, strengths and location.

The Carnegie journey is one of self-study and reflection, with a focus on quality. The program provides a framework applicable to all universities to highlight strengths and opportunities for improvement. Whilst universities are assessed, the Carnegie process is non-competitive and promotes genuine collaboration among institutions. Institutions are binarily assessed as Carnegie accredited or not, without a score, rank or rating.
74: Measuring the Impact of PhD Mentoring: delivering a sector-led evaluation tool for IMNIS programs.

Ms Claire Jackson¹, Dr Dani Milos², Dr Monica Kerr³, Ms Catherine Ennis⁴
¹Graduate Research Development, Research and Innovation Services, University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia, ²Office of Graduate Research, Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia, ³Adelaide Graduate Centre, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia, ⁴Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) Office, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia

The Industry Mentoring Network in STEM (IMNIS) is an award-winning industry-led initiative of the Australian Academy of Technology and Engineering. IMNIS connects PhD candidates (mentees) in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) with industry leaders (mentors) in a 12-month mentoring program.

In 2017, the University of South Australia (UniSA) introduced a longitudinal impact evaluation of mentees’ IMNIS experience based on the Vitae Impact Framework, to better understand the experience and outcomes of program participation.

The universities of Adelaide and Flinders joined the inaugural study, enabling a state-wide evaluation to take place. A short survey using Likert-type questions linked with knowledge and skills development was sent to 49 South Australia-based mentees at three points during program delivery – pre-commencement, program mid-point and post-program. Results from the pilot (96% response rate) showed that the skills and knowledge identified as being most important by mentees at the start were those most developed by the end, and over half attributed this development to their IMNIS experience.

The IMNIS Impact Evaluation Instrument (IIEI) is now available for other universities to use through a zero-cost licence agreement with Macquarie University recently joining the study, providing an opportunity to undertake institutional and national benchmarking of IMNIS outcomes. This paper presents an overview of the research design, data collection and provides an in-depth look at the aggregated results from the pilot year.

The paper concludes with a discussion on the utility of the methodology in the evaluation of PhD work-integrated learning experiences like internships.

84: Stop, Revive, Survive: Improving the HDR “Show Cause” Process at the University of New South Wales

Ms Andrea Walisser¹, Ms Francesca Baruzzi²
¹University Of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

The decision to discontinue an HDR candidature is a difficult one. Candidates may have dedicated years to their research, and their professional outlook and sense of academic achievement can feel intimately tied to progress assessments. Supervisors’ performance metrics are linked to successful completions, and the consequences of unsuccessful candidatures can flow from research groups to Schools and Faculties. On-time completions are a key sector-wide measure.

A significant problem universities face is that these same incentive structures that emphasise on-time completion can make candidates, supervisors, and Schools reluctant to identify unsatisfactory progress, and even less likely to invoke Show-Cause as a potential remedy. Thus, problems can go unaddressed until they reach a critical impasse.

When HDR candidates do not meet key milestones, identifying barriers to progress is crucial. The “Show-Cause” process is a tool that many universities use to manage risk that a candidate may not complete their degree. Confronting at-risk progress is a critical juncture in difficult candidatures that seeks to identify the best outcome—either a pathway to completion, or a decision to discontinue study.

This presentation will show that between 2017 and 2018, the UNSW Graduate Research School managed double the number of Show-Cause cases, using several strategies to improve our service delivery, including:

- System-guided milestone assessment to identify at-risk progress
- Support for remedial actions
- Introducing a Show-Cause Guideline

We are seeing an improvement in how our HDR community perceives and engages with the Show-Cause process, and in our ability to support our candidates toward the best result.
131: Articulating transferrable skills through Doctoral Graduate Attributes

Dr Dani Milos, Ms Megan Prideaux
Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia

The 2016 ACOLA Review discusses the imperative of developing and recognising the transferrable skills of research students. The review acknowledges two key reasons for this focus – firstly to enhance the impact of research, including through industry; and secondly, to recognise the diverse range of careers open to graduates and the need to enhance the skills and abilities that will transition students from research study to the workforce. However, neither the review, nor subsequent documents such as the Good Practice Guidelines for Transferable Skill Development, identify what skill sets will form these transferrable skills, leaving it to each university’s determination. In response to this, Flinders University has established a set of Doctoral Graduate Attributes which provide a framework for students and supervisors that clarifies the competencies they should focus on developing throughout candidature, including through supervisory meetings, attending conferences, presenting and when completing milestones. The Doctoral Graduate Attributes are also a statement to external audiences about the skill sets developed by graduates. They can act as a recruitment tool for future students by identifying what they will gain when they undertake a PhD at Flinders. They are also particularly important for potential employers, as the attributes provide clarity regarding the transferrable skills PhD graduates will bring to organisations. This presentation will outlines the eight Doctoral Graduate Attributes of Flinders University, and present a new framework which will support the range of different career pathways for doctorate graduates.

134: Researcher Development: a practical and applied DBA program

Professor Roslyn Cameron
Australian Institute of Business, Adelaide, Australia

The Australian Institute of Business (AIB) is an accredited higher education provider (HEP) based in Adelaide, South Australia. AIB offers the full suite of business and management degrees from the BBA through to the DBA and PhD and delivers these fully online. The research higher degrees offered by AIB include: MMNGT, MMNGT-Research, DBA and PhD. The enrolments in the RHDs is relatively small as AIB’s main offering is the MBA however, AIB has been gradually building internal supervisory capacity to ensure we can meet the needs of our RHD students. AIB prides itself on being a practical business school and through the early directions of its founders has designed a set of research coursework subjects that reflect this value base for the DBA. The aim of this paper is to establish the distinction between a DBA and PhD before presenting the practical and applied coursework component of AIB’s DBA. AIB has designed coursework for its DBA that reflects this core value. The four coursework subjects in the DBA are as follows: Literature Review Critique; Action Learning Action Research; Case Study Research and; Mixed Methods Research. To establish the level of distinctiveness of this coursework a benchmarking exercise was undertaken against the postgraduate research coursework offered by the Go8 universities and all other Australian universities which offer a DBA. A comparative analysis was undertaken to compare DBA coursework components to determine the distinctiveness of AIB’s DBA and its congruent alignment to offering a practical and applied DBA in the Australian market.
132: Producing highly skilled and career-ready HDR students through an embedded and individualised skills training program

Dr Dani Milos
1Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia

The ACOLA Review highlighted the need for research and transferrable skills training to be embedded into the HDR through a flexible and structured framework. A lot of Australian universities have responded to this finding by enforcing compulsory, structured professional development programs based on the Vitae Researcher Development Framework. Flinders University introduced the Research and Employability Skills Training (REST) Program in 2018. REST recognises and appreciates the fact that HDR students come from a range of backgrounds, bring a range of different skills and go into a diverse range of careers. Through a competency based approach, it puts the students in charge of their skills development – allowing students to assess their own skills, design their appropriate training journey, and recognise, document and demonstrate to employers the specific abilities they have developed through the course of their study. REST is a valuable resource for HDR students, providing them with the necessary skills to progress with their research, writing and professional development training that complements, but is separate, to their degree. Providing a structured and formally embedded training program which follows and supports students’ candidature and is based around the training needs and career trajectories of the student will ensure that they are equipped and supported to complete on time and are well prepared for a range of career outcomes.

CONCURRENT SESSION 13
Next Practice

138: Beyond Boundaries – taking a Team of Teams approach to research support

Martin Lloyd
1UTS, Sydney, Australia

As research, engagement and translation becomes increasingly complex the traditional models of supporting research are being tested. At a time when professional staff numbers are being scrutinised as part of efficiency and productivity reviews, simply increasing the headcount of support staff cannot be the answer, and whilst systems provide some efficiency dividends, research management systems often lag behind what processes universities are putting in place.

So what are the alternatives to the typical “centralised” vs “decentralised” models of research support? UTS are exploring a networked support model influenced by the “Team of Teams” approach described by General Stanley McChrystal in his book ‘Team of Teams, New Rules of Engagement for a Complex World’. This networked support model breaks from more traditional organisational structures and seeks to make the boundaries and decision processes between and among organisational units more porous, and focused on the mission in hand with a common shared objective as the driving force.

This approach has the potential to overcome many of the challenges of centralised and decentralised models, but requires a new way of thinking, and a shift in senior management focus from operational management to consistent and clear communications that empower teams to self-assemble to deliver on the outcome.
**66: Acknowledging the Venn: Turning the forgotten space between Research Management and Librarianship into best practice**

Eleanor Colla, Sarah Brown

1University of New England, Armidale, Australia,  
2University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

As members of the Research Management profession we continually strive towards innovation, new technologies, professional development, and better workflows. We are constantly asking what ‘next practice’ could be, how it could look, and what it would mean for the profession and individuals. How can we turn this into ‘best practice’ to better serve our institutions, researchers, students, and ourselves? And who makes up the profession of Research Management? How do our roles intersect?

This presentation will analyse the joint space between Research Management and Librarianship and discuss how our shared values, work, and skills can allow us to move towards a more evolved and inclusive practice. We draw from our experiences as research support librarians, working with institutions’ Research Office, research managers, and researchers, attending the ARMS 2018 conference, and completing various ARMS accreditation modules. We will discuss how we see this space between Research Management and Librarianship, how it applies to current practice, and how we can continue building these relationships. In our roles we have encountered and experienced moments of success, frustration, misunderstandings, and a shared drive to better our professions and institutions across projects in this space.

Acknowledging, understanding, and collaborating in this shared space provides an avenue of next practice that must be further developed for the benefit of our professions.

**82: The Rise of the Third Spacer**

Rachel Ramsdale, Professor Andrew Turpin, Dr Stephen Giugni

1University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

Access to world-class research infrastructure, both in the digital and physical realms, is crucial to the national research agenda. A critical element of the research infrastructure landscape is the ‘third space’ specialist workforce; those with hybrid academic and professional roles working alongside the research academy to enable access to the infrastructure and the development of new research methods. That a skilled workforce is a critical component of a healthy research infrastructure ecosystem was included as one of nine key recommendations within the Federal Government’s (2016) National Research Infrastructure Roadmap, but with the responsibility to design, develop and sustain workforce planning residing with individual projects and institutions. The University of Melbourne is confronting the evolution of research practice and the challenges associated with the rapidly shifting sands of technology advancement by investing in this ‘third space’ workforce through two key activities. Over several years the Melbourne Collaborative Research Infrastructure Program has supported the placement of technical expertise within individual platform units, providing increased recognition of such roles as well as improved services for researchers. The Petascale Campus Initiative that commenced in 2018 includes support for a knowledge workforce as a critical enabler of Melbourne’s digital method and data intensive research ambitions. Common to both of these initiatives is optimisation and uptake of the ‘academic specialist’ employment category to both reflect the blended academic, professional and often entrepreneurial qualities of this workforce and to enable recognition and career path advancement.
117: Automating Grant Application Compliance and Eligibility Checking: Experiences and Issues

Dr Paul Daniels
Monash University, Australia

Over the last year, the Monash Research Office has undertaken an initiative to introduce automation into the compliance and eligibility checking process for ARC grants. We aim to work smarter, harder, and faster—with the same resources—through the use of IT technologies by automating routine processes. In Phase I of this project, we developed an online review system to expedite the review process and an automated check function for a few key funding rules. In Phase II, we will refine the existing product, automate the remaining (more complex) rules, and develop additional system capabilities. In Phase III, we plan to see the product expanded to applications beyond the ARC. In this presentation, I will discuss some of our experiences with this process to date, as well as highlight some of the challenges encountered.

49: The International Landscape of Research Integrity, Ethics and Compliance

Dr Ted Rohr, Elise Grosser
UNSW Sydney, Sydney, Australia
The University of Melbourne

Research is an international effort and it is critical for institutions and researchers to know the landscapes of research integrity, ethics and compliance in which our overseas collaborators operate. We need to know the existence of national codes and legislation in other countries to negotiate contracts and understand the implications of any requirements to report or deal with allegations of research misconduct. We also need to know disciplinary and cultural expectations in other countries that are not covered in written codes and legislation but imply that researchers elsewhere behave or expect behaviour in certain ways and which may conflict with our expectations and requirements. At the same time, we need to be aware of differences in awareness and interpretation of research integrity, ethics and other compliance across the world to build realistic expectations for international collaborations. Here, we contrast and discuss international settings for research integrity, ethics and compliance environments across continents and, where applicable, within continents and between research disciplines. We explain how the differences in definitions of research integrity, ethics and misconduct can easily lead to misunderstandings between collaborators and institutions and contrast international differences in investigative oversight of research misconduct or breaches of research codes. We then interpret the advantages and disadvantages of different landscapes and evaluate how training and education can promote a greater understanding for mutually beneficial research collaborations.
140: Institutional Barriers that Aboriginal Researchers Face when Conducting Human Research, and Why it Needs to Change

Mandy Downing
*Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Aboriginal researchers are constrained by institutional barriers that exist within the governance structure of Human Research Ethics Review, yet no literature exists on the experiences of Aboriginal researchers. This presentation will showcase the research conducted by an Aboriginal Research Ethics Officer from Curtin University who has engaged with Aboriginal research academics located in Western Australia regarding their experiences of the Australian ethical review process. As Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, we remain trapped in a colonial discourse, where our battle for self-determination has been derailed through a cultural deficit discourse and the consequent stigmatisation that surrounds Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People as a ‘vulnerable’ population in ethical guidelines. The National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research disempowers Aboriginal researchers by applying additional hurdles to manage cultural competence for non-Indigenous people. Is there another way that ethical review can occur for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people’s research or will we forever remain to be seen as ‘vulnerable’?

118: Rating the seriousness of research code breaches

Dr Elise Grosser*, Dr Rebecca Halligan*, Dr Rebecca Griffin*, Dr Anna Vo*, Mr Tom Wright*
*The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia,
*The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

Following the release of the new Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (the Code) and the accompanying guide to managing and investigating potential Code breaches, research institutions across Australia have been working towards implementing the new requirements by 1 July 2019. One challenge for implementation is the need to classify breaches as falling along a spectrum ranging from minor (less serious) to major (more serious), with the option of classifying serious breaches as ‘research misconduct’. The Guide provides a list of factors to consider when determining the seriousness of a breach, however, there is currently no consensus between institutions as to how these criteria should be applied. This is likely to be important for institutions that receive a relatively small number of cases.

This presentation will outline the preliminary findings of a study we are conducting to determine which parameters most strongly affect perceptions of the seriousness of breaches. The study consists of an online survey administered to a convenience sample of academics at several Australian universities. Participants are presented with a series of vignettes and are asked to rate the seriousness of the breach, and for each vignette to consider how key factors derived from the guide (consequences resulting from the breach, mitigating factors, aggravating factors and intentionality) alter their ratings of seriousness. The preliminary findings and their implications for classifying breaches will be discussed, with the aim of promoting consistency in the management of breaches across Australian institutions.

92: Contract Cheating – detection and response

Dr Mark Dixon
*The University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia

Articles in Sydney Morning Herald since ~2014 exposed some PhD students purchasing substantial portions of their PhD. USydney put together a working group to investigate the problem and then report and propose responses.

At UWA in 2018 Mark was asked to investigate HDR contact cheating and report to the UWA Research Committee. He was then asked to collaborate with the undergraduate and postgraduate coursework teams and the postgraduate students association (PSA) to establish compatible responses across the student experience. He discovered dozens of sites offering assignment writing up to PhD level such as https://academicwriting.com.au/, including several in other languages, and four Chinese sites that specifically targeted students at UWA such as https://www.essayeducation.com/perth-assignment-writing-service/. Mark collaborated with Graduate Research School, education Deans, PSA and the Student Guild to explore the issues.
One idea proposed was registering with writing services as available to write so we could catch out students. We rejected this because it seemed an unethical solution to an ethical problem.

Mark then worked with IT staff to log visits from UWA to problem sites. He now has several months of detailed data matching individuals at undergraduate through postgraduate level, to academic fraud sites.

This presentation will share observations from that data, such as prevalence, volume, demographic (HDR compared to coursework) and cyclicity. Mark will then address how UWA is responding in practice.

There are also some surprise findings!

143: Ethics in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research: what does it mean in practice?

Melanie Gentgall1, Ms Jaylee Martin1
1Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies

For twenty years AIATSIS has provided national and international guidance in the ethical practice of research concerning Indigenous peoples. AIATSIS is committed to improving the standards of engagement and the benefits that research can offer Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. This year the AIATSIS ethics guidelines were substantially revised to respond to growing areas of practice and the demand for practical guidance in applying the principles of ethical research. The guidelines represent the highest standards of ethical research and human rights for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander research. The guidelines acknowledge the inalienable rights of Indigenous peoples, including the right to self-determination, and that the principles of ethical research are founded on the recognition and respect of those rights. The guidelines are regularly revised to reflect developments in critical areas to ensure that they continue to remain at the forefront of ethical research practice.

CONCURRENT SESSION 15
Working in Diversity

29: Are less desirable characteristics of workplaces prevalent in the STEMM environment in spite of efforts to address needs for diversity?

Katherine Christian
1Federation University Australia, Ballarat, Australia, 2Cure Cancer Australia, Sydney, Australia

A research project exploring challenges faced by early-career researchers (ECRs) in the sciences in universities and independent research institutes in Australia has investigated the work environment for these researchers in order to examine their job satisfaction and the likelihood of them continuing to work in research in Australia.

As part of the data collection, a national survey has sought views of these ECRs about characteristics of their workplace culture and their impact on them or their career progression. Matters investigated include inequity, bias or discrimination with respect to age, gender, sexuality or race, inequitable hiring practices and harassment based on different power positions.

Have any of these issues caused them to leave or plan to leave their position?

In addition, questions investigating work life balance are expected to highlight the difficulties faced by young women and parents of young families. Answers may be able to provide information about the impact that SAGE, and its associated movement for change for women in STEMM, has had to date on women and parents of young families.

Responses to the question, “If there was one factor you could change that would make a major difference to your levels of job satisfaction what would it be?” will be of interest.

Early findings are presented.
18: LGBT Researchers in international environments – a discussion on diversity and real-life experiences

Mr Lachlan Smith

1Cloud Chamber Ltd, United Kingdom

Promotion and valuing of diversity within the global higher education workforce is now rightly front and centre for many universities. A range of recent prominent initiatives have focused on gender within STEM, but broader diversity policies are inclusive of a wider range of characteristics including sexuality. Despite this diversity considerations and initiatives regarding LGBT+ staff and researchers can remain on the periphery. Universities often have strong support structures in place for LGBT+ students, and many have LGBT+ staff networks, but the life of an LGBT+ researcher in an increasingly global context continues to remain challenging.

Drawing on personal experiences and a joint publication with an International Coordinator from Aarhus University in the Research Europe magazine this presentation provides a different perspective and provoke thinking amongst those whose job it is to support researchers in an international context by:

- highlighting some of the challenges of being an LGBT+ researcher in higher education,
- asking what can be done to promote LGBT+ diversity within an international research context,
- concluding with a call to action to explore and develop an effective response to this challenge.

8: Fifty Shades of Epidermis: Diversity beyond gender

Ms Yuen Chang1, Ms Tania Tambiah2

1Murdoch Children’s Research Institute, Australia,
2RMIT University, Australia

In recent years, a global awakening has occurred about the role of women in professional communities – from politics and cinema to medicine and science. While the under-representation of women in the research sector is a topic of growing interest and concern, there is a conspicuous silence around inequality in other aspects of diversity besides gender, particularly that of cultural identity, ethnicity and language. This is an important gap, as empirical evidence has demonstrated the compounding impacts of intersectionality on experiences of discrimination. In other words, while women are achieving significant gains in recognition and equity, culturally and linguistically diverse women and peoples in general continue to be under-represented and even systemically discriminated against in the workplace.

The necessary and imperative focus on gender equity has arguably placed other dimensions of diversity on the back burner; however, it is crucial that diversity and inclusion policies take into account minority groups beyond those delineated by gender. By recognising the multiple aspects of diversity, we can build inclusive environments where every individual has equitable access to opportunities. Furthermore, studies have demonstrated that diverse perspectives, capabilities and experiences can offer multifaceted benefits to organisations.

In this panel discussion we invite participants of any gender, skin tone, ethnicity, language and cultural identity to challenge their beliefs. This session will be an opportunity to increase awareness through collaborative discussion, with the goal of promoting proactive diversity and inclusion initiatives in research and research management, and to build a network of support and ongoing conversation.
CONCURRENT SESSION 16
Creating, Recording and Communicating Engagement and Impact

2:  A Case Study in Canada: ‘Putting the cart before the horse - why impact shouldn’t be assessment-driven.’

Dr Faith Welch
1University Of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

Historically, the agenda to create impact from research has significantly been driven by assessment. Countries including the UK, Australia and Hong Kong have seen changes to their research ecosystems in terms of how research impact is supported due to governmental drivers to measure the difference their research is making. But has this been a case of putting the cart before the horse? Shouldn’t we concentrate our efforts into developing appropriate infrastructure and support to achieve impact before we start measuring the outcomes?

Canadian universities recognise the benefit of offering support and resource to harness and enhance the impact of research. But this drive to create impact is primarily mission-led at a university level instead of assessment-led by government. These universities focus on providing the appropriate infrastructure to support impact and recognise the positive difference this makes to the local and global community, rather than focussing their efforts on reporting the impact generated from research. Dr Faith Welch, Research Impact Manager at The University of Auckland, was awarded international network collaboration funding to undertake a study tour of Canadian university partners to better understand the country’s relatively unique research environment and to compare the strengths and weaknesses of assessment versus mission-driven systems.

Faith will share the lessons-learnt throughout this trip, including:

• strategies employed to develop an impact culture and increase the impact of research;
• challenges faced in terms of developing and embedding impact into the research ecosystem;
• ideas to encourage and support deeper understanding of the benefits of an impact strategy.

93:  What does it take to build organizational capacity for research impact?

Mr Ken Knight1, Ms Vikki Leone1, Ms Sue West1
1Murdoch Children’s Research Institute, Parkville, Australia, 2The University of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia, 3The Royal Children’s Hospital Melbourne, Parkville, Australia

Melbourne Children’s unites the Murdoch Children’s Research Institute, The Royal Children’s Hospital and the Department of Paediatrics at The University of Melbourne. As a campus we recognise that skills in locating, appraising and disseminating evidence are insufficient for achieving research impact in child health. Over the past three years we have developed, and are currently piloting, an evidence-informed program to build individual and organisational capacity for research impact. The design and development of our program was informed by a preliminary research project that identified existing contextual opportunities and barriers to effective knowledge translation (KT), implementation and research impact.

Our program incorporates four evidence-informed strategies:

• The provision of KT, implementation science and research impact training
• Establishing a campus community of practice
• Partnering with research and clinical teams to provide ongoing mentorship and consultation, and
• Curating and developing tools and resources to inform KT and impact planning across Melbourne Children’s.

We are now in the second year of our three-year pilot program. In this presentation we will report on the findings of the preliminary research and campus consultation, and progress-to-date regarding how our strategies are addressing the identified infrastructure (collaboration and coaching); knowledge (training and resources) and application (planning, implementing and evaluating) gaps on campus. We will share our evaluation approach, the implementation frameworks/models that have informed the program, and, importantly, the emerging and highly promising data on the development of individual and organizational confidence and capacity for achieving research impact at Melbourne Children’s.
102: Supporting Humanities and Social Science Scholars’ Engagement and Impact Needs

**Mr. Wade Kelly**
1La Trobe University, Australia

In many countries pressure is increasingly being placed on academics and institutions to demonstrate the impact of research activities. In Australia this has taken the form of the ARC’s Impact and Engagement Assessment, as well as impact statements in grant applications. As a result, institutional supports for engagement and impact are becoming increasingly crucial.

The results presented in this talk are part of a larger study which makes up my PhD project: a detailed examination of academics’ experiences of participating in community engagement activities. The research utilised a qualitative constructive grounded theory approach (Charmaz, 2014) and details the wide range of respondents’ experiences at universities in Australia and Canada. Interviews were conducted with academics and university staff that support community engagement and impact, such as knowledge mobilisation, translation, and synthesis units, and those supporting commercialisation and addressed:

- institutional support units and mechanisms that support engagement and impact activities and strategies
- why and how researchers utilise, or don’t utilise, supports available
- what types of supports they would like to see made available

By looking at the issue of institutional supports for engagement and impact from both the perspective of academics and those who support such activities, a picture emerges of what needs are being met, and what needs are being underserved. These reflections are critical in informing how institutions and those in researcher support capacities might best resource their support units in order to meet the needs of academics and, consequently, the wider community.

106: A Best Practice Approach to Supporting the Creation and Reporting of Impact

**Dr Anna Thomas**, **Dr David Downes**
1RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia

An increasing recognition that research should have an impact beyond academia has led to global expectations that researchers demonstrate their efforts to engage outside academia and articulate the impact of their work on the broader community. This has resulted in a need for expert, tailored support from within universities’ research management groups to help researchers meet these expectations. This presentation discusses RMIT’s approach to supporting researchers to achieve impact using best practice research translation frameworks.

A central tenant of research translation methodology is that it occurs across the research lifecycle. RMIT’s approach therefore emphasises the need for researchers to plan impact pathways from initial idea through to societal impact. This includes understanding the impact they would like to achieve, the external engagement required to achieve that impact, how best to translate research to external audiences, and how to measure impact as it occurs. To achieve this objective RMIT supports researchers through awareness raising and capability development in relation to planning for impact, tailored support to engage outside academia, and expert advice on optimal translation activities and ways to measure impact. Increased understanding means that researchers can clearly and comprehensively articulate their research translation and impact plans within research proposals, consider and plan for resource needs to achieve their goals, and gather success indicators to demonstrate impact when it occurs. This approach also facilitates a reciprocal learning loop in which research management gains a clearer understanding of the university-based resources and support required by researchers to achieve and demonstrate impact.
136: Flinders Research Fast Start Program – an action-learning orientation and induction to mitigate research lag.

Dr Marina Delpin1
1Flinders University, Bedford Park, Australia

When researchers arrive at a new institution how do they get the most important information to get their research endeavours underway?

Flinders has piloted its inaugural Research Orientation and Induction program – a full day of action-learning informational sessions led by all key players in the University’s research ecosystem including research support, media and communications, library and finance.

All partners in supporting facets of the research journey are located in different Portfolios and Divisions within the University. Researchers just want to know “who can support me?”, so this initiative used a unified approach to deliver all relevant information to them.

Flinders’ Research Orientation & Induction introduced research policies, processes and support available to researchers. Participants commenced using Flinders’ platforms and systems in-session. Additionally, a gap analysis completed during the program enabled researchers to identify how to kick start their researcher development at Flinders – a multi-faceted program that offers training, development and initiatives to interlink the research community.

This presentation will detail the aims and objectives of the program, the partners and stakeholders in its delivery, outcomes, its evaluation by our researchers, and our reflections as providers of the training.

70: Mind the Gap: growing and sustaining a university-wide community for ECR support

Ms Emily Brennan
1Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia

The early career stage of research employment is widely recognised as a time of uncertainty and job insecurity for many, with opportunities only for the fortunate few. This stage is characterised by short-term employment contracts and sessional teaching with academic employment being likened to a ‘gig economy’.

In 2016, Macquarie University launched an Early Career Researcher Support Strategy. The Strategy was developed following research, benchmarking of other Universities, and extensive consultation with senior research staff and early career researchers at Macquarie.

Three of the key findings from this research and consultation were that:

- Rigid interpretations of what constitutes an ECR (eg. 5 years since PhD) meant only a narrow cohort of ECRs were eligible for much of the support available centrally or at Faculty level;
- ECR support available to an individual researcher was highly variable, depending on the Faculty or Department the ECR belonged to; and
- Any existing support was often due to the efforts of a small group of individuals with the motivation to help, rather than a structured, resourced, and consistent institutional approach.

We show how the development of a central ECR Support Strategy has greatly increased the provision of equitable and transparent ECR opportunities, and how increasing visibility of ECR needs has resulted in significant growth in Faculty-level support initiatives.

This paper describes a model for growing and sustaining ECR support in a climate of limited resources by involving the broader University community to ‘mind the gap’.
72: The role of the Research Strategy Office in developing long-term strategies for sustained research funding in a complex landscape

Dr Johanna Barclay
1University Of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

The Australian research funding environment is competitive and complex. We have seen increasing demand for research funds from researchers, in the face of limited or no growth of available funds from the granting bodies. Government cuts to University funding has exacerbated this issue further, with more researchers forced to find external financial support in the face of uncertain employment contracts. The introduction of the Medical Research Future Fund (MRFF) has resulted in fundamental shifts in the landscape, impacting both researchers and other funding bodies. We have seen a tightening of the medical research policy and the introduction of the National Interest Test in the ARC, and a complete redesign of NHMRC schemes to meet new national objectives. Collectively, this has caused confusion and anxiety for many researchers in Australia, which has prompted survival-based approaches rather than considered strategies.

Researchers now need to develop a long-term strategy to achieve stability and sustainability in their research programs. They need to abandon the traditional concept of funding their work through a single funding body, instead moving between different funding bodies to support different elements of their work. To achieve this, they require a high level of understanding of the objectives of each funding body, as well their eligibility requirements. Research Development professionals are ideally placed to guide researchers in navigating this complex environment and developing a robust strategy. Here, case studies will demonstrate how this can be effectively achieved, and pitfalls will be discussed.

120: Learning our AB-Cs: Supporting Early Career Researchers

Dr Amy Harington
1University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia

Just 3% of PhD graduates will end up with a job in academia, however the clear majority of PhD graduates wish to pursue a career in academia. How many of those that make it into academia are able to break out of the constant post-doctoral cycle of short-term contracts and uncertainty? Are universities doing enough to support these young researchers? From a researcher management perspective, we invest significant time and energy supporting these ECRs – effort which is wasted if they leave the university. Therefore, understanding the route cause of ECRs’ inability to progress their careers within the academic system is a key issue for Research Management. Using data collected from ECRs (Academic levels A and B) from across the University, we will aim to identify 1) what the key issues experienced by ECRs at the University of Tasmania are and 2) which of these issues could be addressed by Research Administrators and University Management.
52: What does the track record of a typical ARC Laureate recipient look like and are there differences between the genders?

Dr Angela McGuire, Mr Phil Cross, Dr Regina Magierowski

University Of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia
Research Performance and Analysis Unit, University of Tasmania

Research managers are often tasked with advising potential fellowship applicants as to their ‘readiness’ prior to applying for a prestigious fellowship such as an Australian Research Council (ARC) Laureate Fellowship. The funding and publication track-record of an applicant accounts for a percentage of the selection criteria and can be benchmarked against successful fellows. To help potential applicants determine the best timing for their application we gathered data on the publication and funding track-record of successful Laureates at the time of application. We used a variety of statistical methods including machine learning to analyse the data and here present our findings of the ‘typical’ track record for ARC Laureates across multiple disciplines. Given that women continue to be underrepresented in academia across many disciplines, particularly at senior levels, we then explore differences among genders.

59: Does research management have a future? How we can stay relevant when everything changes

Dr Simon Kerr

Latrobe University, Melbourne, Australia

Research management faces major emerging responsibilities as well as opportunities. Research management 1.0 began as a set of administrative services for research compliance and funding. Research management 2.0 is characterised by professionalisation with increasing specialisation and expertise in areas such as ethics and integrity, strategic research development and partnership management.

What’s next? Research Management 3.0 will be about Advocacy. Professionalisation will continue as specialties deepen expertise and influence. But the future will not be a linear evolution from the past; it will be characterised by unprecedented disruption, posing real dilemmas for the roles of Universities and research institutions. The widely discussed growth of AI, robotics and automation will have major impacts in the economy and research sector, bringing massive social and ethical challenges. But by far the most serious will be catastrophic climate disruption, something not yet seriously discussed in our sector. The IPCC’s 2018 most urgent and blunt report yet warns of imminent and catastrophic impacts on the environment, economy, society and social cohesion from our still rising emissions. Universities have largely been institutionally mute about the climate emergency, but that is about to change. In this session I discuss the critical need for research advocacy and influence in this rapidly changing environment, what I call RM 3.0, and discuss how ARMS can lead in not just supporting research, but in advocating for preparedness of our research systems for these disruptions. I will provide a brief case study of the types of opportunities I am thinking of.
**48: The Future Demands of Research Support: Facilitating Data Intensive Research**

*Dr Paul Wong, Dr Natalie Mast*

Australian Research Data Commons, Canberra, Australia, 
N Mast Consulting, Perth, Australia

This presentation will provide an outline of a study commissioned by the Australian Research Data Commons (ARDC), examining the forms of support required for data intensive research (DIR) over the next decade. The presentation will use recent growth rates in DIR to extrapolate demands in future years.

The presentation will argue that three forms of support will be required for DIR:

- **Hardware and software/analytics expertise** required for “big data” research projects;
- Experts in areas such as data managers and research software engineers to assist with DIR occurring in medium to larger labs or workgroups; and
- **Training** for small groups or individuals undertaking research with an element of data collection or analysis.

The presentation will outline support mechanisms that will need to be established for the Australian research sector to flourish in the new data rich environment, including:

- provision of courses relating to data management and data analysis for HDR students;
- basic and refresher courses on data management and data analysis skills for researchers involved in smaller projects that do not require specialised data focused staff; and
- provision of information for researchers involved in DIR focusing on the skills sets available in the wider workforce that will assist in the management and analysis of their data how to work in the support for these essential support services in grant applications, and how to integrate these workers into the team.

Overall, the presentation will argue that if Australia wants to be at the cutting edge of DIR, planning for support should start now.

---

**64: Research Management Business Transformation: Creating and implementing digital solutions to transform future research experience at The University of Queensland**

*Dr Susan O’Brien*

The University Of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

The University of Queensland (UQ) has embarked on an ambitious program identifying and implementing digital solutions connecting our researchers more effectively to the tools, equipment and services needed to achieve their research goals in a modern context. UQ has undertaken a holistic review to ensure the provision of services supporting researchers and research administrators is efficient, properly interconnected and meets future needs for the whole of the research lifecycle.

The Research Management Business Transformation (RMBT) Program at UQ encompasses the following projects:

- Implementation of a new research management system servicing both ethics and grants
- Research Data Manager providing safe, accessible data storage for all researchers and their internal and external partners
- Provision of Digital Research Notebooks for portability and security of research data
- Research Infrastructure Management System providing visibility and access to research equipment and infrastructure for UQ researchers and external collaborators from the sector and industry
- Integrated implementation of ORCID within these systems underpinning key research workflows such as manuscript and grant submissions, but also automated linkages between scholars and their research activities at UQ.
- Impact and engagement tool

The RMBT Program is progressively transforming the way research support and administration is delivered at UQ. A discussion of the impact of the RMBT on research support and research management at UQ will focus on:

- Research compliance and integrity within the research lifecycle
• Transparency and efficiency for researchers and research managers
• Improved reporting capabilities for individual researchers and the institution

115: Visualising Institutional Collaboration using ORCID Data and Research Graph

Mr Melroy Almeida, Mr Amir Aryani
Australian Access Federation, Brisbane, Australia, Research Graph, Melbourne, Australia

The primary objective of most research offices within the Australian University sector is to promote the strategic vision of the university they represent. They also administer their university’s research grants and policies while aiming to enhance the capability, quality and impact of research. To be successful at this, a lot of research evaluation has to happen. Research evaluation is sometimes hampered by a lack of data that clearly connects a research program with its outcomes and also by ambiguity about who has participated and contributions they have made. Manually making these connections is labour-intensive while algorithmic matching introduces errors and assumptions that can distort results.

Since its inception, ORCID has been uniquely identifying researchers and connecting them to their research contributions. ORCID also plays an important role in building and maintaining relationships of trust between researchers and their organisations in today’s interconnected society. With over 2.5 million ORCID IDs connected to external identifiers like funding, publications and peer review, there is substantial big data within the ORCID registry to make connections between research programs and researchers. As big data becomes part of the research management paradigm that will influence future research management practice, there is an opportunity for research organisations to use it to predict trends, identify and support research policies and help increase research efficiencies.

This presentation will focus on one such example of how data within the ORCID registry can be used to visualise collaboration and linkages between institutions.

81: Investment in Quality Assurance: Where does the value lie in research infrastructure development?

Ms. Nirmala Devarajan
Monash University, Malaysia, South East Asia Community Observatory, Segamat, Malaysia

Universities undertake research to produce critical knowledge that advances society. Despite the important role played by research focused universities, public funding for research is declining with governments investing less and less into research. Nonetheless, research active universities must continue to invest in research to stay ahead. Key investments in research include: purchasing and maintaining new technologies; hiring and training staff to manage those technologies and provide consultation to the researchers; and having a management system that allows regular monitoring and evaluation of the research infrastructure’s costs, outputs and performance. Given the substantial investment in research and research infrastructure, universities have needed to think of efficient ways to continue to undertake research, including collaboration and building alliances with institutional stakeholders. These engagements require clear and robust governance to establish mechanisms for accountability, and strengthen research and research quality. This presentation discusses the application of quality assurance principles into the governance and management of research infrastructure, drawing on lessons from Monash University’s Technology Research Platforms (MTRP). MTRP is an integrated network of research platforms, established to provide research capabilities, facilitate industry engagement, generate revenue and advance knowledge. MTRP has developed a Platform Quality Management System, incorporating quality assurance techniques and procedures adopted from industry and commerce. This presentation provides insight into the direct implications and influences of this strategy to the outcomes of research and to the development of research infrastructure from the infrastructure stakeholders’ perspective, focusing particularly on the values of implementing a quality system in research infrastructure.
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95: Does network-making count?: Inter-institutional relationships and their impact on Australia’s research aspirations.

Dr Megan Power
Monash University, Caulfield, Australia

In late 2018 the revelation of Ministerial intervention in the ARC funding process created a moment of disruption in the National research community. Thanks to the ensuing Twitter flurry we were given a brief insight into how individual views might shape what national research should or should not be.

This paper presents a less surprising, but nevertheless intriguing account of research development in an increasingly networked environment, through the perspectives of those engaged in the Australian Research Council’s Centres of Excellence (CoE) Program.

With input from participants spanning 3 cohorts of CoEs funded in 2011, 2014 and 2017, the presentation will give an overview of the study to date and, in particular, outline how those enacting research seek to manage the complex layers of inter-institutional relationships. The presentation will also highlight some of the key perspectives offered by those in key Centre roles.

Based on a pilot study developed through input from participants at the INORMS Conference in 2018, this study of Australia’s CoE program continues a focus on ‘interactions along the network’, as a means to make more visible ‘institution-meets-network’ relationships.

The presentation will touch on the theoretical framework applied in developing the study and suggest the value in considering how these concepts might inform institutional research policy. While glimpses into the decisions and actions relating to any national research landscape are relatively rare, we hope this study will support future strategic research management and contribute to the dialogue on research network development in Higher Education Institutions.

26: How can we use research data to inform research strategy?

Dr Sam Shokravi
University of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia

Are you well equipped to perform a research review in your organisation that prepares you for the challenges ahead?

At the Melbourne Graduate School of Education (MGSE), the University of Melbourne, we conducted a research review to:

• help achieve the school’s research excellence targets; and
• to identify issues and inform improvement opportunities that will drive growth in research quality, output, income and impact.

This review was conducted by collecting, wrangling and analysing data related to research outputs, resources, services and performance across university systems. This presentation will discuss the methodology and the challenges that the current data collection and record keeping practices pose to a data-led review.

IF you want to embark on a review in your organisation come and learn from us and maybe be inspired by some of our innovative solutions. Our project used quantitative data that was drawn from various systems such as research enterprise, publication and student systems, the THE database and data on professional and academic staff activities. We also collected qualitative data through interviews with staff, a quantitative Research Services Survey (with 40% response rate) and Focus groups. The review made a number of clear recommendations but also exposed several areas that were inconclusive due to the low quality of current data. This suggested improved processes may be needed.
38: Demonstrating research impact in Fire and Emergency New Zealand

Mrs Zoe Mounsey
Fire And Emerency New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand

Fire and Emergency New Zealand is strengthening how research contributes to evidence based decision making across the organisation. Fire and Emergency has been funding research since 1998 however it has recognised that it has not always used research findings effectively in its decision making.

Fire and Emergency identified four focus areas to lift the organisation’s research capability and ensure research contributes to the achievement of its short, medium and longer-term outcomes. The areas of focus incorporate how best to benefit from existing research knowledge, to learn from research commissioned by others as well as commissioning new research.

- Strengthening internal processes – focus on ensuring that commissioned research is relevant to the organisation and engages with key stakeholders at the outset
- Building internal capability – supporting and encouraging our workforce to engage with research and to build skills
- Improving the use of research – through targeted dissemination and communication and identification and monitoring of agreed actions
- Developing collaborative relationships and partnerships – through working with others to influence research agendas and share findings we can make a broader contribution to the sector

The presentation will outline the processes implemented under each of these focus areas and use examples to highlight how the changes are contributing to research utilisation and knowledge transfer across Fire and Emergency. These actions contribute to the monitoring, evaluation and reporting framework which is currently being developed to demonstrate how research has an impact on the organisation.

20: Returning to the challenge of measuring return on investment in research: The development of The TAC ROI Framework

Dr Jacqueline Woerner
Transport Accident Commission, Geelong, Australia

Return on Investment (ROI) is a performance measure used to evaluate the efficiency of an investment. ROI aims to directly measure the profitability of an investment, relative to its total cost. There is frequently a Board expectation that all investments, including research, deliver a defined benefit to the business. Therefore, it is imperative that the ROI of research can be clearly demonstrated. ROI is an extremely difficult construct to measure, especially outside the areas of business and finance. There is currently a paucity of reliable, reputable ROI frameworks applicable to the field of health, disability and compensation research. This is a particularly complex area of research to determine ROI, as it typically consists of a multifaceted combination of economic and social outcomes.

The current study describes the development and pilot application of a framework designed to measure ROI. The primary aim was to develop a simplistic, easy to use ROI framework which is comprehensive, relevant and feasible. The Transport Accident Commission (TAC) ROI Framework was designed to incorporate various elements of health, disability and compensation research, and consists of 6 primary categories: Advancing Knowledge, Building Capacity, Informing Decisions, Health Impacts, Client Experiences, and Socio-economic Impacts.

The new framework was piloted on several TAC research projects. Preliminary results indicate that the TAC ROI Framework is a comprehensive, easily interpreted measure which can be reliably applied in a broad variety of research applications. Furthermore, the implementation of the TAC ROI Framework was utilised for both individual research projects and entire research programs.
78: The Long and Winding Road: Key Lessons from 10 Years of Research Performance Evaluation

Professor Michael Khor
1Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, Singapore

This talk will cover the key lessons from conducting research performance evaluation during the period 2008-2017 at NTU, Singapore, which turned out to be a period of massive growth in research output and rise in ranking for the university. In an effort to incentivise departments to lift the quality of their research output, the university set aside funds to reward those departments that performed well in the following metrics: Research Funding; Publications and Citations. The research performance evaluation (RPE) exercise is conducted separately on the Science & Engineering (STEM) departments and the non-STEM departments. Among the lessons learned are: i) The list of top tier journals should not be based entirely on a single database. Rather, there should be careful consultation with the departments and area experts due to many emerging topics that are not reflected through the broad journal categorisation. ii) Annual review is critical for sharpening the process, and finally iii) Identifying the academics with excellent performance and those who are struggling for funding, but have very strong publication output. These lessons helped refine the university’s strategies for the future.
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87: Planning for a new funding world: Supporting the transition of Monash researchers to a new health and medical funding landscape

Dr Tsharni Zazryn, Dr Wade Moore
1Monash University, Clayton, Australia

After a period of relative stability in terms of health and medical research funding in Australia over the past couple of decades, two major changes over the past few years have, and will continue to, change the way health and medical research funding is provided across Australia. These two changes are the:

- introduction of the Medical Research Future Fund (MRFF), and
- re-structure of the National Health and Medical Research Council’s (NHMRC) grant program.

Changes to this funding landscape have the potential to offer Monash University both challenges and opportunities into the future. With a large health and medical research-active workforce at Monash, strategic consideration and planning is needed to ensure Monash is well-placed to maintain, and ideally improve, the market share and annual income amounts that our researchers have achieved across recent years to continue our great health and medical research.

This presentation will provide an overview of the activities undertaken by the Monash Research Office since 2017 as part of the planning to support Monash University researchers with the transition to this new medical and health funding landscape.
133: A big picture approach to research funding

Dr Ken Choong1, Mrs Melissa Glenister1, Miss Jessica Brody1
1The University Of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia

As the University’s research income from traditional funding sources stagnate in an increasingly competitive environment of static funding pools and in an era of rapidly changing national and international priorities, growing our research income to meet the institution’s needs becomes ever more challenging. The University of Melbourne has been pioneering a sector-wide approach to further develop specific research portfolios that have been identified as strategically important areas of growth for the institution. A case study of activities undertaken in key research portfolios will be discussed to showcase the development of the sector-wide approach framework. This includes methodologies in determining the key drivers and priorities of funding sources within the sector, challenges in identifying and engaging key research groups with strong capabilities across various faculties, and strategies to increase the number of relevant, high quality, multi-disciplinary research funding applications. Working across both the Major Initiatives and International teams, this reduces the siloed approach to research funding by viewing the sector through a holistic lens. The presentation will conclude with a review of the outcomes and achievements of our experience before welcoming further discussion on how other institutions may have taken a similar approach and the lessons learnt from their experiences.

97: Opportunity knocks: Case study of a successful grant development approach during a change management process

Mr Narmon Tulsi1
1Flinders University, Bedford Park, Australia

Grant applications are a consistent core business strategy of universities and yet large scale change management processes often undermine, if only temporarily, business as usual in many respects. The challenge then is to keep momentum, coherence and strategy going even in uncertain times, when structures and roles change, and when new support processes are not finalised. Change management is underway in a number of institutions nationally and federal pressures only add to this. In many cases the changes are specifically geared towards enabling more success at Category 1 funding and ERA outcomes, but it often takes time to fully realise the benefits of the change management process. It has often been said that opportunity can come from adversity.

This presentation describes an initiative to lead and coordinate a research support strategy for ARC Discovery applications for three of the six colleges at an Australian University – based on five years of previous grant development experience. The support was extended to 16 applications across disciplines including Humanities, Arts, Social Sciences, Psychology, Education and Law, assisting academics of varying experience from early career researchers to highly experienced professors. Subsequently 50 per cent of the grants assisted were successful, a success rate significantly above the national average. At the end of the grant round, the applicants were asked to provide feedback on what worked, and where improvements were needed. Come to this session for an overview of the experience and the lessons learned from a highly successful and efficient research development initiative.
99: Making it work: how to stay current in a world of chaos

Ms Christina Spargo*, Ms Jen Girling*
*Menzies School of Health Research, Darwin, Australia

Anyone working in the field of medical research is aware of the current changes in the funding landscape and the increased demands on the research office. We are a small research office in a busy medical research institute isolated by distance and recently the whole research office team obtained ARMS foundation level accreditation. We manage our pre and post award work through a case management style, working one on one with our researchers through all research phases from idea to impact. Faced with the current political and funding environment, and the constant need to diversify funding sources, we are conscious of the need to stay ahead of the game and ensure our skills are valued. Through this lens, and the need to ensure our skills are utilised and respected, we looked at our combined core values, principles and drivers to identify how we wish the research office to be known - Knowledgeable, Approachable and Professional (KAP). Understanding that this could be considered a base line for all professional work, our aim in this strategy change is to strive to be more than average, build on our established reputation and keep setting the bar higher. This presentation will outline what we are changing, how these changes are being accepted and why we decided to “rebrand” ourselves.

104: Simple steps to improving researcher engagement

Ms Mandy Pink*, Dr Helen Stephens*, Dr Rebecca Dorgelo*
*University Of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia

In developing best practice as research administrators, how can we ensure that our improvements are as meaningful and streamlined for our end-users as for ourselves?

Last year we surveyed University of Tasmania researchers on their preferences for receiving communications from the research administration team. We discovered that a focus on building relationships and making personalised contact is a winner. Guided by these findings, we have experimented with methods for communicating new information and better engaging researchers with our processes.

Taking this further, we are now seeking feedback from end-users on how we can improve our pre-award processes to maximise value for end-users. We aim to determine whether the value of the questions we ask as administrators is equally evident to researchers and research leaders. Can our processes seek/provide information in a way that also benefits our end-users?

In this presentation we share the results of this experimental work around better engaging our end-users. Through refining our engagement practice, we aim to streamline the administrative burden on our academic colleagues, freeing them up for their important work of making the real world a better place.
58: How do you assure the Australian public that they have received value from a $200 million targeted research investment?

Ms Janice Besch, Stephanie Ellis, Bojana Kos

‘NHMRC National Institute For Dementia Research, Canberra, Australia

The Boosting Dementia Research Initiative is an early and exceptional example (for Australia) of responding to a ‘grand challenge’. Five years from inception, it is important that we can report back on outcome and impact to the Australian community, and particularly those people who championed the Initiative and people with dementia, their families and carers.

Three aspects come into sharp focus. What was possible and feasible? What was achieved? How do we decide whether continued investment is required?

Being able to capture and communicate the information required in order to comprehensively respond to these questions, and to the full range of audiences, is the topic for this presentation. We will provide a ‘real life’ case study into the challenges of creating recording and communicating engagements and impact. The challenges will be familiar:

- Delivering a $200 million funding boost brings with it strategic, governance and administrative challenges that take time to resolve
- Delivering research programs within that boost will also take time

Establishing and completing projects that rise to the top from competitive funding processes to deliver those programs takes time, particularly if they involve multiple parties; complex intellectual property arrangements; cross-disciplinary partnerships and multi-jurisdictional arrangements

Delivering impact requires complete buy-in across a complex system, and will also take time.

NNIDR is on this journey. We are actively implementing the project management processes, data capture systems and communications protocols that will, in due course, deliver impact. We are at a pivotal time in delivery. Our experience helps to answer the question: What do research organisations need to do to create, record and communicate engagement and impact?

85: Changing the Narrative for Multiple Sclerosis Research

Professor Moira Clay, Professor Bruce Taylor, Professor Alison Venn

‘Moira Clay Consulting, Perth, Australia, ‘Menzies Institute for Medical Research, Hobart, Australia

Engagement and impact are high on the medical research agenda in Australia. With the emergence of the Medical Research Future Fund and Academic Health Research and Translation Centres, the national focus is on research that leads to community health benefits. The challenge for the sector has been to organise multi-disciplinary efforts that create genuine partnerships with community, policy makers, health services and other stakeholders to achieve tangible impact. In 2016, the Menzies Institute for Medical Research identified research on multiple sclerosis (MS) as the focus for a flagship program, based on a detailed analysis demonstrating a long record of research achievement and collaboration through population health, clinical and biomedical science approaches. The MS Research Flagship brought together a community of MS researchers at Menzies under a shared mission of generating, translating, applying and implementing knowledge on the causes, treatment and prevention of MS through an integrated pipeline of research. The formation of the MS Flagship has already had a considerable impact, including building research capacity, significantly increasing MS research funding, increasing community engagement and providing a focus for philanthropy, forming meaningful partnerships with MS-focussed organisations, extending national research collaborations and securing major Federal investment to support MS research and translation. The development of a flagship vehicle empowered researchers to collaborate and develop novel research projects that cross disciplines. Changing the narrative from an individual group focus to an integrated research effort has laid the foundations to significantly reduce the impact of MS for the community.
116: Becoming an Impact Storyteller: Tools and Techniques for identifying examples and building your impact story

Ms Sarah Mcpherson
National Heart Foundation Of Australia, Melbourne, Australia

Demonstrating Research Impact has long been considered a valuable yet complex endeavour, and is now a vital component of the research, and research funding, lifecycle.

Both in Australia and Internationally, there is an increasing demand on Researchers, Research Managers, and Research Institutions to become ‘Impact Literate’ and to actively understand, capture and communicate research impact.

Research Impact Measurement is also a relatively new area of inquiry. Across the globe, passionate researchers and professionals from diverse backgrounds are exploring this area, resulting in new thinking and evidence emerging at an almost dizzying speed. The dynamic and evolving nature of impact measurement means there is no clear ‘best in show’ approach, therefore funding bodies are adopting similar, yet not identical, approaches.

So where does this leave Research Managers and Institutes, now tasked with identifying and communicating research impact in a variety of ways to satisfy funders’ requirements?

The Heart Foundation has recently developed and implemented a research impact measurement framework to understand the impact of the research it funds. A key principle of framework development was to avoid unnecessarily adding to the reporting burden of the research community. This necessitated a comprehensive review of the models and reporting requirements currently in place for Australian and International funding bodies, and an assessment of the common themes and measures of impact.

This presentation provides a high-level summary of review findings, along with an overview of the Heart Foundation framework and associated tools that can assist in the capture and communication of research impact.

98: Researchers’ attitudes and perceptions of demonstrating research impact: implications for management of research.

Ms Louise Barnsbee, Dr Bridget Abell, Dr Pauline Zardo, Prof Adrian Barnett
Queensland University Of Technology, Brisbane, Australia, Institute of Health and Biomedical Innovation, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia, Australian Centre for Health Services Innovation, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia, School of Public Health and Social Work, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia, Faculty of Health, Queensland University of Technology.

Background: Researchers value the concept of research impact, but demonstrating impact is a new concept for many researchers. Understanding researchers’ experiences with impact could facilitate provision of targeted training, and the better planning and capturing of impact. This study aimed to understand how Health Services Researchers in Australia perceive their capacity to engage with demonstrating impact; specifically how impact is understood and demonstrated, the roles of different outputs and measures, and the feasibility of capturing evidence of impact.

Methods: Researchers were identified from a sample of 150 randomly selected articles recently published in key health services research journals. Authors meeting the inclusion criteria were invited to participate via email. The current literature and group discussions informed the survey questions.

Results: Of 129 contacted eligible researchers, 63 responded (49% response rate). Most respondents (80%) agreed/strongly agreed they were confident to demonstrate impact, but training was still desired by 66%. Most (92%) agreed/strongly agreed impact evidence should include downstream influences not captured in traditional outputs and metrics, but qualitative responses noted significant complexities with this approach. A key related observation was that not being able to count these impacts meant the full value of research was not recognised.

Conclusions: There will likely be opportunities to improve processes to understand more completely the fuller value of health research. Given the range of impacts reported, a flexible approach to recognising impact may be required. These findings have implications for research development and strategy in the higher education sector.
127: What can we learn from Local Government about engagement and impact?

Anneka Ferguson¹, Jason Hofman¹, Ella Horton¹
¹University Of Tasmania, Australia

Research quality has long been the focus of national assessments and competitive funding schemes, which have typically comprised peer review alongside traditional research metrics like publications, citations and funding. But there is growing recognition that research quality, while important, is not sufficient for impact, and that early and consistent engagement with the community is necessary to produce meaningful benefits for society.

In addition to the 2018 national assessment of engagement and impact in Australia, there are an increasing number of high-profile grant and fellowship schemes requiring statements on research impact and benefit. This shift requires researchers and research administrators to rethink traditional research pathways and consider how to best involve and respond to the needs of the community.

Delivering positive community impact is a core objective of the government sector, and community engagement has long been recognised as an effective way to improve decision-making processes and address local challenges. To meet legislative requirements and respond to increasing community expectations for involvement and transparency, local governments have explored, developed and refined a range of approaches to community engagement. For example, engaging the community in a cumulative process enabling trust to build over time; an approach which can be embedded into academic processes.

In this study, we explore local government engagement and impact ‘tools and rules’ and propose a framework to apply them in a university setting. Learnings from a local government context provide an opportunity to improve academic systems and processes for engagement and impact.

110: Career Path Researcher Development: Women in STEM

Professor Gayle Morris, Dr Alexandra Murray
¹G Morris Consulting, Adelaide, Australia, ²Charles Darwin University, Darwin, Australia

In response to the significant loss of women scientists to academia, with just 17% of senior academics being female having fallen from the lofty heights of women comprising more than half of science PhD graduates in universities and research institutes, a number of initiatives at both federal government and institutional level have begun. The loss of so many women scientists to academia results in a significant waste of expertise, talent and investment.

The most recent Australian Government initiative involves the Australian Academy of Science and Australian Academy of Technology and Engineering partnering to develop a Women in STEM Decadal Plan. At the institutional level, a number of programs including the Science in Australia Gender Equity (SAGE), and Women in STEM and Entrepreneurship (WISE) programs are under development. This presentation will discuss the great opportunity for a full career pathway approach in researcher development to assist in addressing this important area.

Research can be, at times, an isolated existence with numerous barriers and challenging milestone points such as entry into academia, institutional change, and career interruptions often due to carer responsibilities. To assist researchers in navigating and sustaining the journey, a broad compliment of development opportunities including buddy and mentoring programs, networking support structures, training programs, awards, and fellowship grants will be discussed.
9: Developing collaborative researchers in the network era

Dr David Junsong Huang
National Institute Of Education, Singapore, Singapore

Research institutions are facing an increasing demand to co-innovate in the knowledge economy. Yet, the literature on how research institutions enable collaborative work and develop researchers to collaborate in the network era is still rare. Using a case study approach, this presentation illustrates how a social network analysis tool was adopted to analyze the patterns of research collaborations among researchers within a research institution and how the analytical findings were used to inform researcher engagement and collaboration development. The case reveals strategies that leverage existing social capital among researchers to develop collaborative work. It complements the existing perspective of assembling researcher based on the complementarity of their knowledge and skill. The strategies of developing collaborative researchers inform both researcher development and research leadership development.

103: Researcher Development in Impact and Engagement: Establishing a Rationale

Dr Melinda Laundon, Dr Lauren Woodlands
QUT, Brisbane, Australia

With growing pressures on researchers to demonstrate the impact of their work outside academia, planning for impact and engagement are considered essential capabilities. National research impact evaluations such as Australia’s Engagement and Impact Assessment and the UK’s Research Excellence Framework have provided a focus and framework for evidencing and articulating impact. Additionally, many funding bodies now require grant applicants to submit details of the anticipated impact of their research. This means that researchers are expected to be able to plan for, articulate and achieve impact. Research managers endeavour to support research engagement and impact, but there are often disconnects between research management and researcher skills development. This disconnect is evidenced in the results of national impact assessments, which show that early career researchers are under-represented in the most impactful research. This indicates that there are gaps in researcher development in impact and engagement, particularly for early career researchers and higher degree research students.

This paper reports on a pilot initiative to embed research impact training in a HDR student research methods unit and in an academic development program targeted at early career academics from various disciplinary backgrounds. Drawing on qualitative survey comments from HDR students, early career researchers and academic developers, this paper focuses on establishing a rationale for embedding impact and engagement into institutional researcher development programs.

63: Developing a critical MaSS of researchers: Perspectives from a national South African Centre of Excellence

Ms Caryn McNamara
DST-NRF CoE-MaSS, Johannesburg, South Africa, University Of The Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

The DST-NRF Centre of Excellence in Mathematical and Statistical Science (CoE-MaSS) in South Africa was established in 2014 through an open government call, with a mandate to connect geographically dispersed researchers working in siloed pockets of excellence, and boost supervisory capacity in statistics. Furthering the researcher development needs of emerging researchers (postgraduate students and postdoctoral fellows) and established researchers, along with vast differences between the sixteen participating institutions from different tiers, is challenging. In addition, ever-changing national agendas (e.g. MDGs, SDGs, Science Communication, Open Science; Transformation; Gender equity) require researchers to constantly adjust their skill/toolkits in order to foster relevant and responsive research, as researchers are no longer allowed to operate from an “ivory tower”, in a vacuum from society.

Traditional researcher development activities (e.g. research proposal writing, and grant writing workshops) are no longer enough for success. As such, this talk will discuss some recent interventions employed by the CoE-MaSS to springboard emerging researchers to earlier success, such as:

- Science Communication skills, such as: FameLab, Science Spaza, #tHeartOfResearch
- Psyche effects of new academic environments
- The Junior Focus Area Coordinator (JFAC) experience: assisting experienced researchers to strategically plan future research activities, and
contribute to large, multi-institutional research early on, and
• Online training courses to develop doctoral supervision skills

The ongoing challenge is that with each new policy iteration, the Research Manager (RM) must be proactively responsive to the training needs to facilitate sufficiently to fulfill those imperatives. Without the ability to foresee these trajectories, RMs will simply “flail and fail”.

79: To Research or not to Research? Trials and tribulations of a research-poor College
Dr Sebastien Lacrampe
1The Australian National University, Acton, Australia

Traditionally, the ANU College of Law has been significantly more teaching-focused and less research-focused than other ANU Colleges. However, with the arrival of a new Dean less than two years ago, the College is seeking to resolve that imbalance with other colleges and prioritise research. The ANU College of Law Strategic Plan 2019-2020 (SRP) describes the framework created by the College executive in consultation with academics to increase research interest, research culture, research capacity and, crucially, research income.

In this presentation I will discuss a suite of new initiatives the College is currently putting in place to satisfy the SRP’s objectives. First, I will place the college in the ANU and Australian Research landscape, taking into account a number of indicators such as research income, grant success, ERA and Engagement and Impact results.

Second, I will present the initiatives taken under the SRP in the form of case studies outlining the rationale behind the initiative, the response it received from academics, the challenges faced by the different stakeholders (Research Committee, Research Office, researchers), and preliminary results in terms of research volume produced. In this discussion, I will mostly take the perspective of the research administrator, but will also discuss the roles and expectations of the other stakeholders.

To conclude I will consider whether those initiatives form an integrated strategy that responds appropriately to the SRP.
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36: Bring balance to the university (not leave it in darkness) through an informed, transparent, metricated culture.
Mr Daniel Owens1, Mr Thomas Chow2
1UNSW Sydney, Kensington, Australia

It seems that measuring research excellence grows in importance each day, and on the back of the results of the 2018 ERA Assessment, many institutions will be increasing efforts to understand their own research performance and how to lift that performance over the coming years – not just in ERA, but across all external evaluations of research excellence.

While only a small piece of a large jigsaw that defines research excellence, ‘metrics’ are becoming more prevalent in that definition and we can choose to fight against this ‘metric tide’ or we can embrace and build a metricated culture and drive the conversation around proper use, robustness, transparency and familiarity. Taking the latter approach, UNSW commenced a journey of equipping decision makers and individual researchers with the right data to make the right decisions at the right time, by creating an online research intelligence and collaborations tool, nicknamed “BORIS”. Through this, we hope to facilitate the establishment of a metricated culture at the university, build interdisciplinary and other collaboration, and provide academics and professional staff with a better understanding of research performance metrics.

This presentation will cover UNSW’s journey regarding critical decisions that have been made, challenges and key lessons learned during the implementation process, and the future of this world-class system. Rather than leaving this controversial topic in darkness, UNSW has addressed the changing landscape of research metrics by leveraging best practice business intelligence concepts to support the research community and embraced technology to make it work for us.
86: Automating the Reporting of University Rankings

Dr Tania Wilmann1, Mr Oscar Lane2, Dr Stewart Craig3, Ms Sian Wright1
1Office of the Vice-Provost, Faculty and Graduate Affairs, Monash University, Clayton, Australia, 2Office of the President and Vice-Chancellor, Strategic Intelligence and Insights Unit, Monash University, Clayton, Australia, 3Office of the President and Vice-Chancellor, University Planning and Statistics, Monash University, Clayton, Australia

The release of University rankings requires a prompt response to provide information, analysis and context to the senior management team (SMT). Whilst 3 of the 4 ‘big’ rankings agencies (THE, QS and ARWU) provide results under embargo, meaningful analysis is unable to be completed until the full results are released and a comparison against the performance of other institutions is performed.

Previously, rankings reports to SMT were prepared using a MS Word template and contained charts and tables produced using MS Excel. Rankings information was manually obtained from the rankings webpages and data entered or transferred to the appropriate destinations to generate the required analysis, a time-consuming and error-prone process.

In 2018, we investigated the use of the R programming language to facilitate automation of rankings data extraction and reporting. We automated obtaining the rankings data from the webpages of QS, THE and ARWU and converted it into a format ready for manipulation and analysis. Using R markdown, we generated template reports, which require minimal updating once a new ranking is released and, when run, automatically produce a report containing the updated rankings information.

This has reduced the time and manual entry spent on preparing data for rankings, providing greater time for strategic analysis of the results, more timely reporting to SMT and the rapid availability of results to other stakeholders in the University, such as Faculties. The automation of the reporting has also allowed inclusion of more types of analysis, providing greater scope for in depth examination of the results and strategy recommendations.

37: The measurement of value in NTROs: ERA, EI, the place of peer evaluation and issues of metric measurement

Dr Joseph Toltz1
1The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

The issue of value regarding the assessment, funding and support of cultural research activities has been firmly placed back on the agenda in the past two years. Following revelations of direct intervention by Federal Education Minister Simon Birmingham to deny funding to eleven ARC grants in 2017 and 2018, all in the humanities with a combined total value of AU$4.2 million, an outcry issued forth from the Australian Academy of the Humanities, protesting the undermining of confidence and trust in our “world-leading peer review system”. This act has precedence in Australian politics: as Jon Piccini and Dirk Moses write in The Conversation (26 Oct 2018), Brendan Nelson exercised the same interventionist tendencies in 2005, ignoring ARC processes. In a not dissimilar case of arbitrary ministerial whim, Senator George Brandis removed $104 million from Australia Council funding, reallocating funds to a new “National Program for Excellence in the Arts”. After poor publicity and much outcry, the new program was axed, and $61 million returned. In all these cases, the issue of value has been used to question peer review as a process for recognising quality and excellence in humanities research that does not utilise peer review. Given this, is unsurprising that more and more emphasis is being placed on metric evaluation, despite its total inadequacy to measure research in the humanities. This paper will address the issue of value in data collection, presentation and evaluation at a national level. Is EI a fairer way forward, or just another layer of narrative?
62: INORMS Research Evaluation Working Group - Working towards more responsible use of metrics and rankings

Justin Shearer, Dr Elizabeth Gadd, Aline Pacifico Rodrigues, Anne Albinak, Baldvin Zarioh, Dr Baron Wolf, Dr Hirofumi Seike, Laura Himanen, Laura Beaupre, Dr Patricia Smit, Tanja Strøm

1University Of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia, 2Loughborough University, Loughborough, United Kingdom, 3Sociedade Beneficente Israelita Brasileira Hospital Albert Einstein, São Paulo, Brazil, 4John Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA, 5University of Iceland, Reykjavík, Iceland, 6University of Kentucky, Lexington, USA, 7Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan, 8Tampere University, Tampere, Finland, 9University of Guelph, Guelph, Canada, 10Cape Peninsula University of Technology, Cape Town, South Africa, 11Oslo Metropolitan University, Oslo, Norway

At the 2018 INORMS conference, the incoming Chair of INORMS, Steph Bales, announced the establishment of two new working groups. One was around public engagement and impact, and the other around research evaluation and metrics. Dr Elizabeth Gadd, the Research Policy Manager (Publications) at Loughborough University, UK, was invited to chair the research evaluation and metrics working group. The aim of the group is to develop a joint programme of work and share experiences and best practice with a view to ensuring research evaluation is meaningful, responsible and effective.

The working group, drawn from representatives of each of the INORMS’ member societies, has identified two key focus areas for activity: developing a package for senior leaders to support the use of metrics in a responsible, better informed way; and to undertake a ranking of rankings agencies against measures that are valuable to research managers, in their various capacities and contexts.

This session will share progress on these activities, and open a meaningful dialogue with the wider community about the group’s work.

137: Is Populism Having an Impact on Research Funding Decisions?

Dr Fernanda da Silva Tatley

University of Otago, NZ, New Zealand

We live in a world largely determined by the internet, Twitting and the use of all our social media platforms and networks to share news on discoveries, excite and raise public awareness, promote good (and bad) stories and increase our own information on all issues. But, this focus on public tangibility of research may be introducing biases in the research that is being funded. This may happen as a result of lobbying with government sectors, by those that have vested political and/or commercial interests, disguised as a public desire for openness and truth or transparency. We have seen the EU raising concerns in their report on the high-level Strategy Group on Industrial Technologies on e-type platforms, but the limitations of public influence on research funding, may be more subtle. In this paper, a few examples of the impact of investigator-led blue sky research, that have changed our lives, e.g. the application of X-rays, are compared to the impact of some of the mission-led research such us new crop breeding. There are 2 questions that we ought to be posing: 1. “How can we balance the funding of curiosity driven research with that of functional and applied research?” And, 2. “Where does one stop and the other begin?”
Accessing tender opportunities through panel arrangements

Justin Manzano, Ms Amanda Smith, Phil Tang
La Trobe University

As the research funding landscape shifts, ensuring access to a broad range of funding opportunities is critical. One method of accessing research revenue is through participation in Research Panels. Research Panels are groups of pre-approved suppliers selected via a competitive bidding process. Establishing research panels facilitates the procurement of research services in a direct, streamlined manner. This presentation discusses the successes and challenges experienced by La Trobe University in developing bids for membership of Research Panels.

The first challenge lies in the initial bid. The uncertainty of receiving funding for an activity can reduce the level of ownership that academics feel toward a bid. With no guarantee of work arising from the Panel, securing and supporting an academic lead who is invested in the Panel and the bid is critical, and buy-in from research leadership can further assist.

The broad scope of many Panels provides opportunities for centralised research offices to engage diverse areas of expertise across the organisation and apply project management approaches to coordinating large groups. Banks of generic responses can be developed over multiple bids, and drawn from to reduce burden on academics. However, care must be taken to contextualise these responses to address the needs of the client and the intention of the Panel.

The submission of successful Research Panel bids is a balancing act that pose a unique challenge for research managers and academics alike. However, it can provide your organisation with access to opportunities it would not otherwise have, increasing chances of success.

Investigator Grants at The University of Melbourne – Top Tips for implementing effective support for a new grant scheme

Mr Frank Anastasopoulos, Ms Anne Coco
The University of Melbourne, Pakville, VIC, Australia

In 2018, the NHMRC launched the Investigator Grant Scheme, replacing a range of fellowships. This posed a specific challenge to the research office at the University of Melbourne tasked with supporting applicants intending to submit Investigator Grant applications – How do we ensure that we provide applicants with useful and effective support when we had limited information about the new funding scheme? How do we resource adequately when we don't know how many applications to expect? What on earth does research impact mean?

Ultimately, the support provided by the research office at the University of Melbourne was very well received. All applicants were surveyed post grant submissions and 98% of respondents agree or strongly agreed that they were happy with the quality and timeliness of service (87% strongly agreed). Furthermore, respondents reported a Net Promotor Score of 81.

In reviewing the grant round, we were able to identify a number relatively simple ‘Top Tips’ that can be applied to the support of many grant schemes, especially those that are new.

In this presentation, we will explore the strategies and action we undertook to address the challenges and to ensure that we provided effective and high quality support. We will discuss the ‘Top Tips’ which we were then able to use in implementing support for other grants schemes.
55: Frontiers of Research Development: Tales from the MRFF

Dr Gabrielle Callander, Dr Karen McConalogue, Luke McAvaney

Monash University, Clayton, Australia

The Medical Research Future Fund (MRFF) Frontier Health and Medical Research Program (Frontiers) is a progressive approach to Australian Government funding of health and medical innovation. The program objectives, application process and merit criteria reflect the ambition of the National Health and Medical Industry Growth Plan; to support innovative health and medical research that will result in better health outcomes for Australians and create economic benefit. The impression formed from media releases and Government documents was that entrepreneurialism, industry partnerships and leverage of existing investment would be considered favourably. Yet, the fact that this was the first round, means that we do not have examples of successful proposals and providing guidance is more difficult.

Analysis of the outcomes announced in April 2019 provided an opportunity to reflect on our interpretation, review submitted proposals and identify factors that may have contributed to success. Monash University was successful in leading two of the ten $1 million (approx.) Stage One awards and was a project partner on a further 27 applications. This presentation will review the Frontiers application round and examine trends across the sector to encourage discussion. In addition, it will provide case studies of the two successful Monash Frontiers applications and the potential factors contributing to their success. This presentation will provide an opportunity for research development professionals to reflect on the how the convergence of Government objectives and researcher interests shapes competitive MRFF proposals.

94: A new understanding of ‘compliance’: Lessons learned from administering international medical research grants in the Monash Research Office

Dr Wade Moore, Ms Kylie May, Dr Tsharni Zazryn

Monash University, Clayton, Australia

Continued changes to the dispersal of research block grants has made the receipt and retention of Category 3 international research funding an essential element to the success and competitiveness of Australian Universities. As such it is more pertinent than ever that the administration of international grants is handled efficiently and in compliance with the stipulations set by each funding body.

After a grant portfolio reshuffle within the Monash Research Office (MRO), the Medical Health Sciences team were presented with the unique opportunity of administering international medical grants. Prior to this, the team had only administered national medical research grants. During this transition and to this day the team were presented with the unique challenge of understanding the guidelines and requirements associated with these funders, and then implementing processes to facilitate the administration of such requirements. The team had the unique opportunity to review and refine business processes relating to the administration of international grants with the overarching goal of providing better support to Monash University researchers and ensuring compliance with international funding body regulations.

This presentation will provide an overview of the changes and updates to business processes that were implemented by the Medical Health Sciences team to streamline and better facilitate the administration of international medical research grants.
111: Case Study: Role of Research Office in facilitating whole of university-end user partnerships

Mrs Lekshmi Sobhana
Charles Darwin University, Darwin, Australia

Research offices play a critical role in building and maintaining strong networks and developing effective and collaborative partnerships both within universities and with a range of external stakeholders. As one of the key facilitators of collaborations, research offices are often called upon to review and embed approaches that enhance ease of doing business which provides an incentive for further future engagements.

Partnership agreements with end users become much more effective if they are underpinned by academic and professional activities with a broad scope including research and evaluation as well as other key areas for collaboration such as workforce development, training and education. This better aligns the objectives of the partnering organisations and helps to further develop existing links while encouraging co-design of research and education priorities. It will also enable co-creation of research with impact through effective knowledge exchange. This invariably results in rewarding engagement and benefits for the community at large.

In remote or regional areas, exploring new opportunities to undertake research funded by government agencies offers a world of possibilities. For Charles Darwin University, establishing whole of university partnership agreements with the Northern Territory government and its various departments has been critical as they continue to be one of the main funding sources in the Territory.
**Poster 1: Qualitative Analysis of the UK Impact Case Studies: Understanding Research Data Contribution to Impact Narratives**

**Dr Paul Wong**, Dr Eric Jensen*, Professor Mark Reed*

*Australian Research Data Commons, Canberra, Australia, Institute for Methods Innovation, Arcata, United States

In 2019, ARDC commissioned an analysis of the UK REF Impact Case Studies using a well-established social research method call “content analysis”. This work focused on sampling a small subset of (highly rated) REF Impact Cases where “data”, “database” etc. are mentioned explicitly in the main impact narrative. A manual review process is used to further screen and filter out false positives where the data mentioned is not “research data”. Content analysis is then used to develop categories and factors to address two key questions:

1. How does research data contribute to non-academic research impacts within REF2014 impact narratives?

2. What specific factors are highlighted as enabling research data to contribute to research impacts within REF2014 impact narratives?

As expected, analysis and research using secondary data require careful considerations of the provenance of the original data. Since REF Impact Case Studies were written for specific rhetorical aims - most notable to persuade reviewers that research impacts were linked to research activities, it is reasonable to expect exaggeration of impacts in some cases. Conversely, in other cases it may have caused the role of existing data sources to be downplayed in favour of an emphasis on published research outputs as the primary causal factor for impact. Notwithstanding these considerations, the research undertaken have transparently documented the methodological limitations and explicitly highlighted such issues in the final report to allow the reader to take such limitations into account. In this presentation, we’ll outline the key findings from this work.

**Poster 2: NHMRC Long Term Impact Case Studies**

**Dr Julia Tresidder**

*National Health and Medical Research Council, Australia

NHMRC produces long term impact case studies to demonstrate its contribution to raising the standard of individual and public health throughout Australia. These long term impact case studies are separate to and distinct from the descriptions of research impact required as part of some NHMRC grant applications.

Each long term impact case study is developed in partnership with one or more Australian research organisations and other bodies.

These case studies demonstrate that outcomes and impact can take many years, and the combined work of many people and organisations, to generate. Through documenting research translation journeys they show that the creation of knowledge is vital, but also that there are many other activities necessary to generate impact.

NHMRC has published Guidelines for producing NHMRC Case Studies that are intended to assist partner organisations to work with NHMRC to produce case studies.

Partnering with NHMRC to develop a case study provides benefits for partner organisations including:

- assistance from NHMRC staff in developing the case study
- verification of the impact story using NHMRC data
- quality assurance and validation of the partner’s research translation activities and impacts
- NHMRC’s branding applied to the partner’s impact narrative
- promotion by NHMRC of the case study (and thus of the partner’s impact and organisation).

If you have any comments or suggestions to make about the case studies, would like to be kept informed when new case studies are published, or would like to discuss partnering with NHMRC to document your organisation’s work as an NHMRC case study, then please let us know.

The Impact Case Studies team may be contacted at research.sector.data.policy@nhmrc.gov.au.
Poster 3: Lifecycles of Joint Higher Degrees by Research: ensuring quality and flexibility when one size does not fit all

Rose Walker\textsuperscript{1}, Professor Clive Baldock\textsuperscript{1}, Dr Denbeigh Armstrong\textsuperscript{1}
\textsuperscript{1}University of Tasmania, Australia

Joint Higher Degrees by Research, including Dual Award Programs and Cotutelles, are becoming an increasingly popular mechanism for expanding networks and opportunities. When managed well, these often complicated arrangements allow candidates and supervisors to engage with two research and cultural environments, while affording universities the opportunity to improve research collaborations and metrics, and increase income.

No two Joint Higher Degrees by Research are the same given the variance in institutional rules and policies and candidate circumstances. This being the case, how can we develop a methodology for establishing and managing these programs in a way that ensures quality while maintaining the flexibility necessary to respond to what are often very valuable opportunities? In developing the University of Tasmania’s new policy framework over the past two years, we addressed the following questions:

- What is the lifecycle of a Joint Higher Degree by Research and how can we support supervisors and candidates throughout?
- What role does quality assurance play and how can we standardise assessments?
- In negotiating agreements:
  - What is non-negotiable?
  - Where do we need to be flexible?
- Why is it worth the effort and how do we answer this?
- Where to next?

This poster will address these questions and outline the steps we are taking to continue to grow our Joint Higher Degrees by Research program into a rich experience for our candidates and staff, and a valuable strategic exercise for the University.

Poster 4: Postcards from the EDGE: introducing an integrated user platform to support PhD skills development at UniSA.

Ms Charlotte Ferrier\textsuperscript{1}, Ms Jenni Critcher\textsuperscript{1}
\textsuperscript{1}University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia

UniSA will launch its first institution-wide model for PhD skills development in 2020: EDGE (Enhancement of Doctoral Graduate Employability). There is widespread enthusiasm from candidates and supervisors for a systematic approach to skills development which goes beyond the needs of the research project. Through consultation we identified their clear priority was the ability to engage with skills development with sophisticated tools and resources that supported a tailored experience.

Enter EDGEx – a one-stop-shop cloud-based software solution which allows candidates to plan a personalised approach to skills development, book and record activities undertaken both within and outside the institution and recognise the value of their development as it relates to their personal career aspirations.

EDGEx is a custom-built installation of the Skillsforge product, designed to deliver UniSA’s bespoke EDGE Framework through a candidate-led model. EDGEx is integrated with the UniSA student management system to offer candidates a personalised view of the system each time they log in. It also supports UniSA training providers through real-time activity management from set-up to registration and attendance to evaluation. Rather than an IT-led system installation, EDGEx is part of a University-wide project which has engaged stakeholders across the institution to ensure the delivery of a streamlined approach to PhD skills development. This paper describes the process of designing and implementing a system that can deliver UniSA’s bespoke approach to PhD skills development.
Poster 5: Going beyond the norm of basic grant management

Ms Shirin Jambhulkar
1Monash University, Clayton, Australia

Purpose

The purpose of this presentation is to share one of our best practices in a constantly changing landscape, with a focus to delivering outputs to its customers. Research offices are required to manage customer relationships and expectations from funders, researchers, internal divisions, industry partners and other organisations. Research projects now involve industry needs, cross-disciplinary participation and a wide range of stakeholder interests. The current trend is to continuously adopt and change processes while making incremental progress along the way to support our researchers by adding value in what we offer.

Approach

Agile methodologies, currently are transforming larger organisations including Australian Universities; as the need to adopt innovative and continuous service delivery mechanisms fluctuate to keep up with ever changing needs of its stakeholders. What do we do to make our research grants or large major investments work effectively? What are the preliminary steps required to ensure a smooth transition from pre-award stages to post-award, once the initial excitement of winning a grant starts to fade? At Monash University, we have implemented one such measure at the back of a hybrid version of Agile as we step in to managing our grants proactively throughout their project lifecycles.

Best Practise

Get to know what works effectively in the post-award space, which has added more value to our stakeholder experiences by going beyond the norm of regular processes. The focus is on adopting agile methodology, project management, start to finish approach and setting a roadmap that equips our researchers as they kick-start their projects!

Poster 6: ARMS NSW Chapter leading by example: Demonstrating the feasibility of online professional development via a webinar series

Ms Annette Harris1, Mr James Walsh1, Dr Ross Hill1, Ms Stephanie Macmillan1, Dr Yordanka Krastev1, Ms Kathy Homan1, Ms Emily Brennan1
1Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga, Australia, 2University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, Australia, 3Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia, 4Lowy Cancer Research Centre, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, 5University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

Research management and administration staff operate in increasingly complex, fast-paced, and demanding environments. Professional development offerings for these staff should be relevant to this constantly shifting environment, delivered via information and communication rich formats, and accessible to all, regardless of location.

Responding to these challenges, the NSW Chapter Committee set out to pilot a series of lunchtime webinars to complement its existing suite of face-to-face modules and events. Four webinars on topics prepared by Chapter members were developed and three sessions proceeded. Webinars covered the following topics:

• Facilitating effective cross-disciplinary research collaboration;
• Providing effective funding advice to researchers;
• Effectively communicating institutional compliance requirements.

Format for each session:

• Speaker presentation (30 minutes)
• Q&A with participants (20 minutes)
• Post Topic Reflection Activity (10 minutes)

Sessions were delivered using web-based video conferencing software Adobe Connect, at no cost to participants. Charles Sturt University provided access to the software and handled participant registrations. The ARMS Executive Office advertised the webinars to the NSW Chapter via email.

Participants responded positively to the NSW Chapter’s lunchtime webinar series. Each session averaged 30 participants. Engaged Q&A following each presentation demonstrated participants were keen to learn and share best practice of the topic at their institution.
With the success of this lunchtime webinar series pilot, the NSW Chapter Committee has paved the way for the ARMS PD Sessions @ Zoom series, a diverse program of professional development offerings curated by ARMS for the benefit of the whole membership that was launched in late March 2019.

**Poster 7: PIDs for Purpose: Persistent Identifiers and the Research Life Cycle**

Ms Siobhann McCafferty, Ms Natasha Simons, Adrian Burton, Ms Gerry Ryder

1 ARDC, Brisbane, Australia, 2 ARDC, Canberra, Australia, 3 ARDC, Adelaide, Australia

Persistent identifiers (PIDs) are critical enablers for identifying and linking related research objects including datasets, people, grants, concepts, places, projects and publications. Increasingly, the research community, including funders and publishers, is recognising the power of ‘connected up’ research to facilitate reuse, reproducibility and transparency of research.

PID systems:

- Provide social and technical infrastructure to identify and cite a research output over time
- Enable machine readability and exchange
- Collect and make available metadata that can provide further context and connections
- Facilitate the linkage and discovery of research outputs, objects, related people and things

This presentation will present recent developments in PID services and infrastructure with a particular focus on DOI (research data), ORCID (people and organisations), RAID (research activities and projects) and IGSN (physical samples and specimens) in Australasian and international contexts.

The structure of the presentation will be an initial series of lightning talks presented by experts in PID services and infrastructure. Following this will be a facilitated Q&A where participants will be encouraged to contribute to an open discussion to share experiences, explore ideas and ask questions.

**Poster 8: When change comes to research management: the case for a pre mortem**

Christiane Rupp
1 University of Auckland

In times of constant change to increase growth and competitiveness, the research enterprise is challenged to embrace innovation. Every year institutions allocate millions of dollars to improve research support services. Such changes may be highly complex, not least because they are intended to anticipate a future state of affairs.

When such change occurred in my workplace, questions occurred to me: With so many moving pieces, so many people affected, how accurate can the forecasts and the planning be? How confident should the restructuring project managers be that the implementation of their programme would succeed? Are miscalculations inconceivable?

I soon learned that this issue is the focus of study at the intersection of Business and Economics – and, surprisingly, Psychology. By now it is well known that all people – including the intelligent, honest and highly motivated – are susceptible to cognitive biases in their thinking. These cognitive biases are usually subconscious and therefore not easy to see in one’s own thinking.

One proposed antidote to the negative impact of such biases is the pre-mortem (first proposed by Gary Klein). The pre-mortem is an effective risk management and debiasing tool that helps in the early identification of potential problems and in sensitising team members to cognitive biases. I recommend the use of the pre-mortem technique in research management as a best practice tool side-by-side with the traditional ‘lessons-learned’ evaluations.

In my presentation, I describe why the pre-mortem is valuable and how it works, and I describe several case studies in my institution.
Poster 9: Partner attraction in research collaboration: from engagement to long-term commitment

Denise Redfern
1Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia

The rise of the entrepreneurial university has seen a greater emphasis on partnership with industry through research collaboration for mutual benefit. But the collaborative process can be painstaking when the institutions’ goals don’t readily align. This poster examines the engagement and partnering processes of two university-based projects to reveal the determinants of success for fruitful collaborations.

Poster 10: Investing returns from great discoveries into the discoverers of tomorrow

Ms Nerida Gibb1, Dr Melissa Straffon1,2, Mrs Merrilyn Larusson1,2
1Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Canberra, Australia, 2Science and Industry Endowment Fund, Melbourne, Australia

Many economies in our region are grappling with the challenge of encouraging young people into STEM careers to ensure a strong pipeline of outstanding STEM talent in research and industry. From the CSIRO Gift, the Science and Industry Endowment Fund (SIEF) has dedicated $21M of funding to this endeavour with a Promotion of Science Program that supports undergraduates, postgraduates and postdoctoral fellows in STEM. We present the findings from an analysis of the program that assessed the impact of this investment in the next generation of scientists and engineers. Through the use of a number of different scenarios, this poster will outline how we maximise the alchemy of data to appropriately respond to a research management need. This includes collecting, identifying and using appropriate data; consolidating data from different sources; and summarising findings to respond to complex scenarios.

We will provide the audience with our ingredients to concoct an evidence based remedy (ME-Data-CINE) to any research management malady.
Poster 12: A day on the farm: What do farming and research project development have in common?

Mrs Heather Thomas
1University Of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

What can we learn from a different context to help both research managers and researchers with research project development? How can we rephrase some of the approaches associated with identifying and communicating funding opportunities, developing and facilitating internal and external collaborations, and consider new ways to respond to challenges and opportunities in the pre-award research funding cycle?

When I am asked “what do you do?” sometimes I respond that I am a “hunter-gatherer who goes out foraging to match funding streams with researchers with the goal to bring home/secure sustenance in the form of external research income”.

Hunter-gatherers lived by hunting and collecting food rather than by farming. I still like the hunter-gatherer notion as it appeals to my sense of adventure but have realized that in this contemporary world I could refer to myself as a farmer. This might seem strange but on closer digging we can identify many common features such as 1. Understanding the market - before deciding to grow a particular crop it is important to identify the potential market for that crop. It is the same for research projects, whether the intended ‘product’ is a widget that meets a market need or a scholarly publication for a refereed journal. 2. Timeliness - for both farming and research projects the initial groundwork must be done and seeds sown/ideas formulated in time to ensure that the crop/project is ready for harvesting/submission when required.

These are just two of the examples from different contexts that will be explored.

Poster 13: Legacy, Leadership and Leap: the Laureate Peer Support Program at the University of Melbourne

Melanie Horder
1University Of Melbourne, Australia

Legacy, Leadership and Leap: The Laureate Peer Support Program at the University of Melbourne

The ARC Australian Laureate Fellowship scheme is the most prestigious and arguably the most competitive in Australia. Approximately 10% of applicants are successful nationally with the University of Melbourne awarded between 1-4 Laureate Fellowships each year. The University has found that many applicants underestimate the competitiveness of the scheme, have unrealistic expectations of success and do not participate in the standard information seminars provided by the University’s central research office (RIC). To address this and facilitate more competitive proposals, in 2016 the RIC Major Initiatives team created a pilot Laureate Peer Support Program. The Program aimed to provide targeted, high-level and intensive peer support for high-potential candidates seeking to apply in the next 1-3 years, with the goal to enhance the overall competitiveness of proposals submitted and ultimately improve the University’s success rate.

Viewed as ‘one of the best programs in decades’ by Program participants and now in its fourth year, the Laureate Peer Support Program has created a cohort that better understand the requirements of the Laureate scheme, have greater clarity of their own measures of esteem and – if they choose to submit – are able to develop higher quality proposals. Whilst it is naïve to equate the Peer Support Program with success in the scheme, it is evident that the Program has impacted the quality of submissions, as since its inception 50% of the University’s successful Laureate Fellows are Program graduates as are the top three near miss candidates in each year.
Poster 14: To support or not to support? - Let the data talk

Dr Shannen Lau
\(^1\)The University Of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia

The number and range of schemes are ever increasing, the research areas covered are becoming much broader, and schemes are becoming more complex. As each sponsor has different processes and requirements they have created a large administrative burden for the Research Office; these schemes are often onerous and have administrative burdens out of alignment with grant value.

From 2016 to 2017, the number of schemes the University of Melbourne facilitated increased approximately 50%. The University of Melbourne Research Office is faced with the challenge on how best deploy our limited resources to support our applicants. Furthermore, providing support to all schemes at a minimum level, or no support to some scheme, is not an acceptable option. There is a need for a systemic approach to ensure resources are utilised efficiently and effectively.

Data analytics have provided the information required to make decision on how best manage our resources. We have developed a tool that allows the Research Office to identify those schemes that are likely to add the greatest value to the organisation. This poster outlines the iterative design and implementation process of the tool, as well as discusses the pitfalls and solutions we have learned from the process.

Poster 15: An experiment in research culture development – reflections on two years supporting three small English universities with research grant proposals

Mr Lachlan Smith
\(^1\)Cloud Chamber Ltd, United Kingdom

Research cultures in small and specialist institutions can be immature when compared to large research-intensive universities. Investing in the resources to grow these cultures can be expensive when you are starting from a low base. This presentation reflects on two years that the author spent as the shared research support function at Leeds Trinity, Newman and Bishop Grosseteste Universities in England. The lessons learnt point not only to how research cultures and income can be improved and grown in small institutions but provide a different framework for larger institutions to consider when looking to improve their research cultures. Specifically, the presentation will:

- Explain the nature of the experiment and how it came about
- Describe the different research cultures and structures present at the three universities
- Chart the evolving nature of the institutions over the two years including the growth in research income, infrastructure and culture
- Answer the questions: What happened next? What lessons were learned and what can larger institutions gain from the experiment?

Often larger institutions only look to each other for good practice – this presentation highlights good practice found in more unusual places. Sometimes the smaller and less well-developed institutions can offer innovative solutions to grow research cultures and grant income.
Poster 16: How do early-career researchers in STEMM disciplines view the professional development opportunities available to them?

Mrs Katherine Christian

Federation University Australia, Ballarat, Australia, Cure Cancer Australia, Sydney, Australia

A research project exploring challenges faced by early-career researchers (ECRs) in the sciences in universities and independent research institutes in Australia has investigated the work environment for these researchers in order to examine their job satisfaction and the likelihood of them continuing to work in research in Australia.

As part of the data collection, a national survey has sought views of these ECRs about professional development opportunities available through their institutions.

In particular, the survey has investigated professional development as follows:

- Are ECRs supported in their quest for professional development?
- Are there opportunities they would like which are not available?
- What would they like to do more of?
- What is available they don’t want to do?
- What opportunities do they actually take up?
- Do they even know what is available?
- How could professional development be better delivered?

Mentoring, a key component of successful professional development, is investigated in a separate section. Questions asked include whether the ECR has a mentoring relationship(s), and how did that relationship come about? How important has this mentoring been to their career progression? How beneficial has it been?

The survey also investigates the approach of ECRs and their institutions to career planning. It seeks answers on sources for career planning advice, learning about career opportunities that are beyond academia and the existence of career advisory services for science ECRs.

Early findings are presented.

Poster 17: Giving employers a voice in the development of PhD employability.

Ms Claire Jackson

Graduate Research Development, Research and Innovation Services, University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia

The Review of Australia’s Research Training System (ACOLA, 2016) reported industry feedback which could negatively impact the employability of PhD graduates. Poor understanding of the PhD was shared by employers, and reflections that research training, particularly in transferable skills, inadequately prepares graduates for careers in industry. ACOLA highlighted that in developing deep specialised knowledge in their discipline, we (universities) “may leave graduates deficient in the kinds of transferable skills desired by employers”. Employers called for better demonstration of the breadth of transferable skills that HDR graduates develop through their research training.

An ATN-commissioned report (NOUS, 2017) reinforced these misconceptions, and looked to universities to deliver initiatives which improve PhD employability and through better industry engagement. As part of the Transformed PhD initiative, the University of South Australia has given explicit consideration to the voice of the employer in PhD training. The design of an institution-wide skills model provided opportunities to address the perceptions and needs of employers through a scaffolded approach aimed at building understanding, recognition and evidence of high-level (transferable) skills in the PhD. This paper presents the ways in which employers have been deeply engaged through surveys, focus groups and semi-structured interviews in the development of the ‘EDGE’ model. Feedback that provides new insights to ACOLA and NOUS will be shared from potential employers from a range of sectors (oil and mining, professional services, aged care, manufacturing, pharmaceuticals, food and drink, education, government), concluding with how this input has been used to shape the design of EDGE for optimal candidate experience and outcomes.
Poster 18: Can we develop researchers and research support together?

Miss Jaylene Wehipeihana

1The University Of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

For researchers in Aotearoa (New Zealand) policies such as Vision Mātauranga and Responsiveness to Maori are threaded through funder guidelines. These policies require and encourage researchers to consider indigenous knowledge and engagement when developing their proposals. However, this component or stage of the proposal development is more often than not left to the last minute.

As research management professionals we are often tasked with creating strategies or tools for our researchers. Although we can provide exemplars, organise peer review and undertake workshops on how to craft a proposal. The ability to provide advice in the space of indigenous engagement is still very limited and often left out of researcher development strategies.

After an internal restructure at the UoA which decentralised the Research Office and saw an increase of research management support placed in faculties. Within the Faculty of Science we are developing a review panel made up of research support staff and academics. Using this approach we hope to not only develop researchers but also research support staff.

I will present the lessons learnt from this strategy and develop not only researchers but research support simultaneously, to build capacity and understanding of indigenous engagement.