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Our vision for future discoveries continues to reach for the stars. With access to unique environments, strong partnerships with industry, and a culture of celebrating innovation, the University of Tasmania is an ideal testing ground for new ideas. Our multi-professional research teams are committed to solving real-world problems that deliver transformative public benefits.

The University of Tasmania is:

- using data to build a better world
- furthering the world’s understanding of temperate marine, Southern Ocean, and Antarctic environments
- seeking answers to the world’s most pressing environmental issues
- contributing to better healthcare and a better healthcare system
- developing and refining creative ideas to improve social policy
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You are warmly welcomed to the beautiful city of Hobart, Tasmania, for the 19th annual conference of the Australasian Research Management Society.

Tasmania is home to many research institutions and supporters of research, including the University of Tasmania, the Australian Antarctic Division, CSIRO, and the Royal Hobart Hospital Foundation just to name a few.

This year’s conference theme Research Futures: thinking long term in a world of short attention spans aims to build discussion across all areas of research administration and management on how best to position and support research for future global and local needs, what infrastructure is needed to invest in now for the future, and how to ensure research creates an impact.

The Program Committee has been building 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 are all passionate about this profession, so you are encouraged to make the most of the networking opportunities, whether at the conference concurrent sessions, in the breaks, or at the social functions.

We hope you enjoy the conference in Hobart.

Adele Kay and Dr Megan Dean
Conference Co-Convenors, ARMS 2018

On behalf of the Australasian Research Management Society (ARMS), I welcome you to the 19th Annual Conference of ARMS in Hobart, Tasmania, Australia.

ARMS is the Australasian association dedicated to supporting the development of research management professionals; the promotion of the profession of research management; and the advancement of the research enterprise. The annual conference is an important part of what ARMS offers its members because it is an opportunity to bring our profession together to share knowledge and experiences, as well as to network with like-minded individuals.

The 2018 conference is centred on "Research Futures: Thinking long term in a world of short attention spans". The 2018 Conference and Program Organising Committee have developed a compelling program of nationally and internationally renowned speakers, as well as oral and poster presentations from delegates and industry exhibitions. I take this opportunity to acknowledge the generosity of our conference partners, sponsors, presenters and other supporters whose contributions are imperative in making this conference a success. I also urge you to take time during your stay to explore one of the most pristine and beautiful places in the world in Hobart and its surrounds.

Enjoy the conference!

Dr Campbell Thomson
President, ARMS
**Welcome to Tasmania**

Hobart is Tasmania’s capital city and the second oldest capital in Australia, after Sydney. Located at the entrance to the Derwent River, its well-preserved surrounding bushland reaches close to the city centre and beaches line the shores of the river and estuary beyond. With its captivating history, picturesque waterways, rugged mountains and gourmet experiences, the city has something for everyone!

**Conference Venue**

Hotel Grand Chancellor Hobart  
1 Davey Street, Hobart  
Phone: +61 3 6235 4535

**Registration Desk**

The Conference Registration Desk will be situated on the Mezzanine level and will be staffed as follows:

**Tuesday 18 September 2018**  
8.00am–5.30pm

**Wednesday 19 September 2018**  
8.00am–5.00pm

**Thursday 20 September 2018**  
8.00am–5.00pm

**Friday 21 September 2018**  
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**

Car parking is available for hotel guests and is located under the hotel for an additional cost. Access to the car park is from the rear of the building on Macquarie Street. From the hotel’s main entrance drive along Davey street which is one way and then turn right on Argyle Street and immediately right again onto Macquarie Street.

**Useful phone numbers**

Police/Ambulance/Fire Brigade: 000  
City Cab: 131 008  
Hobart Maxi Taxi: 13 32 22  
Metro Tas Information Hotline: 13 22 01

**Wireless internet**

For free internet access throughout the hotel, sign in to Wifi network ‘ARMS2018’ with password ‘ARMS2018’ using your device.

**Announcements and Changes**

General announcements and program changes will be made via the conference app.

**Disclaimer**

The information is correct at the time of printing. 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 2018 CONFERENCE APP

ARMS 2018 Conference App

The ARMS 2018 Conference App is compatible with iPhones, iPads and Android phones and tablets.

The ARMS 2018 Conference 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
- 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 2018 Conference App:

DOWNLOAD THE APP

The event app is your guide to all the event information you’ll need. 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 2018 Conference App, just enter the event code below and then your email address to log in.

EVENT CODE: ARMS2018
Success has a silent partner.

For over 20 years, ResearchMaster has been quietly supporting the pioneering endeavours of Australasian Universities and Research Administrators, and we continue to be the leading provider of research management solutions in Australia and New Zealand.

ResearchMaster’s complete product suite manages all aspects of the university research lifecycle, including pre & post award grants, research outputs, ethics and postgraduate students.

For further information, please call us on 03 9320 9002 or visit researchmaster.com.au
SOCIAL FUNCTIONS

Welcome Reception
Date: Tuesday 18 September 2018
Time: 5.30pm - 7.30pm
Location: ARMS Exhibition Area, Mezzanine Level, Hotel Grand Chancellor
Dress: Smart casual

Conference Gala Dinner
Date: Thursday 20 September 2018
Time: 7.00pm – 11:00pm
Location: Glen Albyn Estate
Dress: Cocktail Attire

Buses for delegates to the venue will depart from the Hotel Grand Chancellor from 6:20pm onwards
PARTNERS

Platinum Partner

University of Tasmania

The University of Tasmania is ranked among the top research-intensive universities in Australia. The strength and diversity of our research is reflected in our consistent world-class performance across a breadth of disciplines.

Our researchers are global leaders in their field, and together, are pioneering advances in numerous fields of study. In science, we have world-class credentials in Antarctic, marine and maritime studies, environmental management, sustainability, and agriculture. Our research programs in community health, genetics, and epidemiology are improving health outcomes on an international scale. In the arts, we are fully engaged in the cultural and creative industries, fostering vibrant, connected communities. We seek to expand knowledge through analysis, innovation, and insight using state-of-the-art research facilities and a truly multi-disciplinary approach.

Tasmania’s island setting provides a diverse physical environment in which to observe and understand some of the most significant challenges facing Australia and the world. Our research themes are inspired by our locality and build on the advantages provided by our distinct physical, social, and cultural landscapes.

We are committed to ensuring that our research breakthroughs deliver transformative public benefits. To learn more about research at the University of Tasmania, please visit utas.edu.au/research/

Gold Partner

ResearchMaster

ResearchMaster Pty Ltd is Australasia’s leading research management solution provider, with a solid and proven foundation to provide management of an organisation’s complete research lifecycle.

RME is a collaborative cloud based system, enabling you to collect, store and manage 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 and saving processing time.

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

Contact ResearchMaster on +61 3 9320 9003 or visit www.researchmaster.com.au
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 has a reputation for being innovative, making a distinctive contribution to higher education and conducting research that enhances the economic, environmental and cultural life of each of our local communities.

We have more than 500 active partnerships in 57 countries supporting academic and research collaboration and are always seeking new avenues of engagement.
The freedom to focus.

As a researcher, finding answers is what really matters. To allow you to truly focus, ResearchMaster Enterprise seamlessly collects, manages and reports on the full lifecycle of research activities across your organisation. This extraordinary research management system also solves day-to-day operational problems through automation and workflow processes, and assists with long-term and strategic issues through its reporting and integration tools.

For further information, please call us on 03 9320 9002 or visit researchmaster.com.au
## TRADE EXHIBITION

The trade exhibition will be located in the Federation Ballroom.

### EXHIBITION DAYS
- Tuesday 18th September
- Wednesday 19th September
- Thursday 20th September
- Friday 21st September

### OPENING HOURS
- Tuesday 18th September: 5:30pm – 7:30pm
- Wednesday 19th September: 8:00am – 5:00pm
- Thursday 20th September: 8:00am – 5:00pm
- Friday 21st September: 8:00am – 2:30pm

### EXHIBITORS:

**Booth 1**
**Clarivate Analytics**
Benjamin Clark
100 Harris Street, Pyrmont, Sydney, NSW 2009
T: +61 401 504 223
E: Benjamin.Clark@clarivate.com
W: https://clarivate.com/australia-southeast-asia/

**Booth 2**
**Elsevier Australia**
Adam Serry
Tower 1, Level 12, 475 Victoria Ave, Chatswood NSW 2067
T: 1800 263 951
E: a.serry@elsevier.com
W: https://www.elsevier.com/en-au

**Booth 3**
**InfoEd Global**
Damian Davini
5 Washington Sq STE2, Albany NY 12205, USA
T: +61 433 797 906
E: ddavini@infoedglobal.com
W: http://infoedglobal.com/

**Booth 4**
**University Office**
Todd Melville and Peter Mackie
110 Drummond St, Carlton VIC 3053
T: +61 439 696 655
E: sales@universityoffice.com.au
W: www.universityoffice.com.au

**Booth 5**
**Research Professional**
Nicky Cooper
Unit 111, Curtain House, 134-146 Curtain Road, London, EC2A 3AR, UK
T: +44 20 7216 6500
E: sales@researchresearch.com
W: www.researchresearch.com

**Booth 6**
**Digital Science**
Lauren Martin
E: l.martin@digital-science.com
W: www.digital-science.com

**Booth 7**
**ResearchMaster Pty Ltd**
Matthew Rowe
Level 5, 355 Spencer Street, West Melbourne
T: +61 3 9320 9003
E: info@researchmaster.com.au
W: www.researchmaster.com.au

**Booth 8**
**Australasian Research Management Society (ARMS)**
Maria Zollo
T: +61 8 8201 5595 or mobile: +61 (0) 402 418 973
E: admin_officer@researchmanagement.org.au
W: www.researchmanagement.org.au
### TRADE EXHIBITION

**Table 9**
**Wikimedia Australia**
Pru Mitchell  
PO Box 2062 Bennettswood VIC 3125  
E: contact@wikimedia.org.au  
W: https://wikimedia.org.au

**Table 10**
**Vertigo Ventures**  
Bob Fedorciow  
Vertigo Ventures Ltd, East Side Offices, King’s Cross, York Way, Kings Cross, London N1C 4AX  
T: +44 (0) 7712182321  
E: bob@vertigoventures.com  
W: www.vertigoventures.com

**Table 11**
**F1Solutions**  
Gus Boman  
Level 1, 103 Northbourne Ave, Turner ACT 2612  
T: +61 2 6245 7999  
E: info@f1solutions.com.au  
W: www.f1solutions.com.au

**Table 12**
**Ex Libris (Pty Ltd) Australia**  
Amanda Healy  
Level 1, 607 St Kilda Road, Melbourne  
T: 0436 347 373  
E: Amanda.healy@exlibrisgroup.com  
W: www.exlibrisgroup.com

**Table 13**
**Oxford University Press/Epigeum**  
Sarah McMillan  
Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP  
T: +44 (0) 1865 556767  
E: onlinequeries.uk@oup.com  
W: https://www.epigeum.com/

**Table 14**
**Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (ANZCTR)**  
Matthew Wynn  
92-94 Parramatta Road, Camperdown, NSW 2050  
T: +61 2 9562 5069  
E: matthew.wynn@ctc.usyd.edu.au  
W: www.anzctr.org.au

**Table 15**
**Infonetica Ltd**  
Ainsley Martlew, General Manager  
Level 5, 9 Help Street, Chatswood NSW 2067  
T: +61 (0) 2 9037 8404  
E: enquiries@infonetica.net  
W: www.infonetica.net

**Table 16**
**The GrantEd Group**  
Dr Lynette Airey and Kirsten Bartlett (In TAS)  
Suite 1.06A Centre Road, Bentleigh VIC 3204  
T: Linda Andonopoulos 0400155224 or  
Dr Lynette Airey 043358188 and  
Kirsten Bartlett 0438150673 (In TAS)  
E: hello@thegrantedgroup.com.au  
W: www.thegrantedgroup.com.au

**Table 17**
**Johns Hopkins University**  
Dr. Marianne Woods and  
Mr. Patrick Moody  
1717 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Suite 819, Washington, D.C. 20036-2005  
T: +1 202-562-0366  
E: mwoods9@jhu.edu  
W: www.advanced.jhu.edu/researchadmin

**Table 18**
**Kudos**  
Charlie Rapple  
Unit 3&4 Ashurst Court, London Road, Wheatley, Oxford OX33 1ER  
T: +44 01865 872527  
E: charlie.a.rapple@growkudos.com  
W: www.growkudos.com

**Table 19**
**Cgov**  
Darryl Stuart  
L3 54 Jephson St, Brisbane QLD, 4066  
T: +61 7 3211 4444  
E: dstuart@cgov.com.au  
W: www.cgov.com.au
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 is being run 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 is being run in 2018.

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

The ARC is proud to sponsor the 2018 ARMS Conference.
KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

Dr. Lara Boyd
Neuroscientist and Physical Therapist, University of British Columbia

Dr. Lara Boyd is a Neuroscientist and Physical Therapist at the University of British Columbia. She is a professor and has held a Canada Research Chair, a Michael Smith Foundation for Health Career Scientist award and been a Peter Wall Scholar. Dr. Boyd directs the Brain Behaviour Lab at the University of British Columbia. Her work is centered on answering the question of what limits, and what facilitates, neuroplasticity. Dr. Boyd also serves as the Health Research Advisor to the Vice President for Research and is the university’s delegate to the Canadians Institutes of Health Research.

In 2009, Noel’s attention turned to philanthropy where he led the establishment of Research Australia’s successful philanthropy program as the Director of Philanthropy.

He was a member of the Federal Government’s Advisory Council for Intellectual Property (ACIP) from 2009-2014, advising the Federal Minister for Innovation, Industry, Science and Research and was Chair of the ACIP review into collaborations between publicly funded research organisations and industry. The Minister released this report in late 2012.

Dr Noel Chambers
CEO, National Foundation for Medical Research and Innovation

Noel was appointed as the Chief Executive Officer of the Foundation in April 2013. He has a PhD in pharmacology/medicinal chemistry from the University of Sydney. His work experience includes positions in research, research translation, commercialisation, start-up companies, biotechnology and philanthropy.

In the early 90’s his patented discoveries in type II diabetes led to a commercial partnership where he lead a team of researchers at the University of Sydney and for which he was presented the Royal Australian Chemical Institute’s Biota Award for Medicinal Chemistry. Noel then moved into industry where he held senior management positions in research and business development before becoming the CEO of a number of listed (ASX) and unlisted biotechnology/health related companies.

Barney Glover
Vice-Chancellor and President, Western Sydney University

Professor Barney Glover assumed his position at Western Sydney University in January 2014.

Professor Glover is currently the President of the Board of Trustees of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Trust and the Australian Government representative on the University of the South Pacific Grants Committee. He is also a Board Member of the Australian American Fulbright Commission, and The Committee for Sydney, and, Member of the NSW Innovation and Productivity Council and the NSW Arts and Culture Advisory Committee. Professor Glover is a Fellow of the Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering (ATSE), a Fellow of the Royal Society of NSW (FRSN), and a Member of the Australian Institute of Company Directors (MAICD).

Professor Glover’s esteemed career also includes significant expertise and experience at the most senior levels of university management and substantial business leadership credentials. He has also served on the boards of a range of corporate organisations and several state and national centres covering areas such as health and medical research, energy, mineral exploration, and telecommunications.
KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

Professor Brigid Heywood (BSc) (PhD)
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research), University of Tasmania

Professor Brigid Heywood (BSc) (PhD) is Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) at the University of Tasmania. Professor Heywood has responsibility for the research and innovation strategy of the University, the University research institutes, research students, research infrastructure and commercialisation services.

Prior to taking up this position, Professor Heywood was the Assistant Vice-Chancellor Research, Academic and Enterprise at Massey University in New Zealand, where she led the development and implementation of strategies, policies and standards that underpin its research and teaching effort. Preceding this position Professor Heywood held the office of Pro Vice-Chancellor for Research and Enterprise at England’s Open University.

Professor Heywood holds a BSc (Hons) in Biological Sciences from Manchester University (UK) and received her PhD from Liverpool University (UK) where she specialised in studies of biomineralisation. Her subsequent research career developed out of the discipline transition from applied biological sciences to materials chemistry. A trail blazer in many respects, she the first woman in the United Kingdom to hold an established Chair in Inorganic Chemistry – a notable achievement given her founding disciplinary background.

Professor Mai Har Sham
Associate Vice-President (Research), University of Hong Kong

Professor Sham is the Associate Vice-President (Research) of the University of Hong Kong. She assists the university senior management team in developing the University’s research in Hong Kong and mainland China, research integrity and research data management policy and education, as well as enhancing the quality of research postgraduate education. Professor Sham has delivered plenary and keynote lectures on the roles of universities on research integrity issues in different continents. She is the Co-Chair for the 6th World Conference on Research Integrity to be held in Hong Kong in 2019.

Professor Sham obtained her PhD in Biochemistry from the University of Cambridge. She received her postdoctoral training in Developmental Genetics in the National Institute for Medical Research in London, U.K., before joining the University of Hong Kong. She served as Assistant Dean (Research) and Head of the Department of Biochemistry in the Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine. She is currently Convenor of the Research Cluster of Developmental and Stem Cell Biology in the School of Biomedical Sciences in the Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, the University of Hong Kong. As a developmental geneticist, Professor Sham leads a research team that focuses on the molecular mechanisms of mammalian development and mouse models of human congenital disorders. Her research programmes cover areas of gene regulation in development, molecular control of neural crest differentiation, genetic bases and mutant mouse models of human diseases, and neural stem cells.
Barbara Warren combines her love of sport and her background in professional theatre to coach executives, managers and teams to work with greater energy and passion. The objective of Barbara’s practical sessions is for all participants to strive for clear, authentic communication practice. A four times New York marathoner and a keen surfer, Barbara designs and facilitates a range of creative training programs examining how the very breathing techniques and the passionate pursuit of objective she employs in long distance running, are exactly the same for impactful workplace presentations and building communication presence and confidence.

Barbara is the lead presentation skills coach for both the Telstra Australian Business Awards and the Telstra Business Women’s Awards and she is a regular presenter throughout the University of Tasmania and the Australian Maritime College. She has completed post graduate studies at Harvard working across the Law School (Negotiation and Mediation practice) and Executive Education (Leadership).

Barbara is a passionate advocate for lifelong learning. She has used the skills from her theatre background for over twenty five years encouraging business professionals, media personalities, elite athletes, lecturers, PhD students and researchers to value dynamic communication practices and to be engaging presenters and leaders.

**INVITED SPEAKERS**

**Professor Clive Baldock**  
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Researcher Development) & Dean of Graduate Research, University of Tasmania

**Professor Roland De Marco**  
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation), University of the Sunshine Coast

**Dr Rosanne Ellis**  
Acting Pro Vice Chancellor, Research & Innovation, Auckland University of Technology

**Professor Lucy Johnston**  
Dean of Graduate Research, University of Newcastle

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

**Amy Phillips**  
Acting Director, Policy and Integrity, Australian Research Council

**Professor Laura Poole-Warren**  
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research Training) and Dean of Graduate Research, UNSW Sydney

**Dr Belinda Westman**  
Assistant Director, Ethics and Integrity Section, National Health & Medical Research Council
THEME LEADER PRESENTERS

Collaboration & Multidisciplinary Projects
- A/Prof Jonathan Binns, University of Tasmania
  (Concurrent Session 1)
- Dr Kirby-Jane Hallum, University of Otago
  (Concurrent Session 12)
- May Cheng, Michelle Armstrong, Monash University
  (Concurrent Session 22)

Ethics & Integrity
- Dr Ted Rohr, UNSW Sydney
  (Concurrent Session 2)
- Elise Grosser, University of Melbourne
  (Concurrent Session 14)

Global Future, Local Needs
- Connie Mogg, Monash University
  Pallavi Khanna, Shine Wing
  (Concurrent Session 3)

Creating, Recording and Communicating Engagement and Impact
- Carmela Sergi, Flinders University
  (Concurrent Session 4)
- Keith Brophy, Dr Richard Cook, University of Wollongong
  (Concurrent Session 10)
- Dr Lesley Ashton, The University of Sydney
  (Concurrent Session 16)

Research Funding
- Prof Andrea Bishop, Griffith University
  (Concurrent Session 5)
- Dr Che O'May, University of Tasmania
  (Concurrent Session 9)
- Justin Manzano, La Trobe University
  (Concurrent Session 21)

Investing in Research’s Future
- Prof Roland de Marco, University of the Sunshine Coast
  (Concurrent Session 6)
- Dr Julia Tresidder, Dr Wee-Ming Boon, NHMRC
  (Concurrent Session 13)

Research Information, Analytics, Reporting & Performance
- Stephen Hannan, Western Sydney University
  (Concurrent Session 7)
- Andy Mabbet, Wikimedia
  (Concurrent Session 20)
- Dr Michelle Krahe, Griffith University
  (Concurrent Session 23)

HDR Matters
- Lena Caruso, University of New South Wales
  (Concurrent Session 11)

Working with Regional, Rural, Remote & Indigenous Communities
- Sarah Bascomb, Professor Maggie Walter, University of Tasmania
  (Concurrent Session 24)
Learn more about our world-leading research at mq.edu.au/research
PRE-CONFERENCE ACTIVITIES

ACCREDITATION MODULES

Accreditation Module 1.1-Aus: National Research and Innovation Systems in Australia
Date: Tuesday 18 September 2018
Time: 9:00am – 12:30pm
Venue: Grand Ballroom 1, Hotel Grand Chancellor
Presenter: Tania Tambiah

Accreditation Module 2.1: Pre-Award Grant Processes
Date: Tuesday 18 September 2018
Time: 9:00am – 12:30pm
Venue: Grand Ballroom 2, Hotel Grand Chancellor
Presenter: Dr Bryony Wakefield

Accreditation Module 2.3: Research Finance
Date: Tuesday 18 September 2018
Time: 1:30pm – 5:00pm
Venue: Grand Ballroom 1, Hotel Grand Chancellor
Presenter: Shubhra Roy

Accreditation Module 6.1: Working with Industry
Date: Tuesday 18 September 2018
Time: 1:30pm – 5:00pm
Venue: Grand Ballroom 2, Hotel Grand Chancellor
Presenter: Dr Mark Hochman

PRE-CONFERENCE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS

WORKSHOP 1
Dealing with Conflict in the Workplace
Date: Tuesday 18 September 2018
Time: 9:00am - 12.30pm
Venue: Grand Ballroom 3, Hotel Grand Chancellor
Presenter: Barbara Warren

WORKSHOP 2
Interpreting and implementing the new Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research
Date: Tuesday 18 September 2018
Time: 9:00am - 12.30pm
Venue: Harbour View 1, Hotel Grand Chancellor
Presenters: Dr Ted Rohr, Dr Karolyn White, Dr Rebecca Halligan, Bronwyn Greene, Elise Grosser, Belinda Westman, Amy Phillips and Dr Elizabeth Visser

WORKSHOP 3
Managing and developing high performing research support teams
Date: Tuesday 18 September 2018
Time: 1:30pm – 5:00pm
Venue: Grand Ballroom 3, Hotel Grand Chancellor
Presenter: Louise Fleck, Dr Ross McLennan, Professor Andrea Bishop

WORKSHOP 4
Enhancing publication reporting with data visualisations: an introduction to VOSViewer
Date: Tuesday 18 September 2018
Time: 1:30pm – 5:00pm
Venue: Harbour View 1, Hotel Grand Chancellor
Presenter: Eleanor Colla, Sarah Brown

WORKSHOP 5
Engineering and eloquence: Procedural, technical, and language aspects of grant-application development
Date: Tuesday 18 September 2018
Time: 1:30pm – 5:00pm
Venue: Harbour View 2, Hotel Grand Chancellor
Presenter: Dr Alan Crosier
APPLICATIONS FOR ON ACCELERATE NOW OPEN

Apply now for CSIRO’s accelerator closes 28 September 2018

ON Accelerate®, powered by CSIRO, is a free, full time, practical program designed to help you and your team learn new skills, giving you the tools to make things happen. It is open for all Australian publicly funded and university researchers.

Team up with the nation’s leading lean innovation experts and mentors in this fast paced experience, designed to get you moving.

Apply now at oninnovation.com.au

Find us on Twitter @ONaccelerator

Curtin University leaps into the top 1% of universities worldwide.

Curtin has been recognised by the prestigious Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU 2017), respected for its research-orientated ranking measures including research output and number of Highly Cited Researchers. Curtin’s significant rise positions us as a leading global university, and reflects our growing reputation for research excellence.

research.curtin.edu.au
ARMS 2018 MEETINGS

ARMS BOARD MEETING
Date: Monday 17th September 2018
Time: 9:00am – 5:00pm
Venue: Chancellor Room 4, Hotel Grand Chancellor
Onsite Contact: Maria Zollo

CHAPTERS
Meeting: ACT Chapter
Date: Tuesday 18th September 2018
Time: 7:30pm onwards
Venue: The Atrium Bar, Hotel Grand Chancellor
Co-Convenors: Catherine Karcher

Meeting: NSW Chapter
Date: Wednesday 19th September 2018
Time: 12:30pm – 1:15pm
Venue: Chancellor Room 4, Hotel Grand Chancellor
Onsite Contact: Debbie Docherty

Meeting: WA Chapter
Date: Wednesday 19th September 2018
Time: 12:30pm – 1:15pm
Venue: Harbour View Room 2, Hotel Grand Chancellor
Onsite Contact: Tara McLaren

SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS
Social Event: University Research Directors SIG
(by invitation only)
Date: Tuesday 18th September 2018
Time: 7:30pm - late
Venue: Post Street Social, 11 – 13 Franklin Wharf
Onsite Contact: Andrea Bishop, Donna Hannan and Sharon Martin

Meeting: Research Information and Reporting SIG
Date: Thursday 20th September 2018
Time: 12:30pm – 1:15pm
Venue: Chancellor Room 4, Hotel Grand Chancellor
Onsite Contact: Stephen Hannan

Meeting: Research Finance Managers SIG
Date: Thursday 20th September 2018
Time: 12:30pm – 1:15pm
Venue: Harbour View Room 2, Hotel Grand Chancellor
Onsite Contact: Connie Mogg

OTHER SOCIAL EVENTS
Accredited Research Managers (Professional) ARMP, Accredited Research Managers (Foundation) ARMF and ARMS Training Fellows event
(by invitation only)
Date: Wednesday 19th September 2018
Time: 5:30pm – 6:30pm
Venue: The Atrium Bar, Hotel Grand Chancellor
Onsite Contact: Maria Zollo
ARMS Accreditation Programs

ARMS Professional Level Accreditation Program

The Professional 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 two cohorts of Accredited Research Managers (Professional) or ARMPs have successfully completed the program. We congratulate the following ARMPs on their achievements:

2016 Cohort

- Judy Alexander, The University of Newcastle
- Dr 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
- Dr 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
- Dr Bryony Wakefield, The University of Melbourne
- Dr Lisa Yen, ARC Centre for Excellence in Cognition and its Disorders, Macquarie University
- Dr Tsharni Zazryn, Monash University

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 253 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>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>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Worsley</td>
<td>Australian Catholic University/Macquarie</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<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>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>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>YuHui (Mark) Li</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>Nov-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>Amanda Moseley</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Munns</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>Nov-17</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>Annette Harris</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Barkley</td>
<td>CSIRO</td>
<td>Dec-15</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>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>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>
<tr>
<td>Grace Lamont</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Apr-15</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>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>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>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>Anneli Robshaw</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deepa Sharma Acharya</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jananee Raguragavan</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Mar-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>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>
</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>Jodie Parkinson</td>
<td>Federation University of Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elanor Mahon</td>
<td>Federation University of Australia</td>
<td>May-14</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>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-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raimond Placidi</td>
<td>Federation University of Australia</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Read</td>
<td>Federation University of Australia</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<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>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>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>Susan McGrath</td>
<td>James Cook University</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Nunn</td>
<td>James Cook University</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Pearson</td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerryn Westcott</td>
<td>Ludwig Institute for Cancer Research</td>
<td>Sep-14</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>Athena Bangara</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Nov-17</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 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>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>
</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>Sarah Oliver</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanalysa 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>Christine Farmer</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Armstrong</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anh Chau</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrissandra Zagami</td>
<td>Murdoch Childrens Research Institute</td>
<td>May-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Ciavarella</td>
<td>Murdoch Childrens Research Institute</td>
<td>May-14</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>Joycelyn Tang</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>Nov-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>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>
<tr>
<td>Krisnan Kumutha</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>May-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riduan Bin Mazlan</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>May-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Ho</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>May-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Sung</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>May-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne Ng</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>May-16</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>Boris Sarcevic</td>
<td>RMIT University</td>
<td>Nov-17</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>Suzanne Ryan</td>
<td>Sunshine Coast Hospital and Health Service</td>
<td>Dec-14</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>
</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>Lachlan Doughney</td>
<td>Swinburne University</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Hamilton-Brown</td>
<td>Swinburne University</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<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>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>Danielle Hughes</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzy Hainsworth</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Bressanutti</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimity Evans</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliette Dupre Husser</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Blasioli</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Mar-17</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>Adelene Auyong</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Mar-18</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>Alan Hales</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodi McLean</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie Hugo</td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anya 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>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>Hayley Coppinger</td>
<td>The University of Notre Dame Australia</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>Carmen Buttery</td>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Nicholls</td>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandrine Kingston-Ducrot</td>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monika Dzidowska</td>
<td>The University of Sydney</td>
<td>May-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Telleria Teixeira</td>
<td>The University of Sydney</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernadette Ferns</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deirdre Bourke</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanh Tran</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</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>Leonisa Manea</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</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>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>Rachel Benton</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Mitchell</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Stead-Wynne</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Nov-17</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>Amanda Elliott</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>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>Diane Arnott</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Miotti</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Aug-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>Jennifer Grant</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-14</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>Katrina Toufexis</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-15</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>Lisa Melvin</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maruf Razzaq</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-14</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>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Date of Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Miller</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosanna Marchesani</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Aug-17</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>Gail Dixon</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Wragg</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Mar-18</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>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>Julie Orr</td>
<td>University of New England</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Leonard</td>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
<td>Apr-16</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>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>Karen Gomez</td>
<td>University of Technology Sydney</td>
<td>Mar-18</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>Daniele Ryrie</td>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>Aug-15</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>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>Kate Vincent</td>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>Aug-15</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>Rebecca Cook-Johnson</td>
<td>Walter and Eliza Hall Institute</td>
<td>May-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng Yue Pan</td>
<td>Workplace Safety and Health Institute, Singapore</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 0800 - 0900 | Registration  
Mezzanine  
Research Site Tours  
See website for current details |
| 0900 - 1030 | Professional Development Workshops:  
Module 1.1: AUS - National Research and Innovation System in Australia  
Presented by Tania Tambiah  
Module 2.1: Pre-award Grant Processes  
Presented by Dr Bryony Wakefield  
Workshop 1: Dealing with Conflict in the Workplace  
Presented by Barbara Warren  
Workshop 2: Interpreting and implementing the new Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research  
Dr Ted Rohr & Dr Karolyn White, Convenors ARMS Ethics & Integrity SIG;  
Dr Rebecca Halligan (Chair Go8 Ethics & Integrity Group), Bronwyn Greene, Elise Grosser;  
Belinda Westman, NHMRC;  
Amy Phillips, ARC;  
and Dr Elizabeth Visser, University of Auckland |
| 1030 - 1100 | MORNING TEA |
| 1100 - 1230 | Professional Development Workshops (continues)  
Module 1.1: AUS - National Research and Innovation System in Australia (continues)  
Module 2.1: Pre-award Grant Processes (continues)  
Workshop 1: Dealing with Conflict in the Workplace (continues)  
Presented by Barbara Warren (continues)  
Workshop 2: Interpreting and implementing the new Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (continues) |
<p>| 1230 - 1330 | LUNCH |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1330 - 1500</td>
<td>Professional Development Workshop 3: Managing and developing high performing research support teams</td>
<td>Grand Ballroom 1</td>
<td>Presented by Louise Fleck, Macquarie University; Dr Ross McLennan, Uni SA; Professor Andrea Bishop, Griffith University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330 - 1530</td>
<td>Accreditation Module 2.3: Research Finance (continues)</td>
<td>Grand Ballroom 2</td>
<td>Presented by Shubhra Roy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530 - 1700</td>
<td>Professional Development Workshop 4: Enhancing publication reporting with data visualisations: an introduction to VOSViewer (continues)</td>
<td>Grand Ballroom 3</td>
<td>Presented by Eleanor Colla, University of New England Library; Sarah Brown, University of Queensland Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530 - 1700</td>
<td>Accreditation Module 6.1: Working with Industry (continues)</td>
<td>Harbour View 1</td>
<td>Presented by Dr Mark Hochman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530 - 1700</td>
<td>Professional Development Workshop 5: Engineering and eloquence: Procedural, technical, and language aspects of grant application development (continues)</td>
<td>Harbour View 2</td>
<td>Presented by Dr Alan Crosier, Research Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730 - 1900</td>
<td>Welcome Reception</td>
<td>Exhibition Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800</td>
<td><strong>REGISTRATION</strong></td>
<td>Mezzanine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0845</td>
<td>Move to Main Auditorium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0850</td>
<td><strong>CONFERENCE OPENING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0920</td>
<td>Welcome to Country</td>
<td>Plenary Auditorium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome from Convenors / ARMS President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adele Kay, Dr Megan Dean, University of Tasmania, Conference Co-Convenors Dr Campbell Thomson, ARMS President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome Address from The Governor of Tasmania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Her Excellency Professor the Honourable Kate Warner AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020</td>
<td><strong>PLENARY SESSION 1</strong></td>
<td>Plenary Auditorium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030</td>
<td>Delegate Group Photo</td>
<td>Plenary Auditorium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030</td>
<td><strong>MORNING TEA</strong></td>
<td>Exhibition Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROGRAM

### WEDNESDAY 19 SEPTEMBER 2018

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1100 - 1230</td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT SESSION 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Collaboration &amp; Multidisciplinary Projects&lt;br&gt;Chair: Nigel Blundell, University of Tasmania</td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT SESSION 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;Ethics &amp; Integrity&lt;br&gt;Chair: Lauren Di Palma, University of Tasmania</td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT SESSION 3</strong>&lt;br&gt;Global Future, Local Needs&lt;br&gt;Chair: Bryony Wakefield, University of Melbourne</td>
<td><strong>CONCURRENT SESSION 4</strong>&lt;br&gt;Creating, Recording and Communicating Engagement and Impact&lt;br&gt;Chair: Marc Fellman, University of Notre Dame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 - 1130</td>
<td>A/Prof Jonathan Bins, University of Tasmania&lt;br&gt;Value Adding to AQF Level 10 – Integrating Research, Education and Manufacturing in the Naval Design and Manufacturing Industries&lt;br&gt;<strong>Theme Leader Presentation</strong></td>
<td>Dr Ted Rohr, UNSW Sydney&lt;br&gt;What are the common pillars of ethics and compliance management?&lt;br&gt;<strong>Theme Leader Presentation</strong></td>
<td>Connie Mogg, Monash University&lt;br&gt;Pallavi Khanna, Shine Wing&lt;br&gt;Navigating the US compliance minefield – How to not get “Trumped!”&lt;br&gt;<strong>Theme Leader Presentation</strong></td>
<td>Carmela Sergi, Flinders University&lt;br&gt;Celebrating 10 years of successful research and industry engagement with impact: The Medical Device Partnering Program&lt;br&gt;<strong>Theme Leader Presentation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130 - 1145</td>
<td>Dr Miranda Smith, The University of Melbourne&lt;br&gt;Case study of APPRISE, a Centre of Research Excellence with consultation requirement&lt;br&gt;<strong>Theme Leader Presentation</strong></td>
<td>Dr Rebecca Halligan, University of Sydney&lt;br&gt;Research related complaints in Australia – how many are there and what do we know about them?&lt;br&gt;<strong>Theme Leader Presentation</strong></td>
<td>Meghan Bergamin, The University of Melbourne&lt;br&gt;Global Researchers, Local Research Management: Connectivity in modern research management&lt;br&gt;<strong>Theme Leader Presentation</strong></td>
<td>Dr Chloe Bibari, Dr Andy Flies, University of Tasmania&lt;br&gt;Sharing Science Beyond the Walls of Academia&lt;br&gt;<strong>Theme Leader Presentation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145 - 1200</td>
<td>Lorraine Skelton, Massey University&lt;br&gt;Expectations management of multi sector collaborations: A project framework&lt;br&gt;<strong>Theme Leader Presentation</strong></td>
<td>A/Prof Helen Boon, James Cook University&lt;br&gt;Ethics Education For Sustainability: It Is Not Doing What Is Right That Is Hard. It’s Knowing What Is Right.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Theme Leader Presentation</strong></td>
<td>Ruth Graham, University of Sydney&lt;br&gt;New York, New York – an ARMS-NCURA Fellowship Program in the City&lt;br&gt;<strong>Theme Leader Presentation</strong></td>
<td>Alisha Peart, Lucy Jowett, Northumbria University&lt;br&gt;Turning up the heat on Research Impact: Creating a systematic whole institution review of Impact that’s a catalyst for change&lt;br&gt;<strong>Theme Leader Presentation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 -</td>
<td>Anthony Fortina, University of Western Australia&lt;br&gt;Zen and the Art of Herding Research CATs (Collaborative Academic Taskforces)</td>
<td>135 Dr Ted Rohr &amp; Karolyn White, Ethics &amp; Integrity SIG Convenors&lt;br&gt;Q&amp;A panel discussion on the SIG's role in implementing the new Code of Responsible Conduct of Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215</td>
<td>Melissa Glenister, The University of Melbourne&lt;br&gt;Developing an international portfolio of funding - a faculty perspective</td>
<td>29 Dr Paul Wong, Australian National Data Service&lt;br&gt;Research Data as an Enabler and Pathway to Research Impact: Lessons from Text Mining the U.K. Impact Case Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215 -</td>
<td>Lisa Simmons, Ms Leonie Clement, Lance Barrie, University of Wollongong&lt;br&gt;The Power of a Real Network</td>
<td>128 Floris van der Leest, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology&lt;br&gt;Showtime for the new House of Wisdom Blooming in the Desert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230 -</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>1315 Move to Main Auditorium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315 -</td>
<td>PLENARY SESSION 2&lt;br&gt;Barbara Warren - Director, Dramatic Difference Training&lt;br&gt;Creating and nurturing positivity in the workplace</td>
<td>1320 - 1400</td>
<td>PLENARY SESSION 2&lt;br&gt;Creating and nurturing positivity in the workplace</td>
<td>1400 - 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 5</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 6</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530 - 1600</td>
<td>Research Funding</td>
<td>Investing in Research's Future</td>
<td>Research Information, Analytics, Reporting &amp; Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Brendon Douglas, Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>Chair: Dr Ross McLennan, University of South Australia</td>
<td>Chair: Connie Mogg, Monash University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Ballroom 1</td>
<td>Grand Ballroom 2</td>
<td>Grand Ballroom 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530 - 1600</td>
<td>Prof Andrea Bishop, Griffith University</td>
<td>Prof Roland de Marco, University of the Sunshine Coast</td>
<td>Stephen Hannan, Western Sydney University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tips for new players - planning for grant success</td>
<td>Building a Great University - A Visionary Mission</td>
<td>Getting the Research Quality Settings Right - embedding research quality into the research promotions process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme Leader Presentation</td>
<td>Theme Leader Presentation</td>
<td>Theme Leader Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600 - 1615</td>
<td>Frank Anastasopoulos, Sophie Cleaves, The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Dr Christopher Adda, La Trobe University</td>
<td>Siobhann McCafferty, Research Data Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helping funding agencies to run good grant rounds - providing guidance in an age of expansion</td>
<td>La Trobe's Approach to Optimising its Use of Research Infrastructure and Capabilities</td>
<td>Persistent Identifiers for Research: integration and platforms throughout the Data Life Cycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615 - 1630</td>
<td>Heather Francis, RHH Research Foundation</td>
<td>Amanda Smith, Alistair Duncan, La Trobe University</td>
<td>Dr Tania Wilmann, Monash University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The role of benefactors in supporting local health and medical researchers'</td>
<td>Taking one for the Team in a Changing Research Office</td>
<td>Assisting staff with their promotions applications using Institutional reporting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630 - 1645</td>
<td>Rose Pongratz, Dr Chloe Bibari, University of Tasmania</td>
<td>Dr Muriel Swighuisen Reigersbery, University of Sydney</td>
<td>Dr Christopher Adda, Ms Sheila Mukerjee, La Trobe University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding with benefits: Building the relationship between the Research Office and the Funding Body</td>
<td>Retaining and Developing Research Leadership Talent: the strategic SOAR program at the University of Sydney.</td>
<td>La Trobe's Collaborative Approach to Digital Research (eResearch)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645 - 1700</td>
<td>Rosa Ward, Dr Sejal Kendal, La Trobe University</td>
<td>Increasing NHMRC funding in a University without a medical school</td>
<td>Harbour View 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700 - 1715</td>
<td>Kate Lowry, Kate Hall, The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Learning From the Past - A study in budget design</td>
<td>Harbour View 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730 - 1830</td>
<td>ARM(P), ARM(F) &amp; ARMS TRAINING FELLOWS NETWORKING EVENT (by invitation only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800 -</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Mezzanine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0845</td>
<td>Move to Main Auditorium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900 -</td>
<td>PLenary Session 3</td>
<td>Plenary Auditorium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0950</td>
<td>Dr Lara Boyd, Neuroscientist and Physical Therapist, University of British Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After This Talk Your Brain Will Not Be The Same: A Research Grants Story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030</td>
<td>PLenary Session 4</td>
<td>Plenary Auditorium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Dr Noel Chambers - CEO, National Foundation for Medical Research and Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting Medical Research: Intent, Measurement &amp; Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>MORNING TEA</td>
<td>Exhibition Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 -</td>
<td>CONCURRENT SESSION 9</td>
<td>Grand Ballroom 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>Dr Che O'May, University of Tasmania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Game of Grants – Targeted Grant Development Support Based on Reviewer Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme Leader Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 -</td>
<td>CONCURRENT SESSION 10</td>
<td>Grand Ballroom 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>Keith Brophy, Dr Richard Cook, University of Wollongong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profiling Impact: adapting existing resources to educate and engage researchers in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documentation of impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme Leader Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 -</td>
<td>CONCURRENT SESSION 11</td>
<td>Grand Ballroom 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>Lena Caruso, University of New South Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The challenges of HDR and research end user engagement, Watt can be done?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme Leader Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 -</td>
<td>CONCURRENT SESSION 12</td>
<td>Harbour View 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>Dr Kirby-Jane Hallum, University of Otago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach Me How to Name the Bigger Light: Shakespeare and the Art and Science of Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme Leader Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker and Affiliation</td>
<td>Title and Abstract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130 - 1145</td>
<td>Prof Andrea Bishop, Griffith University</td>
<td>To EOI or not to EOI, that is the question...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Faith Welch, University of Auckland</td>
<td>The Art of Developing a University Research Impact Strategy – lessons learnt from the University of Auckland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Helen Ross, University of Auckland</td>
<td>What’s the big idea? Increasing institution-wide engagement in the future of the doctoral candidate experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caryn McNamara, University of the Witwatersrang, Johannesburg</td>
<td>Developing a national curriculum in a disparate Consortium: A data science teaching and research case study from South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145 - 1200</td>
<td>Jane Graham, University of Newcastle</td>
<td>ernal submission and assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Boris Sarcevic, RMIT University</td>
<td>Engagement of managers and researcher’s in funding application development – A former researcher’s perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tara McLaren, Dr Tobias Schoep, Telethon Kids Institute</td>
<td>Developing Systems to Support and Communicate Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Christopher Alomes, University of Tasmania</td>
<td>An Expression of Interest: A new system for a shifting HDR space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Freya Mears, University of New South Wales</td>
<td>UNSW Futures – a new approach to facilitating interdisciplinary research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 - 1215</td>
<td>Dr Georgina Caruana, Dr Alexander Lugg, La Trobe University</td>
<td>Funding and the humanities: Shifting focus from the ARC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Laura García-Carrascosa, Mater Research</td>
<td>Bringing Donors and researchers toGEther – building lasting connections through the BRIDGE program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Kerslake, QUT</td>
<td>The HDR Vision Project - Improving QUT’s HDR Student Experience one interaction at a time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215 - 1230</td>
<td>Dr David Huang, National Institute of Education, Singapore</td>
<td>Understanding the psychology of research collaborations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Julia Kuehns, Ruth McConchie, The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Visualise Your Thesis in 60 seconds: developing a national competition to build essential communication skills for HDRs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Christina Spargo, Menzies</td>
<td>Heating up Collaboration: can Research Administrators really make an impact?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230 - 1315</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Exhibition Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THURSDAY 20 SEPTEMBER 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1315 - 1320</td>
<td>Move to Main Auditorium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1320 - 1350 | Dr Belinda Westman, Assistant Director, Ethics and Integrity Section, National Health & Medical Research Council  
Amy Phillips, Acting Director, Policy and Integrity, Australian Research Council  
ARC/NHMRC Joint Session on the new Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research  
*Plenary Auditorium*                                                           |
| 1350 - 1400 | Move to Sessions                                                        |
| 1400 - 1500 | **CONCURRENT SESSION 13**  
Investing in Research's Future  
Chair: Rochelle Finlay, James Cook University  
*Grand Ballroom 1*                                                             |
| 1400 - 1500 | **CONCURRENT SESSION 14**  
Ethics & Integrity  
Chair: Karolyn White, Macquarie University  
*Grand Ballroom 2*                                                             |
| 1400 - 1500 | **CONCURRENT SESSION 15**  
HDR Matters  
Chair: Fiona Zammit, Edu Management and Consulting  
*Grand Ballroom 3*                                                             |
| 1400 - 1500 | **CONCURRENT SESSION 16**  
Creating, Recording and Communicating Engagement and Impact  
Chair: Michael Crisp, University of South Australia  
*Harbour View 1*                                                              |
| 1400 - 1430 | Dr Julia Tresidder, Dr Wee-Ming Boon, NHMRC  
NHMRC: FAIR in Focus  
*Theme Leader Presentation*                                                    |
| 1400 - 1430 | Elise Grosser, University of Melbourne  
Strengthening the Foundations of Trust: Institutional Investigator Training for Research Integrity Investigations  
*Theme Leader Presentation*                                                    |
| 1400 - 1430 | Dean of Graduate Research Panel Discussion facilitated by Fiona Zammit  
Prof Lucy Johnston (University of Newcastle)  
Prof Clive Baldock (University of Tasmania)  
Prof Laura Poole-Warren (University of NSW)  
*Theme Leader Presentation*                                                    |
| 1400 - 1430 | Dr Lesley Ashton, The University of Sydney  
Challenges of measuring the benefits of university research: Ei2018 at The University of Sydney  
*Theme Leader Presentation*                                                    |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session/Contributor</th>
<th>Title/Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1430 - 1445</td>
<td>Katherine Christian, Cure Cancer Australia</td>
<td>Invest in Job Satisfaction of Early Career Researchers in the Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1445 - 1500</td>
<td>Dr Jessica Gilbey, Catherine Mathews, Australian Catholic University</td>
<td>ACU Strategies for Investing in Research’s Future: The Tinkered Grant and the Tailored Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 - 1530</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea / Poster Session 2*</td>
<td>Exhibition Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530 - 1545</td>
<td>Bev Baugh, Sian Wright, Monash University</td>
<td>Winning hearts and minds - embedding impact into practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545 - 1600</td>
<td>Helen Sowey, University of New South Wales</td>
<td>The measurement tail should not be wagging the impact dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530 - 1545</td>
<td>Thomas Wright, The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Prevention vs Punishment: Using Technology to Promote Research Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545 - 1600</td>
<td>Alma-Mary McFarland, Children’s Cancer Institute</td>
<td>Research Integrity - Individual Responsibility or Collective Obligation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530 - 1545</td>
<td>Karen Jacobs, Flinders University</td>
<td>Everyone is a winner: Enabling change and impact through a digital HDR candidature management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545 - 1600</td>
<td>Ashleigh Roberts, Murdoch University</td>
<td>What is the perceived value of Industry Engagement in the Australian PhD?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1600 - 1615</td>
<td>Tim Macuga, ARC Centre of Excellence for Mathematical &amp; Statistical Frontiers</td>
<td>Think Outcomes, not Outputs. Incorporating communications and engagement for research impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louise Wheeler, Sharyn Wise, University of Technology Sydney</td>
<td>End-to-End Research Data Management for the Responsible Conduct of Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shauna-Lee Ward, University of Tasmania</td>
<td>Single Point of Failures – Restructuring to remove single point dependencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Arti Appannah, La Trobe University</td>
<td>Open Access, citations and research impact: what does the literature say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615 - 1630</td>
<td>Cheryl Claridge, Katie Donnelly, Federation University Australia</td>
<td>A whole new world: Library and Research Office collaboration in the era of Engagement and Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Astrid Nordmann, Dr Ann Gaeth, Swinburne University</td>
<td>Transnational Research Ethics &amp; Integrity Management: an Australian Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kerryn Westcott, Olivia Newton-John Cancer Research Institute</td>
<td>Managing Higher Degree Research (HDR) students at an independent medical research institute – the challenges of integration and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Yates, University of Canberra</td>
<td>Data collection, turning the unwilling into the willing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630 - 1645</td>
<td>Katherine Christian, Cure Cancer Australia</td>
<td>Message to Researchers: Enhance your Reputation with Good Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Brie Turner, University of Technology Sydney</td>
<td>But... my research has no risks! Automating risk assessment for human research ethics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simon Kalucy, Virginia Bahula University of New South Wales</td>
<td>Management of Overtime Candidatures - the UNSW Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Katie Jones, University of Auckland</td>
<td>‘Service Essentials’: Using Visual Display Boards to improve communication and innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645 - 1745</td>
<td>ARM'S AGM</td>
<td>ARMS AGM, Plenary Auditorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830 - 1900</td>
<td>Buses to Dinner Location</td>
<td>Buses to Dinner Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900 - 2300</td>
<td>CONFERENCE DINNER</td>
<td>CONFERENCE DINNER, Sponsored by Curtin University, Glen Albyn Estate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* see page 48 for information on Poster Session 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0800-</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0845</td>
<td>Mezzanine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0845-</td>
<td>Move to Main Auditorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900-</td>
<td>Introducing ARMS 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0915</td>
<td>ARMS 2019 Conference Co-Convenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0950-</td>
<td>Plenary 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Partnership &amp; Exhibition Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115-</td>
<td>MORNING TEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115-</td>
<td>CONCURRENT SESSION 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145</td>
<td>Research Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair: Marina Delpin, Flinders University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ballroom 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115-</td>
<td>CONCURRENT SESSION 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145</td>
<td>Collaboration &amp; Multidisciplinary Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair: Professor Michael Khor, Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ballroom 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115-</td>
<td>CONCURRENT SESSION 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145</td>
<td>Research Information, Analytics, Reporting &amp; Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair: Stephen Hannan, Western Sydney University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ballroom 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115-</td>
<td>CONCURRENT SESSION 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145</td>
<td>Working with Regional, Rural, Remote &amp; Indigenous Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair: Ian McIntosh, Victoria University of Wellington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour View 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145</td>
<td>Theme Leader Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Manzano, La Trobe University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicking Goals under Pressure: Specialised Tender Support at La Trobe University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145</td>
<td>Theme Leader Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Cheng, Michelle Armstrong, Monash University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing the challenges of a complex multidisciplinary, multi-institution, multi-country project – from the administration perspective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145</td>
<td>Theme Leader Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Michelle Krahe, Griffith University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Data Management in Practice: Findings from an Evaluation of Health and Medical Researchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145</td>
<td>Theme Leader Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Bascomb, Clair Andersen, University of Tasmania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing a best practice framework for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research Ethics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145</td>
<td>Theme Leader Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145 - 1200</td>
<td>Vigneshwaran Ramalingam, Rohan Willard, University of New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Dr Mark Hochman, Central Queensland University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1152</td>
<td>Dr Maxine Bryant, University of Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Nirmala Devarajan, Monash University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 - 1215</td>
<td>Caroline Burbury, University of Tasmania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Rhonda Bartley, Australian Antarctic Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Dr Adam Butler, University of Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Dr Beatrice Dias-wanigasekera, Ako Aotearoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215 - 1230</td>
<td>Dr Louise Townsin, Torrens University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Dr Krishna Kotra, The University of the South Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Dr Natalie Mast, University of Western Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Deborah Munns, Charles Sturt University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230 - 1245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245 - 1330</td>
<td>Dr Reza Mohammed, Professor Swee Mak, RMIT University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330 - 1340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340</td>
<td>Prof Mai Har Sham - Associate Vice-President (Research), University of Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**WEDNESDAY 19TH SEPTEMBER**

**1500 - 1530**  
**Poster Session 1**  
Exhibition Area

### HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH MATTERS

**Poster 1**  
Shauna-Lee Ward, University of Tasmania
Researcher Development framework: a catalyst for research excellence

**Poster 2**  
Ruth McConchie, University of Melbourne
Revolutionising the conference poster

**Poster 3**  
Damien Maurice, University of Tasmania
When is an industry-funded HDR scholarship a job?

**Poster 4**  
Dr Anne Drake, Deakin University
Writing for success – training HDR science students in the art of communication

### ETHICS & INTEGRITY

**Poster 5**  
Mel Perry, University of Tasmania
Animal Ethics Simplified

**Poster 6**  
Sarah Bascomb, University of Tasmania
Are we doing it right?

**Poster 7**  
Sarah Bascomb, University of Tasmania
Celebrating excellence

**Poster 8**  
Dr Catherine Nie, The University of Melbourne
Research Integrity Advisors: champions of responsible research

**Poster 9**  
Heather Vail, University of Tasmania
What to do when it goes wrong?

### COLLABORATION & MULTIDISCIPLINARY PROJECTS

**Poster 10**  
Dr Lindus Conlan, La Trobe University
Approaches for balancing the needs of Researchers, Universities and external partners

**Poster 11**  
Debbie Docherty, UNSW Sydney
Building member engagement through remote delivery formats: enabling wider audience participation for NSW ARMS members

**Poster 12**  
Dr Tamantha Stutchbury, University of Wollongong
Challenge-Led Interdisciplinary Research Programs – towards a whole-of-institution, curatorial approach

**Poster 14**  
Mandy Pink, University of Tasmania
Getting on the same page

**Poster 15**  
Alice Boland, RMIT University
RMIT University’s Enabling Capability Platforms – using innovative organisational structures to provide multidisciplinary solutions to complex problems
THURSDAY 20TH SEPTEMBER  

1500 - 1530  
Poster Session 2  
Exhibition Area

**Poster Presentations**

**RESEARCH FUNDING**

**Poster 16**  
Veronica Loew, The University of Melbourne  
*Coordinating ARC End of Year Reporting at The University of Melbourne*

**Poster 17**  
Anne Coco, University of Melbourne  
*Grant application support: What do Researchers value and why?*

**Poster 18**  
Natasha Wiggins, University of Tasmania  
*Teamwork makes the Research Funding dream work*

**Poster 19**  
Helen Stephens, University of Tasmania  
*Teatime: the power of informal interactions in enhancing academic-administrator relationships*

**Poster 20**  
Rebecca David, RMIT University  
*The Elusive Cat3: Capturing philanthropic support for research funding*

**Poster 21**  
Katherine Christian, Cure Cancer Australia  
*Use “Guidelines to the Guidelines” to Assist Researchers with Grant Applications*

**RESEARCH INFORMATION, ANALYTICS, REPORTING & PERFORMANCE**

**Poster 22**  
Dr Jo Ann Gan, La Trobe University  
*Beware of data overload! Providing accurate, timely and strategic research information*

**Poster 23**  
Shoshannah Beck, University of the Sunshine Coast  
*COMPASS: Negotiating our way through an implemented online approval system*

**Poster 24**  
Dr Rebecca Deuble, University of Queensland  
*Farewell to Data Management Plans, UQ's Research Data Manager is here*

**Poster 25**  
Caitlin Savage, Deakin University Library  
*Helping researchers shine: Capacity-building in research metrics at Deakin University Library through a design-based research approach*

**Poster 26**  
Samuel Rowland, University of Melbourne  
*Identity crisis management: how data talks when researchers can’t*

**Poster 27**  
Catherine Synnott, The University of Sydney  
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Abstracts are listed in concurrent session order and are printed as per presenters original submissions.

Concurrent Session 1

Collaboration & Multidisciplinary Projects

155: Value Adding to AQF Level 10 – Integrating Research, Education and Manufacturing in the Naval Design and Manufacturing Industries

A/Professor Jonathan Binns¹

¹University Of Tasmania

Bringing industry, academia and government together to work on collaborative research is not a new concept. Research centres such as the CRCs and the Defence Materials Technology Centre have been successfully applying this formula for many years. However, with the Linkage program from the Australian Research Council (ARC) focussing on this nexus of resources and ensuring that they are applied to research training, a new set of opportunities have opened up to permit defence industries to collaborate around the pursuit of higher degrees.

The ARC’s Industrial Transformation Training Centre (ITTC) funding scheme aims to develop close partnerships between university-based researchers and industry-based research end-users to provide innovative Higher Degree by Research (HDR) and postdoctoral training for the end-user focused research. Naval Manufacturing is just such an end-user focussed industry where research outcomes translate directly to industry outcomes. The industry is therefore ideally positioned to participate in this scheme.

With the 2016 Defence White Paper and the announcement of Naval Group (then DCNS) as the preferred supplier of the Future Submarine design in 2016, we now have significant definition in terms of advanced naval manufacturing. This definition opens opportunities to innovate with stakeholders from industry, government and the university research sectors.

The ARC Research Training Centre (RTC) for Naval Design and Manufacturing has set out to connect researchers based in universities, government and industry with students across the maritime space. With complexity and value placed on advanced manufacturing study areas in the RTC have focused on batteries, inspection robots, welding, hydrodynamic and shock loading all have direct application to the design, manufacture and sustainment of complex vessels. The precise integration of the results of these research projects to the final designs is not finalised at this stage; this is the nature of research. However, the real bang for buck comes with capacity building. The researchers driving these projects will be able to transition from industry, to government, to university, whilst scoring highly for each stakeholder.

125: Case study of APPRISE, a Centre of Research Excellence with consultation requirement

Dr Miranda Smith¹

¹The University Of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

The Australian Partnership for Preparedness Research on Infectious Disease Emergencies (APPRISE) is an interdisciplinary research consortium working to integrate research into emergency responses to infectious diseases.

APPRISE was funded by the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) in July 2016. Funding was conditional on the undertaking of a research priority-setting process in consultation with the Department of Health and other relevant stakeholders. This was conducted in the first 6 months of 2017 with the aid of an external consultant (Nous Group), with a report and response from APPRISE investigators sent to the NHMRC in mid-2017. The consultation process identified 120 stakeholders, leading to 35 face-to-face interviews and four facilitated workshops involving 40 stakeholders across a mix of government, academic and public health related organisations. The NHMRC sought advice on the research priorities and consultation report from the Australian Health Protection Principal Committee (AHPCC), a lengthy process that resulted in the identification of key research priorities. These were broadly aligned with the initial research proposal submitted to the NHMRC.

Complex stakeholder engagement and consultation requirements may be incorporated into future funding calls. We are undertaking a feedback and evaluation process to understand benefits and barriers of this type of arrangement for researchers and key stakeholders. The results of this survey will be presented and will include stakeholder perspectives on the utility of the consultation process. This will encompass perspectives on communication, engagement and decision-making strategies used within APPRISE, and their implications for research.
131: Expectations management of multi sector collaborations: A project framework

Mrs Lorraine Skelton¹
¹Massey University, Auckland, New Zealand

Research underpins the concept of the knowledge nation, and in order for a nation to be deemed a knowledge nation, the Triple Helix or industry, university and government need to collaborate. The sectors are mentioned separately for good reasons, with each having different drivers and requirements that need to be satisfied, and in international research settings these expectations also become country specific. With each layer of consideration researchers have gone beyond their traditional roles requiring scientific methodology to a need for a more complete framework for these endeavours.

With this, researchers need to understand and satisfy the expectations of each of the stakeholders and their inherent cultures, and have a framework in place to navigate through the important factors. With the rise of these collaborative endeavours, both institutions and researchers have been set up to cover collaborations through standard forms of contract covering funding allocations, deliverables, project terms, and IP ownership, leading to research being a contract led endeavour, and whilst this method is well understood between research establishments, how they help or impede collaborative efforts across sectors is yet to be fully understood. There has been a plethora of theoretical work reviewing how these relationships should work, with more recent studies pulling together reviews of the reported differences between groups.

Here, we have collected data from research managers and research staff across New Zealand and Australia and in each of the sectors. Working on their collective experience, a framework is proposed for collaboration development.

135: Zen and the Art of Herding Research CATs (Collaborative Academic Taskforces)

Mr Anthony Fortina¹
¹The University Of Western Australia, Perth, Australia

Research is increasingly a team sport and a full contact one at that! While most collaborations achieve their goals, sometimes collaborations feel anything but collaborative. And as research managers, we are often called upon to help things get back on track or clean up the aftermath. As the title indicates, academics and researchers are fiercely independent and the well-known metaphor of “herding cats” comes to mind when encouraging research collaborations and supporting these activities.

This talk will stroll through the collaborative research landscape, flirt with the concept of an ideal multidisciplinary project, identify the challenges to successful research collaborations, provide real case studies (only the names of the innocent will be withheld) and explore what we can do as research managers and administrators to overcome or manage the challenges and achieve optimal outcomes.

Concurrent Session 2
Ethics & Integrity

56: What are the common pillars of ethics and compliance management?

Dr Ted Rohr²
²UNSW Sydney, Sydney, Australia

Starting from different historical roots, various ethics and compliance environments evolved distinct terminology and processes. The terminology used in human ethics is very different to that in animal ethics or gene technology. The management of research in these fields requires specialist knowledge by researchers as well as by research administrators and committee members. Some fields, in particular clinical trials governance, have reached an international standard whereas in others practices and regulatory frameworks are highly localised or, in some countries or institutions, non-existent. For research managers, this can be in the way of their career advancement by encouraging retention in a particular specialist area and make it hard to establish a similar career in a different country. Here, I deconstruct the components of ethics and compliance management to find the common pillars of management in human ethics, animal ethics and gene technology. I will then demonstrate how these pillars can be used to construct new environments for new technologies such as drones and compliance requirements such as export controls quickly to react to future needs through rapidly evolving technologies. I will also demonstrate how these pillars can be quickly used to design an effective ethics and compliance management environment.

(note: the content will also be delivered as an oral presentation at INORMS 2018)
126: Research related complaints in Australia – how many are there and what do we know about them?

Dr Rebecca Halligan¹, Dr Rebecca Griffin¹

¹University of Sydney, Australia

Stories about research misconduct appear regularly in the media both in Australia and worldwide but there is little quantitative information available about the number and type of research related complaints received by Universities. In 2017 a number of Australian Universities conducted a benchmarking exercise to compare the numbers of research related complaints being managed by their research integrity offices from 2014-2016 and the outcomes of these processes.

Data and attempts to benchmark nationally and internationally will be discussed.


Associate Professor Helen Boon¹

¹James Cook University, Townsville, Australia

Higher education students must be prepared to meet and deal with ‘wicked problems’, sustainability challenges which assail life on Earth. It is not enough for future professionals to be knowledgeable only in their own substantive area. Interdisciplinary knowledge and appreciation is essential to promote ethical sustainable practice which will safeguard future generations. Since government policies have failed to reach global consensus on issues like climate change, renewable energy, water safety and the like, a bottoms up approach is proposed. Higher education institutions are well placed and indeed instrumental to enhance students’ ethical sensitivity and reasoning for sustainability challenges.

Research to guide the construction of empirically based guidelines and recommendations for professional ethics education is urgently needed. This ethics education in the professions must be based on interdisciplinary contexts, focusing on diverse sustainability perspectives to help students, the future professionals, understand and respond to sustainability challenges ethically. Likely benefits of the application of such research will be graduates from a range of professional courses who can deliberate upon and respond ethically to sustainability challenges to safeguard our future social, economic and environmental sustainability.

Q&A Panel Discussion on the SIG’s Role in Implementing the New Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research

Dr Ted Rohr & Karolyn White

Ethics & Integrity SIG Convenors

The new Code and accompanying Guides spell out a busy time ahead for those involved in research integrity across the research sector. The ARMS Ethics & Integrity Special Interest Group has access to various resources, such as even management and online platforms that can be used to facilitate discussions among members and communicate with funding bodies. The SIG has held local, State-based workshops in the past and can do so again to enable universities and research institutes to share plans and strategies to implement the new Code and Guides. This panel discussion will review the resources and practical steps needed to work together across the sector and with funding bodies and collect member ideas and feed-back on how such collaborations can be effective and reach out across all universities and research institutes.

Concurrent Session 3

Global Future, Local Needs

17: Navigating the US compliance minefield – How to not get “Trumped”!

Ms Connie Mogg¹, Ms Pallavi Khanna²

¹Monash University, Melbourne, Australia, ²Shine Wing, Melbourne, Australia

With researchers building alliances across the world, it has become increasingly common to receive funding from the federal agencies of other countries. While this can create an administrative nightmare, one commonality is clear, in these fiscally challenging time, the different government agencies from across the globe are united in wanting a high level of accountability in relation to any funding they provide, including funding for research. A higher level of governance and compliance can be a strong marketing tool when competing for limited research funding sources.

With different countries comes different administrative and reporting requirements. The United States is one country which has very specific requirements for compliance, and with these come serious implications for compliance breaches. Not just for the individual researcher, but for the research institution as a whole.
The current US administration’s ‘America First’ policy encourages federal agencies to focus on prioritizing the funding of research within the US. This has led to increasing pressure on funding bodies to more closely monitor its offshore research activities and to ensure that there is full accountability of all funds expended.

So what has the US put into place, what does it mean to offshore research activities, and what can we as administrators do to ensure that we meet the requirements?

This presentation will discuss:

- Background on Uniform Guidance
- What does this mean for research institutions outside of the US
- What are the key items of concern
- What are the consequences to Australian practices
- What is the state of play within Australia – cultural shift in operations
- What do we need to do to get us on the same page

**30: Global Researchers, Local Research Management: Connectivity in modern research management**

**Ms Meghan Bergamin**

The University Of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia

This presentation will explore the need for research managers to connect with academics in new and innovative ways, and with new technologies. Connectivity is becoming an increasingly important challenge due to the internationalisation of academia, but it is also becoming easier to make meaningful connections with researchers outside of traditional forums.

I will first argue that the role of local research managers now requires a global outlook to cater for current and prospective staff based overseas. Next, I will outline the challenges of engaging large numbers of academics with the important – but not necessarily riveting – administrative tools they need to manage their research careers. These challenges can be exacerbated by the broadening geographic horizons described earlier, as well as increased pressure from competing priorities. Nevertheless, my presentation will conclude that the challenges of globalisation offer an incentive to innovate and improve research management practices through clever use of technology and more effective promotion of the value of support services.

The presentation will draw upon case studies from my own research management team, which is based in a large, diverse faculty. The team has devised strategies to communicate complex guidelines, instructions and procedures to academics across a variety of career stages, disciplines and locations. With limited resources and no additional funding, we have used a combination of interactive live events, online services, and ongoing engagement activities to achieve improved outcomes for researchers.

**101: New York, New York – an ARMS-NCURA Fellowship Program in the City!**

**Ms Ruth Graham**

The University Of Sydney, Australia

This presentation will outline two amazing weeks in New York City undertaking an ARMS – NCURA Fellowship Program of professional development. The fellowships are advertised as a joint initiative between the two organisations and is intended to reduce barriers to global research administration and create an administrative environment conducive to global research collaboration. To that end, the session will focus on:

1. Professional Development of the fellow; and
2. Benefits to organisations in terms of research collaborations and business process improvements

Ruth Graham’s two weeks at New York University were hosted by Cormac Slevin within NYU’s Offices of Sponsored Programs. The presentation of the trip will cover managing the most of such an activity through meaningful engagement with international colleagues. The session will also address dealing with jet lag, keeping up with the day job whilst overseas and NYU Christmas parties!

**29: Developing an international portfolio of funding - a faculty perspective**

**Mrs Melissa Glenister**

The University Of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia

Being asked to develop an international portfolio of funding for the faculty can be both a daunting prospect and an exciting opportunity. Where do you start? What are your baseline statistics and how should you approach the work to ensure successful outcomes? These are the questions that went through presenter Melissa Glenister’s mind when she was asked to develop the international portfolio of funding for Melbourne School of Engineering. In this presentation, Melissa
will discuss the primary approaches she used over the course of 12 months to support researchers with their pursuit in both applying for international funding and in forming global collaborations. She will draw upon the foundational work she initiated to establish a United States Grant Accelerator program (US-GAP) which was launched University-wide in partnership with Chancellery and the central Research, Innovation and Commercialisation office. She will discuss the lessons learned during this time, including the challenges and triumphs. This presentation will be of interest to research administrators and managers who are looking for creative and innovative ways to support researchers with their global pursuits for funding and in building international collaborative networks.

128: The Power of a Real Network
Ms Lisa Simmons1, Ms Leonie Clement1, Ms Karen Lovasz1
1University of Wollongong

As the professionalization of research management is becoming well established, participation in networks of research managers is becoming an important part of research managers’ roles. There are significant benefits that have flowed from the cooperation and collegiality of research managers at the University of Wollongong. Challenges encountered in establishing a local network include the balancing of Faculty, University and self-interests. The group provides encouragement, coaching, historical contexts and strategic cooperation of all the Faculty Research Managers. Additionally the inclusion of bi-monthly wider university engagement supports the positive engagement and progression of university matters as they align to Faculties. The authors form part of a regional university research manager’s network that is starting to mature and see significant efficiencies, depth and sophistication in the management of research units in the University. The authors are keen to explore the development of further niche networks that can be established and matured to be key to the development of the professional research manager, support in addressing strategic research issues for disciplines and the move to positive relationships to support development.

Concurrent Session 4
Creating, Recording and Communicating Engagement and Impact

109: Celebrating 10 years of successful research and industry engagement with impact: The Medical Device Partnering Program
Ms Carmela Sergi1
1Flinders University, Sturt Road, Bedford Park, Australia

The Medical Device Partnering Program (MDPP) was established by Prof Karen Reynolds at Flinders University in response to a need to address the lack of effective engagement between research and industry. The medical device sector is characterised by a relatively small number of large industry players, including multinationals; and a very large number of small-to-medium (SME) and start-up industry. As a result the majority of industry stakeholders have emerging skills and facilities with limited scope to undertake deep research. They also have limited relationships and access to end-users and clinicians.

The MDPP is a proven and sustainable model that breaks down barriers to engagement between research and industry in this challenging sector. It supports the development of cutting-edge medical devices and assistive technologies through developing unique collaborations and partnerships between multidisciplinary researchers, industry, clinicians, end-users, inventors, and manufacturers. Specifically, the program provides a mechanism for the development of prototypes, proof of concept and/or commercialisation planning and is tailored to deliver industry driven research outcomes with impact.

Since inception, the MDPP has assessed over 330 project ideas, facilitated over 120 industry-led ideation workshops and undertaken 78 projects. Some of the outcomes of these projects are now available to consumers in the marketplace and many are continuing the development journey.

Now in its 10th year of operations, the MDPP has progressed to development of a new and expanded model that is currently being conducted in consultation with national and international partners. This new co-designed model is anticipated to be launched throughout Australia and Asia in 2019.
Capturing engagement and impact has become an important task for all universities, particularly in Australia since the 2015 announcement of an Engagement and Impact Assessment in the National Innovation and Science Agenda. The 2017 Engagement and Impact pilot, at the University of Tasmania, revealed many rich case studies of translation of research into economic, social and other benefits. The University of Tasmania is the only university in the state and sharing research with the community, beyond direct stakeholders, is paramount to our success.

Over the last few years the University has seized opportunities and supported ventures that have created accessible and friendly platforms for researchers to speak to the community. Initiatives that we have led include ‘Science in the Pub’ and ‘Science Worth Seeing’. These initiatives seek to break down the ‘academic elite’ stereotype, encourage interest in local research, empower people by giving them an inside look at how science is actually done and demonstrate how and why a well-designed experiment is likely to lead to reproducible, real-world results. We will discuss how these initiatives evolved, the logistics of running such events and the resulting successful outcomes.

70: Research Data as an Enabler and Pathway to Research Impact: Lessons from Text Mining the U.K. Impact Case Studies

Dr Paul Wong
1Australian National Data Service, Australian National University, Australia

Can research data contribute to research impact beyond academia? Most of us would probably answer in the affirmative. Some may even cite a few exemplars to demonstrate the case. However, a systematic approach to understand the connection between research data and research impact has not been explored so far. The U.K. Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2014 is perhaps the first research impact assessment undertaken at a national scale which provides a rich data source for systemic exploration of the connection between research data and research impact (beyond academia).

In 2017, the Australian National Data Service undertook a project to text mine the detailed impact section of the U.K. REF Impact Case Studies. As Australia will carry out its first Research Engagement and Impact Assessment in 2018, it will be a timely occasion to have a debate about the contribution of research data in generating research impact. Our initial finding suggests that research data played a non-trivial role in supporting the generation of research impact in many of the cases. In certain “data intensive” cases specifically, counterfactual considerations may warrant direct attribution of impact from research data. If this is right, then institutional investment into infrastructure and management of research data could be considered as an investment into pathways for generating research impact beyond academia.
In addition, the text mining methodology developed here can also be used to explore the contribution of research impact by other research products and artefacts, e.g. software or computer models.

35: Showtime for the new House of Wisdom Blooming in the Desert

Mr Floris van der Leest

King Abdullah University of Science & Technology (KAUST) is fantastic in every aspect of the word: The University is the fulfillment of a dream of the late King Abdullah, who wished to establish a modern House of Wisdom.

KAUST has four focus areas: Water, Food, Energy and Environment. It has space for a huge Science & Technology park. KAUST has its own innovation fund and an innovation center with room for start-up companies.

From the word go, KAUST is racing to create a world-class university, in four ways: focusing, spending, recruiting, and creating long-lasting partnerships. By doing so, the University has quickly established an impressive track record and become a significant regional academic hub.

Our mission statement states that we aim to be a catalyst for innovation, economic development and social prosperity in Saudi Arabia ... and that we exist for the pursuit and advancement of scientific knowledge and its broad dissemination and benevolent application.

To store our engagement with in-kingdom entities in a lasting and standard format, a database-driven online Engagement Tracking application has been developed in-house that tracks ideas to impact asking detailed questions along the way.

Storing Engagement Activity in a database has at least two benefits: a) a metadata-rich record is kept of the pathway to and the paper trail towards impact, and b) reports are available for each submitter and/or manager to view and/or download.

Concurrent Session 5

Research Funding

66: Tips for new players - planning for grant success

Professor Andrea Bishop

This presentation is targeted toward newer grants support staff and researchers who want to gain a broader view of the Australian funding landscape and some key considerations to build grant success.

Changes to research and innovation policies nationally has resulted in rapidly changing funding landscape, greater competition for some static funding pools and growth of new funding opportunities. One clear consequence is the need to adapt our approaches to better support research grant success. But where to start? Understanding the drivers and priorities for funding is important to understanding where, when and how to target applications. While there is no one-size-fits-all, there are many common attributes for identifying potential funding targets and developing more competitive funding applications.

This presentation will provide a brief overview of the research funding landscape in Australia; the profile publically funded research and priorities; and take home ideas on how to create more compelling proposals for research funding.

89: Helping funding agencies to run good grant rounds – providing guidance in an age of expansion

Mr Frank Anastasopoulos, Ms Sophie Cleaves

Competition for research funding is fierce and researchers are looking to maximise their opportunity for funding success by applying to new or previously untried grant schemes.

In 2017, the University of Melbourne facilitated applications to 52% more schemes and 40% more funding agencies than in 2016, and this pattern appears to be continuing in 2018.

New funding sources such as the MRFF and the Victorian Government’s Medical Research Acceleration Fund are contributing critical additional funds to research. New and substantial funding schemes being run by traditional funders as well as organisations new to grant administration.
Although welcome, in some cases unnecessary administrative burden and researcher angst has resulted as funding agencies attempt to deal with increases in volumes of applications and as neophyte funding agencies attempt to develop grant programs. Some undesirable outcomes include extremely low success rates, large administrative and applicant burdens that are out of alignment with grant value because of unclear instructions and criteria, and opaque review processes. It is also often clear that funders are struggling with the administrative burden.

Many funders are struggling to offer a robust and efficient grant mechanism.

In this presentation, we will make the case for ARMS to act as an advocate and provide advice and guidance to funding agencies. We will present a short list of ‘do’s and don’ts’ from our own recent experiences that may help reduce funder, applicant and administrator burden.

49: The role of benefactors in supporting local health and medical researchers

Ms Heather Francis

This presentation examines the role of benefactors in funding local health and medical research to benefit the health and wellbeing of Tasmanians, while at the same time helping local researchers secure their futures. In regional terms, the Royal Hobart Hospital Research Foundation is a generous supporter of local health and medical research, having invested over $8m in grant-funded studies to date. Currently, four of the Foundation’s five Incubator grants are being funded by two external benefactors who have each donated up to $10k per grant. A further $25k has just been funded through a gift from another individual who coordinates distributions from a bequest trust.

In Tasmania, the potential for attracting benefactor support for local early career researchers through smaller gifts is particularly exciting, and the Foundation is well positioned to fill this gap. Benefactor support is playing an increasingly important role in supporting local career researchers in the Tasmanian setting. It is important to recognise that a cultural shift needs to occur in terms of increasing awareness that benefactor support can provide a kick start that enables local researchers and clinicians to obtain preliminary results which can be used to leverage greater support from government and other not-for-profit organisations nationally and internationally. The capacity to demonstrate good research governance processes to potential benefactors is a critical element in this strategic program.

112: Funding with benefits: Building the relationship between the Research Office and the Funding Body

Ms Rose Pongratz, Dr Chloe Bibarti, Mrs Trina Findlay, Dr Joanne McEvoy, Dr Natasha Wiggins, Mrs Sue Bronstein

Being the sole university in the state, the University of Tasmania is in a unique position that allows our Research Office to work closely with Tasmanian-based funding bodies. One such funding body is the Royal Hobart Hospital Research Foundation. The Foundation is one of the University’s key funders for Early- and Mid-Career Researchers in the local health and medical space.

Working closely together, the Foundation and the University are able to align their processes to facilitate the smooth administration of each grant round. Around 50 applications are submitted to the Foundation each year; the University submits around 30-35 of these, with a success rate of approximately 25%. This creates a peak grant review period for the Research Administration Officers and increased contract activity for the Funding Officers.

The increasing level of collaboration between the Foundation and the University is exemplified by the implementation of the substantial commencement milestone to reduce last minute extension requests. The University’s support in proactively updating the Foundation on the status of grants, as well as the University’s participation in and hosting of the Foundation’s annual grant round information sessions, are also evidence of an increasingly positive working relationship.

This presentation will explore how we have developed our working relationship and highlight our key learnings.

93: Increasing NHMRC funding in a University without a medical school

Ms Rosa Ward, Dr Catherine Hayden, Dr Sejal Kendal

In 2017, La Trobe University attracted over $16M in funding from the NHMRC. This was the largest amount of NHMRC funding awarded to a non-Go8 university without a medical school. A number of strategies led to this success; some at a broader institutional level and some driven by the research grants team. At an
institutional level, the recruitment of strong researchers in health related fields as well as our partnership with other stakeholders increased the cohort of competitive researchers with successful track records in NHMRC funding. However, the success didn’t just come from our clinical researchers – scientists working across a number of medical research fields were also awarded funding. The funding was from across a number of schemes ranging from early career fellowships to partnership projects. Success in each scheme required different sets of circumstances which could be duplicated in other institutions.

The other contributor to the success in the 2017 round was the engagement of researchers with a major grants pipeline implemented by the grants team to support NHMRC grant applicants. This encouraged early submission of draft applications for development feedback and one-on-one management of the grant preparation and submission process by a member of the grants team.

In conclusion, a number of factors contributed to La Trobe’s NHMRC success in 2017 – the challenge will be to maintain this level of funding with the upcoming changes to NHMRC funding schemes.

58: Learning From the Past - A study in budget design
Ms Kate Lowry¹, Ms Kate Hall¹
¹The University Of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia

Having a comprehensive financial arrangement is vital for any well run centre. Detailed budgets which accurately indicate research expenditure and income, and which are able to guide researchers on how to best achieve their research objectives are integral to ensuring delivery of projects on time and on budget. How to accomplish that consists in much more than good accounting practices. Aspects such as negotiation, decision making on how best to prepare and divide funding can be fraught with competing and vested interests, from researchers, universities, and the funding body. Delays in research, hiring or other extenuating circumstances can significantly throw timelines out the window, resulting in sizable carry forwards. Having a budget strategy in place that allows the centre to grow and adapt is pivotal to moving through the different stages of a research centre.

In this presentation we will introduce and explain the budgetry arrangement model of our Centre of Excellence and comment on the problems and administrative burden that model has entailed for the centre. We will explain what we have learned from the experience of restructuring a centrally held strategic budget and finally we will detail the experience of setting up a budget for a new centre which draws on the lessons learned.

Concurrent Session 6
Investing in Research's Future

158: Building a Great University - A Visionary Mission
Professor Roland De Marco¹
¹University of the Sunshine Coast

My personal experience has embodied leadership in the formulation and implementation of strategy and planning to quickly escalate research and excellence at Curtin University (CU) and University of the Sunshine Coast (USC) during formative periods at these institutions. In this context, I will summarize key philosophies, strategies and approaches that are generic, transferable and scalable to any University of global significance, and I will draw upon the case studies of CU and USC in demonstrating the delivery of significant research growth and research development at these institutions. "The proof of the pudding is in the eating", and my talk will present information on research trajectory and performance at CU and USC to illustrate the effectiveness of the development and implementation of a suitable research strategy and plan.

134: La Trobe’s Approach to Optimising its Use of Research Infrastructure and Capabilities
Dr Christopher Adda¹
¹La Trobe University, Australia

Research infrastructure plays a critical role in enabling researchers to achieve a university’s goal of research excellence. There are, however, a number of barriers when it comes to accessing infrastructure including the knowledge of what is available, how to access it and associated costs, and required expertise to operate it. While there is often a focus on seeking funding for new equipment, little consideration is given to the ongoing support and expertise required to maximise the return on investment. In an environment where external funding for research infrastructure is becoming increasingly scarce and internal expenditure needs to be minimised, efficient management of resources becomes critical. This can be achieved by ensuring that investments are targeted and aligned with the University’s research agenda, that use of equipment is optimised and there is sufficient support.
and expertise to maximise the outcomes generated using research assets. La Trobe University’s Research Infrastructure Plan takes a whole-of-University approach to optimising the use of existing research infrastructure and strategically focussing the funding for new infrastructure investments to achieve the University’s Research Plan. This presentation will focus on some of the initiatives that La Trobe is employing to address some of the barriers and better manage its infrastructure, including its Research Platforms program and Research Equipment Management System and changing the culture to promote collaboration.

118: Taking one for the Team in a Changing Research Office

Ms Amanda Smith¹, Mr Alistair Duncan¹, Dr MaryAnne Aitken², Deepa Balakrishnan¹
¹La Trobe University, Bundoora, Australia

Recently we have re-designed the workspace in the Research Office at La Trobe University. There are no individual offices, every workstation is available to any member of the research portfolio and there are several types of work settings available. The design is supported by technology that allows mobility and collaboration.

Data collected includes pre- and post-move evaluation surveys, focus groups and utilisation records. Overall there is an increase in satisfaction with the workplace and the original purpose and vision for the changed space seem to have been met. These included: making the workplace focused and flexible, integrating collaboration, improving workflows, making visitors feel welcome and accommodating self-organising multi-disciplinary teams.

There were three major issues with the new space: difficulty locating people, noise levels, and team cohesion. The first two of these are relatively easy to deal with but the third was unexpected, especially when, conversely, the feeling of an improved sense of community had been reported via survey.

The space has been successful for teams with high technology needs, flexible, collaborative workstyles, and project-based work. The space has removed the ‘friction’ of collaboration and enabled transparency in work practices and flows.

One Research Office Team with a predominantly quiet and focused workstyle, implemented strategies such as daily agile meetings to foster renewed team cohesion and establish a balance between individual, focused work and collaboration in the new workspace.

Strategies and practices for improved team cohesion and integrated performance are now being modelled for other teams in the Research Office.

11: Retaining and Developing Research Leadership Talent: the strategic SOAR program at the University of Sydney

Dr Muriel Swijghuisen Reigersberg¹
¹The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

In its 2016 - 20 strategy the University of Sydney explicitly outlines its commitment to attract and develop research talent and leadership across all disciplines and career stages. As part of this strategic commitment one of the internal schemes raised was the SOAR Fellowship program. SOAR Fellowships are designed to retain and develop early- and midcareer research talent across all disciplines. The scheme seeks to award at least 50% of its Fellowships to women, is funded for 24 months and totals up to $75k per annum, per fellow for research expenses and teaching or administrative relief. Approximately 20 Fellowships are awarded every year.

This presentation will outline how this strategic program is embedded within the current strategy, implemented and resourced. Information will be provided on internal selection processes and criteria; the researcher development support provided as part of the scheme and the ways in which return on investment is being captured. This will be complemented by examples of current successes and challenges to date. The presentation will show how strategic goals for researcher development, if clearly outlined in strategic documents and adequately resourced, can have a positive influence on researcher productivity and leadership-building, but that capturing return on investment cannot merely be numerical in order to demonstrate benefit. Personal and qualitative benefits must also be accounted for.

19: Research management in times of organisational change

Dr Chris Kroger¹
¹GNS Science, Lower Hutt, New Zealand

Securing funding for organisation-specific strategic research requires huge dedication and skill by the investigators, matched by project management-type support and competence from their research officers. There is a role for ROs in using their experience and influencing skills to moderate or encourage bidding into the desired direction, and procuring future-thinking
management systems. But how can ROs support and influence investigators and direction, when the organisation is undergoing structural and strategic change? When the RO itself is under review?

We will be discussing ways to remain engaged with the day-to-day activities of the RO while providing a view to the future with a changed strategy and/or structure. The RO can and should play a crucial role in implementing the new strategy. Thus, if the reviewed RO has the opportunity, they should contribute to the change process by asserting their role in the organisation as being the vanguard of research implementation and direction. Moreover, ROs (of some organisations) are active in research commercialisation, influence the selection of information systems, and assist with future-looking budgeting and capital expenditure. Last not least, the RO is a place most scientific staff will interact with, thus are an important information purveyor for decision makers and takers.

151: Mind the gap: Research funding and gender equity
Dr Chloe Bibari1, Dr Angela McGuire

1University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia

“Gender Equality and Equity” has been widely discussed in the news recent times. How can we better promote the careers of women is a common question and challenge across all industries including Universities. The Science in Australia Gender Equity (SAGE) Initiative was started in 2014 by the Australian Academy of Science with the aim to support the hiring, promotion, participation and retention of women in science, engineering, technology, mathematics and medicine (STEMM) across Universities. But how well are women in tracking in NHMRC and ARC fellowships? And can this inform how well Universities are tracking with regards to gender equity?

Here we present national data on NHMRC and ARC fellowship applications to investigate the reasons behind the gender gap in participation and success rates. We also discuss how we as research administrators can potentially support women to apply and succeed in large funding opportunities.

Concurrent Session 7
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96: Getting the Research Quality Settings Right – embedding research quality into the research promotions process
Mr Stephen Hannan1

1Western Sydney University, Penrith, Australia

The introduction of the Research Quality Framework (RQF) in 2004 put research quality firmly on the political policy agenda, but it wasn’t until 2010 with the release of the Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) assessment that the sector received its first research quality report card. Whilst research quality is part of the research strategy zeitgeist, many of the behavioural drivers, notably institutional KPIs, academic promotions and workload allocations, still use publish or perish volume measures. This is partly driven by long standing academic culture, but research administrators have failed to assist the cultural change by not providing simple but comprehensive individual research quality metrics to both the academics and those required to assess the performance of the academic.

This presentation will focus on the development and introduction of the Researcher Report Card to support the academic promotions process at Western Sydney University and open a discussion on the role of metrics in supporting a cultural shift from quantity to quality.

The Researcher Report Card does not reduce the performance of an academic to a single number, but provides a suite of measures allowing reviewers to see the overall performance of the researcher in both quantity and quality. Critically the inclusion of this report card into the academic promotions process allows researchers to clearly see type of things reviewers consider when they assess the quality of the research rather than having to interpret motherhood statements about research “excellence” and “quality” present in so many academic promotions policies.
149: Persistent Identifiers for Research: integration and platforms throughout the Data Life Cycle

Ms Siobhann McCafferty1, Mr Ian Duncan2, Dr Andrew Janke1, Mr Gavin Kennedy1

1Australian Access Federation / Data Life Cycle Framework, Brisbane, Australia, 2Research Data Services, Brisbane, Australia, 3National Imaging Facility, Brisbane, Brisbane, 4Queensland Cyber Infrastructure Foundation, Brisbane, Australia

Persistent Identifiers (PID’s) are an essential tool for digital research processes and infrastructure and a key player in the evolving data management ecosystem. They are increasingly used by institutions, funders, publishers and researchers to streamline and connect doing, finding and reporting on research.

The increasing use of PIDS reflects a change in research data management practices, which the Data Life Cycle Framework (DLCF) proposes, equates to a project centred rather than researcher centred model.

The DLCF is an NCRIS funded project which seeks to address the complexity of digital research by facilitating a connective framework to make the best use of existing national, local, international and commercial eResearch tools. Thus, following the F.A.I.R Principles of making research data Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Re-usable.

This presentation will explore tools, platforms and services that place the research project or activity at the centre of research workflows, and support our assertion that this significantly strengthens the chain of provenance, improving discovery and access, and ensuring that output is attributable and reportable.

We will examine the role of established PIDs such as DOIs, Orcids, ISNIs and GRIDs, also, emerging PIDs such as Instrumentation IDs, Funder ID’s and RAiDs.

We will also suggest how these may be integrated with platforms such as Virtual Labs, Ethics application systems, Storage request platforms and Institutional DAM Tools. Example platforms presented will be QCIFs Redbox and The University of Queensland Research Data Management (RDM).

62: Assisting staff with their promotions applications using Institutional reporting

Dr Tania Wilmann1, Ms Anthea Hall1, Mr Kieran Klease2, Dr Casilda Black1, Dr Kim Langfield-Smith1,2

1Monash University, Clayton, Australia, 2Nous Group, Australia

Applying for Academic Promotion can be a stressful time for academics and involves considerable preparation as well as completion of a sizeable application form.

In 2014, Monash launched a pilot program to investigate the benefit of providing applicants with Institutional reporting data with the aim of reducing the administrative burden associated with their application. Information on research outputs, grant applications and HDR student supervision stored in the institutional Business Intelligence system was provided to applicants to provide a base level of information to include in their application. This enabled Monash to ensure relevant, robust and comparable information was submitted from all applicants enabling greater transparency and ease of assessment, thereby reducing the time spent by both applicant and the reviewing committee.

Following the successful pilot in 2014 in the Faculty of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences, this model has been adopted University wide. In subsequent years, the reports provided to applicants have been, and continue to be, refined to improve the utility of the information for applicants, administrative staff and assessors.

As well as reducing the administrative burden on academic staff applying for promotion, introducing this initiative has instigated greater engagement by academic staff with the information held in University repositories. This, in turn, improves the accuracy and completeness of information held in these repositories which is valuable for investigating performance at a School, Faculty and University level and external reporting. This presentation will discuss the approach adopted by Monash as well as cover learnings realised throughout the implementation process.

147: La Trobe’s Collaborative Approach to Digital Research (eResearch)

Dr Christopher Adda1, Ms Sheila Mukerjee1

1La Trobe University, Australia

Digital Research (eResearch) is about enabling and accelerating research programs through the use of computing and information technologies. Such technologies are used across most research disciplines with varying degrees of complexity, but it’s not easy to support the full spectrum of research needs, particularly for a smaller university where there are competing budgetary priorities. La Trobe has taken a collaborative approach to Digital Research with the Office of the DVC(R), the Library and ICT divisions working together to support the research community. La Trobe’s Digital Research Strategy is driven by the needs of researchers and its objective is to provide researchers with the tools and support they require to maximise their research
performance. La Trobe has established teams in each of the divisions that have the expertise to support research, as well as an integrated website and services catalogue with referral mechanisms to ensure that all services are seamlessly connected between the different organisational divisions. This presentation will outline some of the outcomes from the implementation of the strategy including the delivery of research data management systems and services to the University.

Concurrent Session 9
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98: A Game of Grants – Targeted Grant Development Support Based on Reviewer Comments

Dr Che O'May1, Dr Joanne McEvoy1, Ms Rose Pongratz1, Mrs Trina Findlay1, Dr Natasha Wiggins1, Professor Tracey Dickson2

1Office of Research Services, University Of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia, 2College of Health and Medicine, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia

In the competitive world of research funding, programs and initiatives are needed to enhance grant success and researcher development in grant writing. The University Of Tasmania Office Of Research Services, in collaboration with the academic community, aimed to provide targeted support to members of our research community in the College of Health and Medicine to improve the quality of grant applications. To identify the areas that most needed development, we read the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) assessor comments provided in response to the University’s submissions and identified common concerns.

These concerns were grouped into seven main issues that will be discussed as part of this presentation. These issues were communicated to our researchers and we implemented strategies to target development and support. This included an expansion of our first-page peer-review program and the training of Research Office staff to better address these areas when providing their grant reviews.

This presentation will outline details and key outcomes of the program, will discuss what worked and what did not, and will share key action points that other research managers can take home. Further, we will discuss our plans for adapting this approach and extending it to other Colleges within the University.

65: To EOI or not to EOI, that is the question...

Professor Andrea Bishop1

1Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia

The research funding landscape in Australia has shifted significantly and will continue to do so under the current policy drivers. A consequence is increasing competitiveness for Australian Competitive Grants Register schemes, in particular, and for research funding more generally. The importance of high quality, well-conceived and crafted applications has ever been greater, in order to both increase success rates and to reduce opportunity costs. Expressions of Interest processes (EOIs) are increasingly used by institutions as an application gateway in response, but does it actually help - when should EOIs be used and to what effect? Are they constructive or unduly restrictive? Do researchers and research supervisors consider these processes to add value? How are applications, assessments and success rates affected? Should such processes be centralised or devolved? This presentation explores theories behind EOI processes and where and EOI approach is likely to work best.

86: Linkage Projects – the transition to continuous submission and assessment

Ms Jane Graham1, Mr Stefa Delfgou2

1The University of Newcastle, Newcastle, Australia, 2University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia

Since July 2016 the Linkage Projects scheme has been open for continuous submission of proposals with the expectation that all proposals will be rigorously assessed within 6 months of submission. This initiative delivered on a measure under the December 2015 National Innovation and Science Agenda and was a significant move away from the previous ‘one round per year’ approach. “Shifting to continuous submission and assessment of proposals allows both researchers and industry partners to take greater advantage of opportunities for collaboration faster and encourage more partnerships between universities and business” (NISA 2015).

We will explore how effective the shift to continuous Linkage Projects has been at encouraging collaboration between researchers and businesses. Using published selection reports across the past five years and periodic outcome reports over the past 18 months we will describe sector-wide return and success rate patterns and identify any changes evident following the implementation of the new system. The analysis
will include the forthcoming 2017 selection report comprising the first full year of continuous round data. Analysis of these data may identify patterns in the quantity and timing of Linkage submissions. How do we measure the effectiveness of the change on the quality of Linkage collaborations? Using our two Universities as case studies we will discuss, university, researcher and industry responses to the new system and consider how we might define and measure effective collaboration and engagement under the continuous Linkage Projects scheme.

104: Engagement of managers and researcher’s in funding application development – A former researcher’s perspective

Dr Boris Sarcevic¹
¹Rmit University, Melbourne, Australia

The competitive funding environment has led to universities and research organisations providing research services spanning support in application submission and increasingly to assistance with research proposal development. Research managers can play a vital role in supporting researcher’s prepare high quality competitive funding proposals through internal review and development support mechanisms. Critical to the successful implementation of research funding development programs is the close engagement of research managers with researcher’s to ensure support is optimally aligned to researcher needs. An important challenge is to tailor programs to ensure active researcher participation and engagement to overcome “review fatigue”. Consideration to providing different levels of advice and support also depends on factors such as: the organisational structure, career stage of the researcher being supported; requirements of the funding scheme; and the evolving nature of research funding requirements, with an increasing focus on impact and translation. These issues will be discussed from the perspective of a research manager with an extensive background in research leadership and success in research funding from major national and international funding organisations.

74: Funding and the humanities: Shifting focus from the ARC

Dr Georgina Caruana¹, Dr Alexander Lugg¹
¹La Trobe University, Bundoora, Australia

At La Trobe University the humanities have been overwhelmingly reliant on ARC funding. After a particularly low return in the Discovery Project 2018 round, applications from the humanities in the 2019 round dropped significantly, yet applications in other schemes have not increased in turn. Although some applicants have chosen to resubmit proposals with a different administering organisation, this represents a relatively small proportion of the number of unsuccessful applicants.

To encourage the ongoing development of La Trobe’s research culture and facilitate improvement of potential applicants’ ROPE, we want to encourage more applications for funding from other sources, especially in view of the changing value and prestige of such awards. But numerous institutional barriers as well as historical stigma, and general ignorance of alternative sources of funding, mean that ARC funding is still regarded as the only credible option for those working in the humanities. To help researchers recognise the value of alternative funding, increase the number of applications to bodies other than the ARC, and grow research income for humanities researchers, we are continuing to develop a process to more actively tailor support for each researcher.

This process is integrated with our current ARC pipeline, so that applications which are identified as not fitting the ARC objectives will be supported towards identifying alternative funding opportunities and preparing applications for them. We aim to provide a number of alternative pathways for humanities researchers, of which ARC funding is just one.

Concurrent Session 10
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43: Profiling Impact: adapting existing resources to educate and engage researchers in the documentation of impact

Dr Richard Cook¹, Mr Keith Brophy¹
¹University of Wollongong, Wollongong, 2500

Impact and engagement assessment could be another expensive, labour-intensive exercise, meaning little to those outside of the sector. To combat this cynicism and generate immediate returns on the time investment required to record engagement and impact across the university, UOW employed a communication strategy to educate our researchers and publicly promote their impact simultaneously.
Our three-pronged approach combined:

- extending the UOW researcher profile platform to promote impact
- introducing Impact Stories (mini case studies) and developing terminology to guide and educate researchers
- launching training, a competition and a website to increase uptake

Key to the success of this strategy was the extension of the UOW researcher profile platform - UOW Scholars:

- providing an intuitive, user-friendly interface to allow researchers to create, update and share impact stories directly within their profile
- integrating the impact story data points within the profile platform ontology
- enabling reporting on the collected impact stories

The new functionality enabled researchers to package details, evidence and collaborative links relating to their research impact in an accessible and open format. Reporting, and the subsequent competition and judging process, generated valuable content and insights directly benefiting the creation of ARC engagement and impact submissions.

21: The Art of Developing a University Research Impact Strategy – lessons-learnt from the University of Auckland

Dr Faith Welch

The University of Auckland recently appointed its first ever Research Impact Manager to work as part of the Office of Research Strategy and Integrity, with a view to developing a University Research Impact Strategy that will grow impact literacy, create a positive impact culture, celebrate and support researchers, and establish efficient tools and processes for monitoring and reporting impact. Dr Faith Welch will share her experiences and lessons-learnt from developing an impact strategy in both the UK and New Zealand.

59: Developing Systems to Support and Communicate Impact

Tara McLaren, Dr Tobias Schoep

Universities and research institutions are under increasing pressure to demonstrate the return on investment in research activities to funding bodies, government and to the community. Organisations have not historically been required to capture and report on engagement and impact data and most do not have established systems in place. Although some organisations have invested in building strong corporate and community communications platforms, most still have a significant amount work to do in developing researcher understanding of research impact and developing their capacity to achieve impacts.

Medical research faces particular challenges in demonstrating engagement and impact, with vast differences in the opportunities for different disciplines to inform change, and long-time lags, sometimes decades, between research and impacts. The lack of information about what constitutes ‘good engagement and impact pathways’ has meant that activities are often opportunistic and dependent on an individual’s experience, network and capacity.

To address some of these challenges, the Telethon Kids Institute has developed a system for the capture, reporting and communicating of activities along a pathway towards impact. This system has been designed with the researcher, the research organisation and the external stakeholders needs in mind. The system has four connected modules, each with a unique function: Impact Collect, Connect, Impact Analyse and Impact Map.

This presentation will highlight the experiences of the Research Development team in designing, building and implementing the Impact Collect module which was rolled out internally in early 2018. This session will also include a live demonstration of the system’s functionality.
**CONFERENCE PRESENTATION ABSTRACTS**

**136: Fostering & Managing Engagement Beyond Official Partner Organisations**

**Ms Jessie Roberts**

*Centre of Excellence for Mathematical and Statistical Frontiers, Brisbane, Australia*

Engagement and collaboration with industry partners is an important role of all CoEs. While collaborations with official Partner Organisations (PO) are well recorded, these partners rarely represent all industry collaborations of the Centre. Capturing, reporting on and leveraging additional collaborations can be difficult as there are no formal administrative or management structures in place. Additionally, bringing on a new PO to the Centre’s partnership agreement can be administratively onerous, as can removing partners, making administrators and academics reluctant to add new collaborators.

To address this problem, ACEMS has created the Industry Affiliate Member program. This initiative provides a formal mechanism to acknowledge our full spectrum of collaborators, from both industry and cognate disciplines, and acknowledges their contribution and place within the ACEMS community. This initiative has a low administrative overhead, but provides structures for recording the activities of our collaborations, maintaining regular contact, initiating appropriate media stories as well as onboarding and offboarding. This semi-formal administrative process is very beneficial for reporting.

The initiative has also had benefits beyond the management of collaborations. The celebration of collaborations with industry and stakeholders, regardless of the length of collaboration, has a positive influence on culture and opportunities around industry engagement. Industry Affiliate Members attend networking events and provide exposure to industry problems for students and early career researchers. Further to this, increasing the visibility of industry and stakeholder collaborations has encouraged academics to ask for support in fostering their current projects or when beginning new collaborations.

**42: BRInging Donors and researchers toGEther – building lasting connections through the BRIDGE program**

**Dr Laura Carrascosa**, Mr Shannon Ryan, Mr Mark Ryan, Dr Johanna Barclay

*1Mater Research Institute-University of Queensland (MRI-UQ), Brisbane, Australia, 2Mater Foundation, Brisbane, Australia*

Developing a successful career in health and medical research is complex, and researchers operate in a highly competitive environment. Whilst it is the role of group leaders to mentor their staff, researchers rarely receive training to engage with the general public. This is critical to create awareness of their research beyond the scientific community and to increase the impact and translational potential of their research by identifying issues that are important to consumers. In addition, consumers represent a critical – and often overlooked – engine of research funding. For example, by utilizing a donor network, Mater Foundation raises funds to support annually approximately 40% of the research activity at Mater Research Institute (MRI-UQ). To increase researchers’ opportunities to interact with consumers and attract funding from potential donors, Mater Research and Mater Foundation have launched the BRIDGE program. Through this program, researchers are provided with comprehensive training on how to engage with donors and convey the importance of their research. These researchers are then given opportunities to speak at major fundraising events organized by Mater Foundation.

This presentation will summarize the key aspects of the BRIDGE program and the preliminary outcomes of a pilot implementation of this program, including researchers and donors’ feedback.

**Concurrent Session 11**

**HDR Matters**

**115: The challenges of HDR and research end user engagement, Watt can be done?**

**Ms Lena Caruso**, Ms Rebecca Lawrence

*1UNSW Australia, Australia*

The Watt and ACOLA reviews highlighted multiple issues with Higher Degree Researchers, including the production of quality research outputs by Australian universities but poor engagement with industry (research end-users), poor research translation and little collaboration with end users. Also highlighted were barriers to industry placements and intellectual
property arrangements that can be too complex for industry / research end users. A lack of industry relevant skills training was also identified.

In particular, the ACOLA Review identified three key areas for improvement specific to Higher Degree Researchers and industry, these included skills development for Industry placement and the ability to support industry-relevant research projects. A further challenge is enabling industry placements in research training.

Both reports have many provided recommendations as to what should be done, but where to start and what can be done? UNSW has recently collaborated with CSIRO to offer an Industry PhD. This program looks to address many of the issues identified by both reviews:

- A generous four year scholarship
- The research project is defined by industry, therefore an industry problem
- Candidate has three supervisors including Industry Mentor
- A six month internship to be completed over four years
- Skills development with industry input and UNSW / CSIRO training

We will discuss implementation of an Industry PhD program in collaboration with CSIRO and Research End Users and identify the challenges of operationalising a PhD program that aims to increase industry-university collaboration.

**90: What’s the big idea? Increasing institution-wide engagement in the future of the doctoral candidate experience**

**Dr Helen Ross¹, Associate Professor Caroline Daley²**

¹University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

The landscape for doctoral education has changed dramatically over the past few decades. No longer solely training for an academic career, the expectations and needs of our doctoral candidates have shifted; we now educate future (and current) leaders in academia, industry and the public sector. How should we provide the experience and support that these candidates need for their future without losing sight of the research doctorate as an original contribution to knowledge?

The University of Auckland is undertaking a large scale review of the doctoral experience, examining what it means to study for a doctorate today. Working across the institution to define and design the building blocks of a world-class doctoral experience, we have engaged with academic leaders and supervisors, professional staff, as well as with doctoral candidates themselves, to co-create a road map of Big Ideas that will guide the UoA doctoral experience.

This presentation will discuss the challenges and opportunities of co-creating a large scale strategic plan for doctoral experience, maximising engagement and input from across a wide-ranging and varied institution, and will outline the first steps of implementation of our Big Ideas.

**141: An Expression of Interest: A new system for a shifting HDR space**

**Dr Christopher Alomes¹, Ms Annika Winter¹**

¹University of Tasmania, Sandy Bay, Australia

With increasing interest in Higher Degree by Research (HDR) programs from domestic and international applicants, the University of Tasmania (UTAS) faced an ever-growing volume of Expression of Interest (EOI) from interested applicants. The EOI process was manually based where applicants and university staff completed and assessed hard copy forms. With the growth in EOIs this resulted in increased time commitments from both professional and academic staff, with a number of applications then deemed ineligible at an advanced stage of assessment. This resulted in an elongated turnaround time from EOI to application, to offer or rejection.

A university funded project initiated new StudyLink system enhancements in early 2018, to streamline the HDR application process, bringing the EOI and application processes together under a two-step online workflow within StudyLink. The work stream is designed to determine if applicants meet minimum eligibility requirements through a simplified EOI, following which eligible applicants then transition easily to the full application process, removing duplication of information between systems and processes.

The revised work stream has delivered an improved ‘Application to Offer’ turnaround timeframe, whilst delivering a significant improvement in the applicant experience, faster turnaround communication to applicants, and efficiencies in Graduate Research Office administration.

The new process has provided a complete and consistent EOI and application data set, enabling operational and strategic reporting capability. Comprehensive data from the very first point of the EOI process can now be used to support the University’s strategic goals.
This presentation will discuss the various systems improvements and functionality of the recently updated EOI and application processes, and demonstrate the efficiencies created at each stage of the application process, as well as the valuable reporting capacity now possible.

39: Visualise Your Thesis in 60 seconds: developing a national competition to build essential communication skills for HDRs

Dr Julia Kuehns1, Ms Ruth McConchie1, Ms Jennifer Warburton1, Ms Kathryn Lindsay1
1University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

In 2015 the University of Melbourne ran its first poster competition for Higher Degree by Research (HDR) students. Initially a traditional printed poster, the format went digital. 2016 saw the first ePoster competition, which in 2017 ran as the “Pitch Your Thesis” ePoster competition. Suitable for HDRs at any stage, this innovative competition challenges students to communicate their research in a 60-second, engaging digital display that is accessible to a non-specialist audience. By creating a “visual elevator pitch” students develop crucial employability skills including: effective communication, digital literacy, and visual storytelling. They also build their awareness of open access to information and copyright.

Aligning with the University of Melbourne’s engagement strategies, the ePoster competition was championed by the Pro-Vice Chancellor Graduate Research, and in 2018 was developed into a national competition. “Visualise Your Thesis” has been adopted by leading universities across Australia who will use our tried and tested formula to run their own competitions, leading to a national showcase.

This paper will briefly chart the history of the competition. It will also discuss the steps required to nationalise a local competition, share lessons learned, and give a brief overview of how to run this competition at your own institution.

60: The HDR Vision Project - Improving QUT’s HDR Student Experience one interaction at a time

Mr Andrew Kerslake1
1Queensland University Of Technology, Brisbane, Australia

Delivering IT projects to meet the needs of HDR students can often be complex, and may deliver outcomes that do not align with the current needs of our students due to poor stakeholder engagement or user testing. This can lead to dissatisfaction among both HDR students and supervisors, and often could be avoided via appropriate stakeholder mapping and engagement.

In 2017, QUT initiated the HDR Vision Project, which looked to improve the QUT HDR Student Experience across a number of key areas, including pre-admission and scholarships, candidature and mobile access to information. A key element of the HDR Vision Project was the focus on the student experience, including the need to ensure that QUT was delivering this project with a focus on what our students want and need, rather than what we think our students want and need. In taking this user-centric design approach to project delivery, we endeavoured to keep students at the centre of all that we do, including the project planning process, prototyping and user testing.

In this presentation we will provide an overview of two successful projects within the HDR Vision Project – the HDR Preadmissions Project, and the QUT App (HDR Student View) Project, and provide insight and learnings into how moving the HDR student from simply a user to a key stakeholder informed the path our projects took, and how this lead to successful project delivery and increased engagement and satisfaction across our HDR cohort.

Concurrent Session 12
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52: ‘Teach Me How to Name the Bigger Light: Shakespeare and the Art and Science of Collaboration’

Dr Kirby-Jane Hallum1
1University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

What literal and metaphorical lightbulbs turn on when you bring together photonic physicists, Shakespearean scholars and theatre practitioners and invite them to examine light? Here, I present a case study for uniting researchers from opposite disciplines, and, often opposite sides of the campus.

The synergy between art and science was identified by Shakespeare himself. As Adam Max Cohen notes, “[t]he theatre seems a natural place to seek out representations of technologies because of the crossfertilization between technological and theatrical imagery.”1 Too often Science and Art are seen as being at odds, but our future relies on expertise that can span this divide.
The University of Otago’s Dodd-Walls Centre for Quantum and Photonic Technologies and Humanities Division recently joined the Fortune Theatre to discuss low-tech and high-tech methodologies for illuminating a forthcoming production of Shakespeare’s Macbeth. The resulting collaboration led to exciting and novel ways to examine how the physics of the theatre bring Shakespeare’s text to life, and also unlocked new interfaces for researchers to explore in their future work.

Research Offices are often the most connected service divisions within universities, but they also run the risk of sustaining the disciplinary silos of academic departments. This presentation will offer insights into the challenges and opportunities of facilitating truly transdisciplinary research by covering such themes as motivations, incentives, managing expectations, impact and commercialisation potential.


142: Developing a national curriculum in a disparate Consortium: A data science teaching and research case study from South Africa

Ms Caryn (Caz) McNamara1
1University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa

In multidisciplinary research, “no [researcher] is an island” (with apologies to Donne). The research endeavour must be conducted as a team to achieve success. Often governmental research imperatives or grants funding agencies drive the formation of such large Consortia through either direct funder mandate, or the assumption of increased grant success through such a submission. But to what end should we establish these large Consortia, and how?

Vast inequalities frequently exist between members of any Consortium due to their institutional situation (historical; strategic trajectories; and project-level buy-in) and the individual contributing researcher(s) understanding of their role and willingness to time-on-task. In addition, regular changes in funding landscapes at various levels can also cause project unease, and bring about significant implications in an institution’s executive leadership’s re-prioritisation of available resources (whether human, equipment or other).

In this case study, we contextualise the historical background of the South African higher education research landscape. We discuss the initial bid for, and development and early implementation of, a national postgraduate multi-University-aligned teaching curriculum, as mandated by the Department of Science and Technology (DST) under the National Integrated Cyberinfrastructure System (NICIS).

We continue by pragmatically exploring how one should consider: the benefits of appointing an experienced Research Manager from the pre-grant stage; selecting appropriate collaborators; defining roles upfront (implementable and financial); and how to collaborate between multi-institutional offices with similar functions. We discuss alignment of academic curricula across institutions with disparate levels of teaching and supervision is hugely challenging, but has nonetheless been successfully implemented.

116: UNSW Futures – a new approach to facilitating interdisciplinary research

Dr Freya Mearns1, Daniel Owens1, Professor Nicholas Fisk1
1UNSW Sydney, Sydney, Australia

UNSW Sydney is currently implementing an ambitious strategy to become Australia’s global university by 2025, excelling in research and teaching, with a reputation for thought leadership, genuine global impact, and a commitment to advancing a just society. As part of this strategy, the UNSW Futures initiative will invest $200M in innovative, interdisciplinary, cross-faculty research that addresses humanity’s major challenges. It is intentionally a disruptive scheme at UNSW, where research has historically been undertaken primarily in faculty silos – this scheme challenges those historical structures to forge new genuinely interdisciplinary collaborations under virtual Future Institutes. The investment will provide an umbrella framework for broad interdisciplinary coverage from across the university, bring some of the best international scholars to UNSW to collaborate with its leading researchers on major global challenges, and provide seed funding for new, ambitious research that will then be a beacon for national and international recruitment, philanthropy, industry, and government support. The scheme has a two-stage process for Future Institute bids from leading UNSW researchers – an initial Expression of Interest round to shortlist potential Futures focus areas, followed by full applications from bid leads to secure a portion of the $200M investment. The first Future Institutes will be announced in July 2018 but the application process, itself, has already produced new cross-faculty collaborations. Here we report on our experiences in launching such a disruptive program, including the challenges faced in driving a cross-faculty initiative under a virtual framework.
20: Understanding the psychology of research collaborations

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

Research collaboration is becoming a prominent form of research activity for researchers to address complex research problems. Collaboration starts with individuals being willing and able to work well with others. The benefits of research collaboration are well documented in the literature and strategies to promote collaboration are widely shared in the research management community. As a necessary complement, this paper focuses on understanding the barriers, in particular the psychological barriers that prevent researchers from collaborating with others. First, drawing from the author’s experience as both a researcher and a research manager, this paper illustrates how lack of trust and lack of psychological safety (i.e. individuals’ perceptions about the consequences of interpersonal risks in their work environment) holds researchers back from collaborating with others. Even though they alone are not sufficient, trust and psychological safety are necessary for successful research collaboration. The paper then makes reference to the literature, differentiates trust and psychological safety and shares examples on types of activities in collaboration that may make researchers feel vulnerable and lead to them feeling a lack of psychological safety and/or unwillingness to trust collaborators. The examples shift lenses from team leaders to different types of team members as well as from team learning to team performance, to help research teams develop trust and psychological safety at both individual and team levels.

Concurrent Session 13
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76: NHMRC: FAIR in Focus

Dr Julia Tresidder1, Dr Wee-Ming Boon2
1 National Health and Medical Research Council, Canberra, Australia, 2 National Health and Medical Research Council, Melbourne, Australia

The National Health and Medical Research Council support the principles of Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable (F.A.I.R.). This relates to the outputs and outcomes of health and medical research funded by NHMRC. NHMRC’s Open Access policy, updated in 2018, support these principles. Along-side the open access agenda, NHMRC is also modernising its capabilities to report on impact and outcome from grant investment. NHMRC is also enhancing its grant management system to minimise burden on researchers and reviewers at all stages of the application and grant life cycle. These new capabilities will enable reporting on outcomes post-grant acquittal and focus on making publications, datasets and intellectual property more F.A.I.R. This presentation will outline the emerging reporting capability, provide an overview of the grants management system enhancements and provide time for discussion.

14: Invest in Job Satisfaction of Early Career Researchers in the Sciences

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

It is well documented that many people leave research positions in the sciences early in their careers because there are simply too many challenges for these ECRs, particularly for young women. Despite the fact that women form almost half of those with post-graduate qualifications in chemistry or biological sciences, women remain underrepresented in senior roles.
The literature shows that young scientists don’t want to leave research, but when they do, as a consequence of inadequate or no funding, we all lose the value of a massive investment, and lose their skills just when they are becoming useful.

Research institutions could hold on to them a bit longer by investing in their job satisfaction. Assuming availability of sufficient short-term funding, perhaps this could be accomplished with limited cost by:

• Provision of professional development to give them generic management skills. The typical scientists escape this learning during the PhD, and suddenly they find themselves managing a $500,000 research project without the skills to do so. Provision of a research management handbook such as “Keys to Successful Research Projects: All The Things They Never Teach You” (Christian, 2018) is perhaps a preferable way to teach these young researchers, under such pressure to publish and attract funding, than courses which take them outside their labs.

• Establishment of effective mentoring, from people other than direct supervisors

• Encouragement of networking and travel opportunities

• Career planning services, including information about alternative pathways

• Provision of more appropriate support for young women and parents of young families


ACU Strategies for Investing in Research’s Future: The Tinkered Grant and the Tailored Contract

Dr Jessica Gilbey1, Ms Catherine Mathews1

1Australian Catholic University, North Sydney, Australia

The Australian Catholic University (ACU) Research Grants Team (RGT) and Contracts Team take a personalised approach supporting research projects. Our strategies are reliant on simultaneously systematic and adaptable approaches. The RGT is lately devoting energy into the pre-award and developmental stages of research. With individual research backgrounds, RGT staff are experienced in straddling pre- and post-award management but investing in planning, development and refinement of research projects is fundamental to our process. The roles extend to strategy and expertise-sharing rather than being limited to last-minute administration. Whilst it is important that academics lead and mentor each other, a close relationship with the RGT and the sage advice of an experienced research officer is integral to the creation of projects which are relevant, feasible, well-planned, and fundable.

Working closely with the Contracts team is conducive to support and solutions which suit strategic research aims and the work being undertaken.

Assisted by the OGC, our Contracts Team has legally-qualified staff whose emphasis is tailor-made drafting, in the interests of the agreement parties. Legal considerations through the life of the Project to its completion are an important part of that emphasis, given the anticipated growth in the enforcement of Contracts, on legal remedies and their impact upon professional and institutional reputations. Governance and compliance measures are insufficient to prepare for the challenge of meeting warranties, addressing breaches, or countering repudiation.

Together, we combine a traditional structured approach of process and policy with a flexibility which advances designed or tailored outcomes for Research Projects.
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145: Strengthening the Foundations of Trust: Institutional Investigator Training for Research Integrity Investigations

Ms Elise Grosser1

1University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

In a climate of increasing suspicion about the quality of research and the trustworthiness of researchers/research institutions, the way institutions investigate allegations of research misconduct has come under the microscope.

Formal investigations require that allegations are rigorously and fairly examined to ensure the responsible conduct of research and the integrity of the research record. In this process, investigators are required to have no conflict of interest, relevant experience and a deep understanding of disciplinary practices and accepted standards. Nevertheless, some argue that institutions cannot be trusted to manage investigations into research misconduct.
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To counter this argument and place the University of Melbourne in a position of strength, we have undertaken a series of initiatives to harmonise and professionalise the process of investigation. Taking lessons from best practice internal investigation processes, we have built a comprehensive training programme for a select pool of Research Integrity Investigators to equip them with relevant interview and investigation skills. This presentation will cover how we put together the training and associated tools to promote greater consistency in the investigative process with the aim to generate greater trust in the University’s response to research integrity concerns.

111: Portrait of a fair and defensible research misconduct enquiry
Ms Kim Gilliland1, Dr Catherine Nie1, Ms Elise Grosser1
1The University of Melbourne, Australia

Conducting a research misconduct enquiry requires careful navigation between private and public responsibilities; professional obligations and standards; community expectations; and private interests. Further complicating the enquiry process is the breadth of policy outlining expectations for the responsible conduct of research and the range of other internal processes necessarily dependent upon an outcome from the research misconduct enquiry (such as disciplinary and other performance management procedures). Such a complex landscape lends itself to a great confusion and difference in opinion about the specifics of conducting a research misconduct enquiry.

Drawing upon established legal principles and examples of their current articulation by Australian courts, this presentation seeks to reduce confusion in this complex space by clearly and simply illustrating what is required of research institutions and the investigators appointed to this difficult task. This presentation will look at the fundamental requirements of procedural fairness and confidentiality, as well as the importance of clearly defining the scope of enquiry at the very outset. By having a clearer vision of these requirements, research institutions may take greater confidence in the fairness and defensibility of the outcome of enquiry.

By sketching what is and what is not required when conducting a research misconduct enquiry, this presentation makes an important contribution to current discussion about the professionalisation of the response by research institutions to allegations of research misconduct and associated breaches.

27: Case Study – From issues to solutions: Helping to preserve the academic integrity related to plagiarism in a postgraduate programme
Dr Jerry Hoffman1
1Southern Institute of Technology, Invercargill, New Zealand

Plagiarism can be a major problem for many tertiary institutions. This presentation will explore serious issues of plagiarism that had major implications for a postgraduate business diploma. In one instance, approximately one third of the submitted dissertations had significant issues relating to plagiarism. These issues were more than just poor citation. Many were done with ‘conscious intent’ in order to receive a passing grade. The cohort for the classes were mostly international students who had a degree qualification from their home country before coming to New Zealand. As part of the course structure all students had training in proper referencing techniques and how to avoid plagiarism. This presentation has two main themes. The first part of the presentation will examine the various types of plagiarism that occurred. There will be specific examples of the plagiarism and how this was detected. The second part of the presentation will explore how these matters were dealt with by the academic staff and the eventual outcomes.
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133: Challenges of measuring the benefits of university research: EI2018 at The University of Sydney
Dr Lesley Ashton1, Ms Wendy Scott1, Ms Nicole Weisfelt1, Ms Hannah Steinbauer1
1Research Portfolio, The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

In 2018 the first national engagement and impact assessment was performed across Australian institutions as a companion exercise to ERA.

The national assessment has the potential to provide a rich showcase of engagement and impact arising from research across the sector. Nonetheless, one of the largest challenges throughout the exercise is the retrospective collection of information that, for many institutions has not been systematically collected or stored over the impact reference period (2011 to 2016 inclusive).
During EI 2018 assessment, The University of Sydney used a top down-bottom up approach and identified 188 potential impact narratives. Over 42% were returned in FoR11, followed by 10% in FoR13 and 6% in FoR15. Of these, 5 were ineligible for the EI2018 assessment (impact outcomes and benefits fell outside reference period, or the research program was relatively new to the University), while 7 were considered to contain impact that was emerging and not mature enough for submission in 2018.

The holistic approach used by the University of Sydney to prepare the EI2018 submission will be presented, highlighting variations in the systematic capture and coverage of information across disciplines and how these challenges were overcome.

22: Achieving research impact through alignment with health priorities
Dr Johanna Barclay¹
¹Mater Research, Brisbane, Australia

In the face of increasingly tightening public funding and a greater responsibility to demonstrate the appropriate use of research funding, the traditional research outputs of publications and conference presentations are insufficient. Research impact has become a major focus in many countries, although most continue to struggle to define and demonstrate this routinely, including Australia.

Mater Research is the research arm of the Mater Group, closely aligned with Mater Health. To ensure strong integration, Mater Research has developed 5 research programs which mirror the 5 clinical streams of the hospital, and all research is aligned within these programs. In a recent push by Mater Research to measure and demonstrate impact, it was decided that research should focus on key health priorities, to be decided by the hospital.

Each clinical stream has been tasked to identify 2-3 Impact Statements which reflect a strategic priority within the service. These should be specific, measurable, and reflect a health outcome of value to patients. The formation of these Impact Statements has been a powerfully collaborative process between health and research, and will allow Mater Research to prioritize research activities to achieve clinically significant outcomes, and capture the impact of these activities.

105: Research dissemination: what’s happening, what’s missing, what’s next? Researchers’ attitudes, expectations, behaviors and choices
Mrs Charlie Rapple¹
¹Kudos, Oxford, UK

Strategic dissemination is key to successful creation, recording and communication of engagement and impact, but currently “guidance provided to researchers [about dissemination] is too general ... there is almost no training and few tools provided to researchers” (Phipps et al, JRA XLVII:2). Individual institutions provide a range of supporting services and systems, but researchers still tend towards systems and behaviours that transcend institutional boundaries (for example, using ResearchGate rather than institutional repositories to promote publications). A further challenge is capturing / comparing data to evaluate activities and channels and make evidence-based decisions about future strategies. Building on my previous work looking at researchers’ reputation management and sharing behaviours, I am currently undertaking research to explore attitudes towards and experiences of collaborative dissemination, and to understand what tools or processes would help researchers to collaborate with each other, and with research managers / administrators, in more effectively planning, managing and measuring dissemination. I propose to present a “first look” at key findings and recommendations resulting from this body of work.
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71: Winning hearts and minds - embedding impact into practice
Ms Bev Baugh¹, Ms Sian Wright¹
¹Monash University, Clayton, Australia

Achieving impact from research and engaging with a broad range of stakeholders is increasingly becoming an expectation of government and international funders. To the uninitiated this is by no means an easy concept to articulate well in proposals and even more challenging to measure and evidence. Responding to this expectation means we should now critically consider practice from overseas, and develop a sustainable approach to enable our researchers to systematically embed engagement and impact into the research process more broadly. Such practice needs to
include consideration of engagement and impact in the initial research phase (from research design, budget development and implementation) right through to dissemination outlets, considering new and creative ways to engage with those outside of academia. This highly interactive session will challenge research managers and administrators to consider the need for incentives for researchers; answer questions on what are the infrastructure needs, optimal resourcing and support models required; consider the role the Research Office has in building capacity and capability; and reflect upon whether engagement and impact should now be considered as part of all of our position descriptions. This session will look briefly at examples of practice in the UK, consider Monash’s approach to date in responding to the impact and engagement agenda, at not just as a point in time reporting exercise but also as business as usual practice.

45: The measurement tail should not be wagging the impact dog

Ms Helen Sowey¹
¹UNSW, Sydney, Australia

Nowadays, the role of a research manager includes supporting researchers in their engagement and impact beyond academia. But what does this actually involve?

One approach is to support the ARC Engagement and Impact (EI) Assessment process, helping researchers to identify the engagement activities that they are involved in, and show evidence of impact.

An alternative and, in my view, far more inspiring approach is to start with these questions: What do researchers hope to achieve in the world? What types of impact might be relevant to a particular discipline? What types of engagement might lead there?

My 15 years’ experience as a facilitator of inter-sectoral collaborative projects in the health, social services and justice sectors has convinced me of the value of bringing research together with policy and practice. This experience has also given me a nuanced understanding of the pitfalls of inter-sectoral collaboration, and the skills required for doing it well.

The goal of the engagement and impact agenda is to encourage the practice of engagement and the achievement of impact in the real world – we must not forget that the measures used in the ARC EI Assessment are merely proxies for these outcomes.

In this paper, I outline how I have facilitated reflective discussions among researchers to encourage them to “think big” about engagement and impact. I argue that, as research managers, we have a critical role to play in facilitating such reflective discussions, and ensuring that the measurement tail does not wag the impact dog.

144: Think Outcomes, not Outputs. Incorporating communications and engagement for research impact

Mr Tim Macuga¹
¹Arc Centre of Excellence for Mathematical & Statistical Frontiers (acems), Brisbane, Australia

Never has there been such an opportunity for researchers to put themselves, their research, and their organisations out into the public eye. On the flipside, never has it been so important for a researcher and his/her organisation to show their research is creating impact. There were more than 2.5-million papers published in 2015 alone. These are outputs. But what were the outcomes of most of these papers? Is the research making a difference? Do others know about your research? Most importantly, do these publications show your organisation is having an impact? Whilst impact varies significantly across academic fields, the effort to demonstrate impact is vital to any organisation. That’s where communications and engagement come in. Whether your organisation’s research is more experimental or more applied, having a strong level of engagement with industry, or across disciplines, or with the media or mainstream public can make a world of difference. For that engagement to have impact, though, it must be communicated. I will discuss the current media climate and show where and how researchers can more actively engage in the communication process. In addition, I will discuss the importance of creating an organisational communications and engagement culture, so that it becomes a part of the research process, and not something that’s added at the end, when it may be too little, too late to create a meaningful outcome.

57: A whole new world: Library and Research Office collaboration in the era of Engagement and Impact

Mrs Cheryl Claridge¹, Mrs Katie Donnelly¹
¹Federation University Australia, Ballarat, Australia

The introduction of the Engagement and Impact assessment process has led to challenges for universities in the ways in which they collect, record and communicate research stories. These challenges are experience not only by researchers, but by the professional staff that support them. In light of changing external reporting mechanisms, our institution has embarked on an innovative project to
identify potential areas of collaboration between the Library and Research Services. This project is working to develop knowledge and skills in both Research Services and the Library to facilitate innovative and effective collaboration that will support change, and will deliver processes for robust reporting of research at Federation University Australia. We have built on learnings from other institutions to inform our project, and are working towards building a bespoke model for our institution. The project will also strengthen existing relationship between our two organisational units, educating relevant staff on the new Engagement & Impact environment. Further to this, the project will build a cohesive framework for future expansion of the collaboration between the two areas on a number of issues of mutual interest.

12: Message to Researchers: Enhance your Reputation with Good Communication

Mrs Katherine Christian

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

Unfortunately, most researchers do not give communication about their research the focus it deserves. They simply don’t consider the value good communication about their project, its intentions and its results adds to their reputation and their quests for further funding.

My recommendation to research administrators is to create an expectation that researchers routinely follow these steps:

- Complete and regularly update their personal page on the institutional website
- Develop and regularly update a project website, or at least web page, linked to their personal page
- Advise the media office every time they have a paper accepted. Complete, with the media team, a communication plan. While the audience won’t always be the public, there is always a target audience.
- Encourage the researchers to post their findings on social media
- Explain, and explain again, the importance of consumer involvement in their research. Provide assistance where necessary.
- Encourage distribution of newsletters to project participants (this will need ethics clearance) and funding bodies
- Check their reports to funding bodies for readability – and regularity
- Encourage researchers to speak about their work internally. Don’t restrict this to their department, but encourage interdisciplinary meetings.

Further recommendations are to make researchers think about the impact of their work, outside publications. Lab tours, community visits and other dealings with the public can provide wide impact opportunities.

Last, as well as working out their h-index, they should be taught to describe the impact of their papers, and to routinely provide evidence of how their research in these papers has been translated.
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54: Prevention vs Punishment: Using Technology to Promote Research Integrity

Mr Thomas Wright

1The University Of Melbourne, Australia

In recent times, there has been rising global concern about the integrity and authenticity of research. Damaging cases of plagiarism are being identified within publications and theses that highlight the difficulty of detecting plagiarism, as well as the lack of consistent understanding about what it is and how to avoid it through appropriate acknowledgement practices.

The University of Melbourne seeks to address these issues with an educative response rather than focusing on punitive measures to drive cultural change. To assist in detecting weak writing and referencing practices, we have introduced iThenticate, a text-matching software program for researchers and graduate research students. In addition, we have created various support tools and mechanisms to educate graduate research students, facilitate important discussions between supervisors and graduate research students, and prevent potential cases of plagiarism.

This presentation will explore the collaborative University-wide implementation of this technology led by Research Integrity, including the pilot project, tools, outreach activities, and engagement with key stakeholders. There will be a discussion of some of the key insights, feedback, achievements, and challenges faced implementing such a program across a large, multi-site research intensive institution with a diverse graduate research population of over 4800 students.
122: Research Integrity - Individual Responsibility or Collective Obligation?
Ms Alma-Mary McFarland1
1Children’s Cancer Institute, Randwick, Australia

When a cutting-edge medical research institute is also a registered charity, very closely affiliated with a Go8 university, and is also a public company, there is an almost perfect storm of integrity, ethical and compliance issues to consider at every turn.

In addition, the highly emotive nature of our research—curing childhood cancer—creates what might be described as a veritable witch’s brew of possible dilemmas for the research integrity manager. Add to this, we are working with passionately committed researchers who want to obtain every cent they can from many different funding sources to fund their research projects—and in a highly competitive environment.

The recent revelations from the Royal Commission into the Banking Industry highlight the importance of sound and ethical governance across every organization and, in this context, research integrity. As we have seen from the revelations concerning AMP recently, the risk to reputation and financial viability arising from failures in sound and ethical corporate governance can be enormous.

In this presentation, I want to explore, in a practical way, how research integrity should be embedded in and integrated as part of sound and ethical corporate governance across all organizational activities, and not just treated as something that stops at the door when the researchers leave the laboratory.

28: End-to-End Research Data Management for the Responsible Conduct of Research
Ms Louise Wheeler1, Ms Sharyn Wise1, Dr Peter Sefton1
1University of Technology Sydney, ULTIMO, Australia

Research integrity is more likely to be compromised inadvertently through poor data management practices than through intentional misconduct. This case study presents a university-wide approach to the development of a comprehensive Research Data Management (RDM) solution that promotes best practice and enables researchers to meet their research integrity obligations.

When the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research was adopted in 2007, RDM was largely the responsibility of the researcher, sometimes data were on university systems but management was often ad hoc. We will present a case study of how research integrity and research data management developed at UTS, first as discrete efforts then later through increased collaboration.

We will identify lessons learned from earlier attempts to roll out RDM policy and solutions. These lessons informed the collaborative design of both the UTS eResearch strategy and roadmap, and the integrity governance framework. We will report on progress building end-to-end RDM infrastructure which allows researchers to provision data management services as part of the research planning tool.

Early feedback has shown that practical RDM solutions and practice-based training improve the awareness and culture of research integrity via improved traceability of data and data provenance, and that providing data management planning tools which are actively linked to data services offers and incentive for researchers to undertake RDM practices for reasons other than simple compliance.

38: Transnational Research Ethics & Integrity Management: an Australian Study
Dr Astrid Nordmann1, Dr Ann Gaeth1, Dr Heidi Collins2, Prof Paula Swatman1
1Swinburne University of Technology, Melbourne, Australia,
2Swinburne University of Technology, Sarawak, Malaysia

As Australian universities expand their international reach through the establishment of international branch campuses and strategic partnerships, many of them in countries with significant cultural differences from the ‘home’ university, there is a need to consider how human research ethics and integrity should be managed outside Australia.

This study examines trends among Australian universities with international/offshore branch campuses in terms of how they manage the training, management and oversight of human research ethics and integrity. Focus is not only on the policies and procedures that institutions may have in place at present, but also the challenges faced in managing research in geographically and culturally distant locations and future directions in policy development and management practice.
The University of Technology of Sydney (UTS) has completely automated its risk assessment process for the review and approval of human research ethics applications.

In 2015, the Vice-Chancellor commissioned a strategic review of governance instruments as part of ‘UTS Unleashed’ an over-arching framework, comprising many projects, intended to reduce bureaucracy and to create a culture of efficient and responsible decision-making.

In line with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (National Statement sections 5.1.18 – 5.1.21), UTS established non-HREC levels of ethical review for research involving no more than low risk. Criteria for allocating research to these different levels of review were built into a ‘risk assessment’ algorithm within ResearchMaster Enterprise 6.16.1. The risk assessment was designed to categorise research into: high risk (review and approval undertaken by the HREC); low risk (review and approval undertaken at a Faculty level); and negligible risk (declaration only).

Feedback was sought from a representative group of stakeholders using a prototype of the online form to determine whether the risk assessment questions were logical and comprehensible. Currently, non-HREC review of research involving no more than low risk is carried out at a Faculty level by representatives familiar with the National Statement and who have due regard for relevant privacy regulation. The Ethics Secretariat monitors these processes and will conduct audits on a regular basis. Further, those reviewing research at a non-HREC level understand that they must refer any research identified as involving more than low risk to the UTS HREC.

Flinders University, like many other universities, has recently gone through a major restructure. The restructure has created a central HDR management process, from admission, progression and examination, to skills development and partnership being centrally administered by the Office of Graduate Research. To manage this change and ensure the lifecycle of the student is followed, Flinders has recently signed up with SkillsForge. In combination with a number of strategic decisions, such as bringing together experts from the Colleges and updating HDR policy to reflect best practice, this online candidature management tool is enabling us to change the HDR culture. This is being seen through a more streamlined administration process, a responsive and individualised skills training program, a friendly and easy to use interface for both students and supervisors and transparency and clarity in workflows. By enabling a more efficient and productive administration process, we are able to focus our efforts on producing more highly skilled, career ready HDR graduates. 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.

The Australian PhD is evolving rapidly. This oral presentation/poster presents key emergent findings about the perceived value of industry engagement in the Australian PhD context. This qualitative study employed an anonymous online survey with questions tailored for each of the participant groups - Industry representatives, PhD Graduates and PhD Supervisors.

A review of the current literature deliberating the contemporary PhD informed the study from conception.
through to development of the analytical framework. The analysis approach comprised top-down and bottom-up theming and coding in Nvivo 10 (Miles & Huberman (1994)). Emerging themes cluster around perceived challenges, benefits, concerns and best practice when engaging in collaborative PhD programs. Findings reveal important similarities and differences between each group relating to policy, expectations, awareness, motivation and experience. Areas for further exploration in this research include communication, opportunities, time and definitions.

123: Single Point of Failures – Restructuring to remove single point dependencies

Mrs Shauna-lee Ward¹, Dr Julianne O’Reilly-Wapstra
¹University of Tasmania, Sandy Bay, Australia

Research administrators and managers continually strive to provide an efficient and streamlined support service for academic and professional staff colleagues and for Higher Degree by Research (HDR) applicants and candidates. Continual improvement of processes and workflows will result in increased efficiencies, however, these efficiencies will be limited if the core organisational structure of a unit and non-efficient systems also limit the ability for a team to provide best practice in research administration.

The Graduate Research Office at the University of Tasmania performs all administrative and processing tasks associated with HDR candidature, including Admissions, Scholarships, Candidature/ Variation Management, Graduate Certificate of Research, Examination and Graduation. Recently, the team progressed through a restructure to address organisational shortcomings which hampered efficiencies in progressing workflow. Alongside this change, a significant systems improvement project was undertaken.

The previous organisational structure encouraged single point dependency, specialisation of roles and duplication of work. Through formal change management, a single team of core research administrators was formed with one overarching position description. This single position description covered two major areas of the HDR lifecycle and the team perform their day to day functions under these two areas: pre-commencement (expressions of interest, applications, admissions, scholarships) and post-commencement (commencements, enrolment, variations, examination and graduation). Staff now have a wider functional portfolio and are responsible for progressing workflow from start to finish. This matched with significant systems improvements in the application workflow has eliminated single point dependences, duplication of work and has empowered staff to manage portfolios with increased confidence and competencies. As the dust settles, early analysis shows reduction in time taken to progress workflow not only for the research administration staff but for their academic colleagues and HDR applicants.

67: Managing Higher Degree Research (HDR) students at an independent medical research institute – the challenges of integration and collaboration

Ms Kerryn Westcott¹
¹Olivia Newton-John Cancer Research Institute, Heidelberg, Australia

The Olivia Newton-John Cancer Research Institute (ONJCRI) is an independent medical research institute located at Austin Health, within the Olivia Newton-John Cancer Wellness and Research Centre. ONJCRI is affiliated with La Trobe University and we have established the School of Cancer Medicine as an off campus academic department of the University to conduct collaborative research and research training. In addition to this, ONJCRI as part of Austin Health, is a member of the Victorian Comprehensive Cancer Centre (VCCC) based in Parkville, and our students are provided with opportunities through the VCCC programs.

The challenge ONJCRI faces is how to facilitate the processes required by the enrolling University while including additional strategies in our student management systems to ensure high quality students are recruited and fully funded, and that student training is managed and delivered in a way to ensure high student satisfaction, the highest quality academic research and outputs together with on-time completion to match the Government HDR rules.

This presentation will discuss these challenges, the processes and initiatives at ONJCRI for HDR and how we ensure integration of our students into the:

- LTU community as an off campus location
- ONJCRI research programs
- Austin Health community including exposure to clinical experiences
- Larger HDR Scientific community in Melbourne through the VCCC

In addition it will examine the issues that HDR students identify as important when studying at a smaller independent institute and how we continue to address and deliver a stimulating and engaging program which
encourages high participation and interaction from both students and supervisors, and achieves high quality peer reviewed publications and timely HDR completions.

107: Management of Overtime Candidatures - the UNSW Experience

Mr Simon Kalucy¹, Ms Virginia Bahula¹
¹UNSW, Sydney, Australia

Australian Universities receive funding to support Higher Degree Research (HDR) candidates to complete Doctoral degrees in four-years (two years for Masters). A large proportion of candidates submit their thesis within this timeframe, however overtime enrolment remains a problem for all universities. Across the university sector there are a range of approaches to managing HDR candidates towards on-time completion. Some universities have introduced fees for domestic candidates who go overtime. UNSW has taken the following approaches to addressing the problem:

1. The Progress Review Procedure was revised in October 2017 to include more stringent conditions for the management of overtime candidates via the Review process. There is an emphasis on candidates, supervisors and Schools to take greater responsibility for candidates going overtime.

2. Through proactive management of HDR candidates at Faculty Higher Degree Committees (HDCs). HDCs provide a forum for discussion of complex cases including overtime enrolment directly with the Dean of Graduate Research or delegate.

3. Ongoing management of HDRs in cooperation between HDR school/faculty Postgraduate Coordinators and centrally based Candidature Management Officers (CMO) working within the Graduate Research School (GRS). The GRS provides policy and procedural advice regarding the management of overtime candidates (and other complex cases), directly to Schools and Faculties.

These mechanisms help to bring HDR candidatures to a conclusion, usually through successful thesis submission, and have led to a reduction in overtime enrolments to below 5% as of the end of 2017.
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72: Open Access, citations and research impact: what does the literature say?

Dr Arti Appannah¹
¹La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia

Open Access (OA) is a model for publishing scholarly articles in a freely available format, through the internet. In Australia, the OA status of journal articles is required for Excellence in Research Australia (ERA), a national research evaluation framework which identifies and promotes research excellence in higher education institutions. The inclusion of OA in the ERA submission is to track how much of the government’s funded research is available freely. Another reason is due to its association with increased citations which can lead to greater scholarly impact. The number of citations on an article commonly form the basis of evaluation of a scientist’s research. Critics of OA dispute the claim of a ‘citation advantage’ leading to impact. They argue that the established system of academic peer-reviewed publishing provides already high levels of open access to scientists, also stating that researchers have access to the literature anyway and that there would be little advantage to publishing as OA. This presentation will review the literature on OA publishing, summarising the research findings on whether this kind of publishing does indeed result in a greater number of citations and increased research impact. La Trobe University’s ERA dataset will be analysed to further add to the findings and disciplinary differences will be explored. The findings can help inform university policy for OA publishing, gauge its effect on institutions’ research performance which is evaluated by exercises like ERA, and assist research management professionals to advise researchers on publishing strategies.
154: Data collection, turning the unwilling into the willing

Scott Yates1
1University of Canberra

In the research domain there is a growing demand for data for Government reporting, strategic guidance, management reports, budgetary predictions, work force planning, assessments, promotions and many other reports as well of web portal and profiles it is important the information collected is complete and accurate.

There are three areas involved in research data, data collection, maintenance and reporting. This presentation looks at the data collection side of research data.

There is a large amount of data available today for organisations to purchase and subscribe to but there is still the requirement to collect data in house, the two main questions that often arises are “What are we missing?” and “How accurate is the data we have collected?” In most instances this information can only be supplied by academic staff.

Drawing on the experience of designing surveys, forms, collecting and maintaining data and reporting and having worked for two government agencies, two institutions and in the private sector for the last 27 years, as well as being recognised by the Australian National Audit Office for best practice with data collection and management, this presentation draws on real life experiences looking at how to collect data from the unwilling and how to make them want to give it to you.

129: Service Essentials: Using Visual Display Boards to improve communication and innovation

Ms Katie Jones1
1The University Of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

Service Essentials was developed by the University of Auckland as a tool to engage with service partners, to understand and collaborate on priorities and workflow planning, setting clear targets and tracking progress to make improvements that positively impact teams, partners and customers. The programme provides tools and techniques to support managers to effectively deliver key operations and processes at the University.

The system encourages staff to use visual display boards, with magnets relating to areas of work and achievement to be place on the board, along with relevant charts, photos, diagrams and symbols. The information is visible to each member of the team, enabling greater involvement in planning, as well as greater oversight of times of high workload. Cross-team collaboration is encouraged, allowing for idea swapping and insights into other teams processes. Short stand up meetings are held frequently around the visual display board, enabling teams to plan and organise work, identify opportunities for improvement and innovation, and recognise achievements and successes.

Service Essentials has been adopted by over 180 teams at The University of Auckland, and has high usage within central and faculty based research management teams. It has proven to be a highly useful and engaging tool for team building, planning, communication, performance monitoring, and innovation. Examples of how Service Essentials is used within Research Management will be presented, especially the value in using Visual Display Boards for within and across team communication.

Concurrent Session 21
Research Funding

110: Kicking Goals under Pressure: Specialised Tender Support at La Trobe University

Mr Justin Manzano1, Mr Phil Tang1
1La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia

As the battle for research grant funding becomes ever more competitive, universities are required to diversify their funding sources. This is increasingly the case at La Trobe University, where contract research currently makes up a significant proportion of its research activity – much of it funded via tenders. Tenders present unique challenges, such as short turnarounds and a focus on the needs of clients. This is distinct from the researcher-driven nature and predictable timing of major grants.

To address this, La Trobe University established a dedicated team for supporting the submission of tenders. This discussion will explore three areas where specialisation has brought about change to the management of tenders at the University.

Firstly, new tools and procedures have been developed to specifically address challenges posed by the unpredictable and time-critical nature of tenders. This includes a library of responses to common commercial questions, and a specific costing methodology. Secondly, centralisation has helped reduce administrative burden on academic departments, whilst promoting better consistency and more even representation across the University. It has also facilitated access to other central support teams, such as legal services and commercialisation. Finally, by specialising staff
experience and skills, the team is able to provide academics with more direct and comprehensive support during negotiations with clients.

Following the establishment of the team, tender submission numbers have increased, whilst turnaround times for contract negotiations have decreased, suggesting that specialisation in this area is critical for organisations looking at other ways to fund their research.

113: An evolving hybrid research support model at UNSW Engineering

Mr Vigneshwaran Ramalingam¹, Ms Louise Milazzo¹, Mr Rohan Willard¹
¹University of New South Wales (UNSW) – Sydney, Sydney, Australia

Efficient research management and administration continues to be a challenge in large, research-intensive universities. Most universities provide these services in some combination of a centralised/decentralised model. In centralised models, it is difficult for service providers to be adaptive and provide tailored research funding support for individual groups. Researchers, on the other hand, can feel overwhelmed by the complexity of central processes and by the amount of communication they receive from within and outside their institution, often resulting in missed opportunities and bureaucratic inertia.

To overcome these hurdles, the Faculty of Engineering at the University of New South Wales (UNSW) Sydney, is pioneering within the university to develop a localised research management team to complement the central research office, resulting in a ‘hybrid’ central/local approach to professional research support. The Faculty Research Management Team differs from the central office by following a more agile approach in its structure and ways of working, which gives us the ability to adapt to a dynamic environment and flex resources to where they’re needed. Outcomes include greater awareness of relevant funding opportunities at the right time, and improved responsiveness to opportunities, while still leveraging the advantages of organisational scale and consistency provided centrally. Adopting this agile approach has helped the team to break down institutional silos in research support. In this presentation, we will showcase a number of research funding case studies on how this new service model has been delivering tailored resources and support to the faculty, thereby complementing and extending the centralised research services.

91: Reviewing the reviewer - the use of professional grant writers

Ms Caroline Burbury¹, Dr Che O’May¹, Jaye Cavanagh¹
¹University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia

Gaining a competitive advantage in the research funding sphere is an imperative to secure success in leading ARC and NHMRC schemes. The size of the University of Tasmania allows sufficient time and resources for Research Office staff to review each ARC Discovery Project and NHMRC Project Grant submitted, but what amount and what level of review will lead to desired results?

In recent years, the University of Tasmania has been trialling the use of professional or external grant reviewers to provide non-academic reviews. Professional reviewers are offered to a select proportion of applicants in some of the major grant schemes in addition to the grantsmanship review conducted by our Research Office. However, these professional services are not cheap and the level of service and quality of external reviewers varies widely. How do you know that the investment will be worth it? Is the quality of a professional reviewer any better than the review carried out by an experienced research administrator? Does the academic applicant value the services provided by a ‘professional’ external reviewer more than those of a research administrator? How do you determine the right fit?

We will outline some of the results we’ve gained by working with professional reviewers. This will include the different types of review provided, applicants’ receptivity to reviewer comments and some success rates. We will also share some of the feedback received from applicants comparing our own reviewers with external professionals to consider the disadvantages and benefits in using external reviewers, including cost.

61: Anticipated, unwanted and preferred futures - finding alternatives and possibilities for research and research funding in Australia

Dr Louise Townsin¹
¹Torrens University Australia, Adelaide, Australia

The presentation introduces foundational futures studies concepts and places them in the context of research in contemporary Australia. The six pillars of futures studies and six basic futures questions are outlined to provide the theoretical framework for the study. This framework is then applied to undertake a thematic analysis of data drawn from the website,
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"The Conversation". Twenty-three articles published by Australian academics between September 2015 and March 2018 tagged with "research funding" are included in the data analysis. This presentation offers a unique approach to using futures theories, methods and tools to consider what the future of research and research funding in Australia could be. The findings afford researchers and research leaders opportunities to consider current and future trends and how notions of anticipated, unwanted and preferred futures are being used by academics and researchers. This inquiry also thus sheds light on possibilities for strategic influence within the Australian research landscape.

Concurrent Session 22
Collaboration & Multidisciplinary Projects

140: Addressing the challenges of a complex multidisciplinary, multi-institution, multi-country project – from the administration perspective.

Ms May Cheng1, Ms Michelle Armstrong1
1Monash University

While the aims of a complex collaborative research project that is delivered across either multi-faculty, multi-institution or multi-country might be focused, the administrative structures supporting such projects are often challenging in a large institution such as a university. These challenges include inter alia, multiple funding sources, transparency of information, geographical and faculties/organisation specific policies and resources.

Delivering international projects brings about additional challenges such as access to expert support and knowledge regarding applicable laws, taxation, banking, currency and cultural issues.

How do we develop solutions to foster an effective and collaborative business environment to provide advice, guidance and seamless support from the earliest consideration of a research project through to contract management, fit for purpose financial management, delivery of transparent and oversight reporting, and compliance.

Michelle and May will share their insights as members of the cross-Monash community focusing on solutions to effectively manage complex multi-stakeholder research projects.

152: Research contracts benchmarking across Australian and UK institutions

Dr Mark Hochman, Dr Rob Johnson1
1UK Research Consulting

The two authors have conducted a research contracts benchmarking survey across 11 Australian and 19 UK universities during 2018. The presentation will discuss the topic of research contracts from a unique perspective, as landscape overviews and benchmarked data in this area are notoriously difficult to obtain.

The main value of our work arises from the fact that it is a benchmarking analysis, not only highlighting good practice, but also comparing different peer groups of universities to spot opportunities for improvement. Benchmarking at the international level is also possible, thanks to the similarity between British and Australasian institutional research offices.

This presentation will also be the first time our initial evidence is shared.

Our work addresses real-world issues in contracts management, many of which will be common across all national jurisdictions. The international nature of the benchmarking study will ensure relevance across national contexts and include identified opportunities for improvement due to the different approaches taken in the countries considered.

We expect that our findings would be of interest to most conference attendees, as we will discuss good practice applicable to different institutional contexts. This will include, e.g., large and research-intensive universities but also small and specialist institutions, at both national and international levels.

Our benchmarking results are expected to highlight the most pressing issues in the research contracts community and provide evidence of transferable practice which can be widely applied.

24: How to herd penguins- a case study of interdisciplinary research management

Ms Rhonda Bartley1
1Australian Antarctic Division, Kingston, Australia

The Australian Antarctic Science Program is led by the Australian Antarctic Division and draws together Australian and international researchers from government, universities and research institutions. Australian Antarctic science focuses on the role of Antarctica in the global climate system, the need to understand and conserve Antarctica’s unique life forms, and to protect the Antarctic environment and support...
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sound environmental stewardship. The program is founded on principles of collaboration, cooperation, and data sharing and hosts a diverse range of projects in Antarctica, the subantarctic and Southern Ocean as well as projects that are Australia-based. Research management in this context presents both challenges and opportunities - from strategic research planning, negotiation of collaborative arrangements, grant administration, interagency and international liaison, operational planning, and deployment of research teams to extreme environments, through to the communication of science outcomes through papers, publications, social media and community outreach. As a case study of interdisciplinary research management the Australian Antarctic Science Program offers insights into a range of common issues and themes in research management - albeit with the stunning backdrop of the unique Antarctic environment.

94: Building Vanuatu’s national capacity through collaborative research at USP’s Emalus Campus

Dr Krishna Kotra

Collaborative research either in own discipline or interdisciplinary has been lately the most favoured research modus of operandi not only to suffice the needs of the national/international participation but also to take up multi-disciplinary approach for better execution and outcome. This paper is a review of the approaches, initiatives, process and success in regard to research skill development of staff and students from 2015 to till date at The University of the South Pacific’s (USP) Emalus Campus (EC) in Port Vila, Vanuatu. In spite of limitations in colleagues and infrastructure, EC has chosen a strategical methodology to overcome and thus now standing as a base for pioneering and cutting edge research in the field of ocean and climate change studies besides allied social science areas. Various potential research themes, information related to carry research projects, stakeholders support etc., were widely communicated to academic and research institutions for possible collaborations. This successful experiment at EC has now running several studies with reputed collaborators and to name a few, Universities like Oxford, UNSW, Griffith, Auckland, Queensland, PNGUnitech and national research institutes like, ESR (New Zealand), Cefas (UK), Ocean Foundation (USA), WHOI (USA) etc. The outcome of these efforts include, research visits, seminars, trainings, workshops for students and staff at EC besides doing collaborative research in Vanuatu. This in turn has ignited the passion and rigor and scientific temperament and improved research skills of students and staff. Further, it also facilitated towards generous donation of instrumentations and software to EC to be further used by staff and other collaborators. Additionally, the students and staff of various stake holders from government and private organizations have benefited by enhancing their research skills. It can be concluded that collaborative research would relinquish better opportunities for Vanuatu researchers as it would outshine limitations of expertise and infrastructure and thus building the national capacity.

97: How Redbacks (you read correctly!) facilitated collaboration and multi-disciplinarity in research, innovation, and industry engagement at RMIT University

Dr Reza Mohammed, Prof Swee Mak

Australia ranked 23rd in the 2017 Global Innovation Index. In recent Department of Education studies, 20% of university students did not rate their university experience positively, and 30% reported not being employed in full-time work within four months of graduation. RMIT University (like many other Australian universities) has responded by ensuring that industry collaboration, innovation, improving the student experience, and increasing student employability, are all ongoing key strategic priorities. We will present a very successful initiative at RMIT that aligns with these strategies and fosters inter-unit collaboration.

In 2017, we developed the RMIT Redback Innovation ChallengeTM to enhance the student experience at RMIT. It has since evolved into an effective industry engagement strategy that, in collaboration with the RMIT School of Graduate Research, now underpins the university’s Research Innovation Training and Development Program. In these high-energy challenges, diverse, inter-disciplinary teams of graduate researchers get ready for life and work by sharpening their innovative thinking and problem solving skills to create value and impact for our industry partners, whilst fostering a strong sense of student belonging.

We will discuss how the Challenge facilitated inter-disciplinary collaboration, and will share key statistics and strategies for enabling discipline, gender, and nationality diversity. We will share feedback from participants and industry collaborators supporting the effectiveness of the initiative. Finally, we will discuss the challenges faced and mitigation strategies used to achieve positive outcomes of inter-unit collaboration with the RMIT Activator, the School of Graduate Research, the Office of the Vice-Chancellor, the Colleges, and Schools.
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Concurrent Session 23
Research Information, Analytics, Reporting & Performance

25: Research Data Management in Practice: Findings from an Evaluation of Health and Medical Researchers

Dr Michelle Krahe¹, Ms Julie Toohey², Mr Malcom Wolski³, Professor Paul Scuffham¹, Professor Sheena Reilly¹
¹Menzies Health Institute Queensland, Griffith University, Gold Coast, Australia, ²Library and Learning Services, Griffith University, Gold Coast, Australia, ³eResearch Services, Griffith University, Nathan, Australia, ⁴Centre for Applied Health Economics, Nathan, Australia

Building or acquiring research data management (RDM) capacity is a major challenge for health and medical researchers and academic institutes alike. Considering that different RDM practices can have direct influences on the integrity and longevity of data, optimising institutional services and support in recognition of RDM needs is especially valuable within the context of the broader open science movement. This study evaluates the RDM practices of researchers from an academic institution, to identify research practices as contextualised by the stages of the research data lifecycle to inform future RDM strategy. Health and medical researchers from an Australian academic institution were invited to complete an online survey related to typical RDM tasks, aligned with the six stages of the research data lifecycle. In this paper, we present findings stages: (i) planning research; (ii) data collection; and (iii) processing and analysing data. Our results indicate that tasks associated with planning research, data collection, and processing and analysing data varied greatly among health and medical researchers. In addition, the variety of places from where research data were collected, along with the processing and analysis techniques employed, reflects the complex ecosystem of RDM practices among researchers. Considering the RDM practices of health and medical researchers, as contextualised by stages of the research data lifecycle, provides valuable insight towards shaping services to build researcher capacity. Applying best practice to institutional strategies in RDM will strengthen researcher capacity, instil good research practice, and improve health informatics and research data quality.

106: A system to span the gaps between the research office, finance, the department and researchers

Dr Maxine Bryant¹
¹University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

In many institutions research offices are the central unit with responsibility for research funding. Although we are intimately involved in the development, submission and contracting of research projects and the creation of grants, we often have limited involvement in the management of the project once it’s underway. Once the grant opens, it’s usually managed by the lead researcher, with support from the department or college, and involvement of the central finance department. This dispersed management can often be problematic – the various departments often operate in silos, communication breaks down, not everyone can access the information they need, and processes are inefficient – resulting in confused or frustrated academics. As research offices, how do we simplify processes and help bridge the gaps? And how do we ensure we are meeting our responsibilities to ensure the research is being done, the contract terms are being adhered to, and our academics are supported? At the University of Canterbury, we’ve created a web based system to help connect the various players involved in management of research contracts. This system, My Research Grants & Consultancy, combines information from the research management system and the financial system to simplify contract management for researchers and share information with those who need it. The system also provides various features to help researchers monitor their grant expenditure, track their progress and meet their contractual obligations. This presentation will outline how we have developed this system to meet the demands of the various groups involved in managing research grants.

53: Comparing Apples to Apples – don’t make a sausage

Dr Adam Butler¹
¹University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

Major global citation provides categorise research outputs using their understanding of ‘subject areas’. This gives data consumers the impression that all outputs associated with a ‘subject area’ are comparable. However, what citation providers are doing is creating a subject area sausage with all manner of ingredients. If researchers and administrators wish to compare performances they should compare apples to apples, not...
relying on a sandwich à la saucisse. World university rankings and the government’s ERA process trust and use broad subject area classifications to the detriment of research and researcher development.

If universities wish for best practice researcher support by way of performance comparisons then ‘bibliographic coupling’ must be used. Bibliographic coupling is an established method whereby scientific outputs that cite the same references are identified. The premise is that if researchers are citing the same documents then their research is likely to be comparable. The more references two documents have in common the closer that relationship. When conducting bibliographic coupling, tweaks can be performed that moderate erroneous connections. For example, reducing the time frame of the references allows better clustering of papers.

The most prolific researcher for the author’s institution was identified via Scopus within the Scopus subject area of ‘Social Sciences’. According to the Scopus author profile this researcher is also associated with 10 other Scopus ‘subject areas’. So how can this researcher be fairly benchmarked? The presentation will show how this can and why it should be done.

16: A little information can be a dangerous thing: Understanding research analytics
Dr Natalie Mast1
1University of Western Australia, CRAWLEY, Australia

This presentation will outline both the positive and negative aspects of bibliometric data provided by third party systems, Using Clarivate Analytics’ product Incites as an example.

The types of bibliometric data generated by Incites will be explored and the meaning of those results discussed.

The presentation will highlight the benefit of being able to quickly generate summary performance statistics at an institutional, organisational unit and individual level, but will also highlight some of the problems in relying on that data when statistics are generated using a very small number of publications, the source data is unreliable or there are limitations in the system settings itself.

The presentation will conclude with suggestions explaining how research managers can get the best out of analytical tools, when they can be confident in the results, when they should provide caveats in relation to analyses produced and when it’s best to limit usage of such results.

Concurrent Session 24
Working with Regional, Rural, Remote & Indigenous Communities

117: Establishing a best practice framework for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research Ethics
Ms Sarah Bascomb1, Professor Maggie Walter1
1University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia

In order to support our staff and students to design, conduct and report high quality, sensitive and ethical sound work with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people or their data, the University of Tasmania has developed specific guidance and resources. The aim is to ensure the University is seen as an Institution not only of sector best practice in this area, but as a leader and as such attracts high quality staff and students and funding and collaboration opportunities.

A number of resources were developed by a working group led by Professor Maggie Walter, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Aboriginal Research and Leadership) under the direction of the Research Integrity and Ethics Committee. The resources included a new, easy to use webpage and a professionally designed infographic to summarise key information in a visually appealing format, with a series of easily accessible hyperlinks. One of the process changes was the introduction of a new supplementary form for submission alongside ethics application which requires researchers to explicitly detail how their project embodies and complies with the six key values of ethics conduct as outlined in the NHMRC guideline Values and Ethics: Guidelines for Ethical Conduct in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Research (2003). The most significant introduction however was the appointment of four Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Ethics Advisors. These Ethics Advisors are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander staff or students who are available to support researchers design projects in accordance with the six ethical principles. They also provide advice to ethics committees. This presentation will explain the process for establishing such a framework, and step through the resources that were developed.
64: Building and sustaining successful strategic research partnerships with rural communities: a case study of a community observatory in rural Malaysia

Ms Nirmala Devarajan1,2, Professor Daniel Reidpath1,2, Professor Ian Smith1,3, Professor Mahendhiran Nair1,4

1South East Asia Community Observatory (SEACO), Monash University, Malaysia, 2Global Public Health, Jeffrey Cheah School of Medicine and Health Sciences, Monash University, Malaysia, 3Office of Vice-Provost (Research & Research Infrastructure), Monash University, Australia, 4Monash University, Malaysia

Undertaking community based research is not without its challenges. There are multiple stakeholders with often competing agendas, and social and cultural sensitivities to understand and observe. The credibility of community based research sites and the research that it generates depends on its ability to facilitate successful collection and sharing of high-quality data. The task of establishing and managing such research infrastructure requires action on a number of fronts: administrative infrastructure; information technology systems; strategies for building capacity; and stakeholder relationships and community partnership.

For a community based research site, especially one operating in a rural and remote setting, failure to engage effectively and comprehensively with the stakeholders can result in the stakeholders jeopardising the success of the research program. This presentation discusses some of the challenges of carrying out research within a rural and remote community in Malaysia, drawing on lessons from a demographic research platform set up by Monash University, the South East Asia Community Observatory (SEACO). SEACO was set up to support and facilitate population health and demographic research, community-based intervention studies, and support national and global policy changes. The challenges in the initial phase of the SEACO establishment related to obtaining buy-in from its various stakeholders, managing differing expectations, dealing with community resistance and operating in a resource limited setting will be presented. The focus will be on the approaches adopted and lessons learned, that have led to building and sustaining a successful strategic research partnership with a rural community in Malaysia.

34: Ako Aotearoa’s Funding in Indigenous communities and engagement

Dr Beatrice Dias-wanigasekera

1Ako Aotearoa (Centre of Tertiary Teaching Excellence), Wellington, New Zealand

Ako Aotearoa is New Zealand’s Centre of Tertiary Teaching Excellence, and has funded educational research over the past 10 years for the benefit of improving outcomes for learners. New Zealand has prioritised the improvement of outcomes of Maori and Pasifika learners as a key social and economic development strategy of New Zealand.

Ako Aotearoa’s funding has supported many research projects covering Maori and Pasifika learners. In working with indigenous communities, the relationship-building and partnership development approach has been a key to success in establishing trust and confidence in our competitive funding process. Ako Aotearoa obtains buy-in for indigenous research through deep consultation with Iwi and Maori communities through several pathways, prior to the development and issue of RfPs. We present the results of our 2017 funding round, which was completely dedicated to these communities.

Maori and Pasifika-driven research has been found to be generally highly collaborative, with high levels of community engagement. A continuing challenge has been to increase participation with hard-to-reach communities, especially in Northland and Gisborne areas. Our future strategies for the improvement of engagement with these communities, including the introduction of ‘knowledge brokers’ into our work, through our hubs and research teams, are described.
The reality of research in rural and regional communities in Australia is that to conduct research there is probable additional cost in both travel expense and staff resources. Accessing a valid research sample is more difficult than in denser urban regions as people are spread across considerable distances. Researchers must undertake frequent travel to meet with rural and regional stakeholders. The travel is often combined with overnight accommodation. As a result, research in rural and regional communities is often more expensive, and time consuming, than comparative research undertaken in urban regions. Yet rural and regional researchers are competing with their urban counterparts for the same funding. To succeed in researching in rural and regional environments researchers must be organised, adaptive and creative in order to mitigate the costs associated with long distance research. Researchers and research support staff at Charles Sturt University (CSU), a regionally based university in NSW, have experience in conducting research involving vast distances. The University has developed a range of tools to mitigate the cost and combat the tyranny of distance. In this presentation I will explain some of these tools, including the information technology structure, developed to enhance regionally based research. I will present examples of research designs, use of technology and personal organisational techniques used to overcome the challenges involved with working in rural and regional areas.
Poster 1 Researcher Development framework: a catalyst for research excellence
Mrs Amanda Avens¹, Professor Clive Baldock, Dr Julienne O’Reilly-Wapstra
¹University of Tasmania, Sandy Bay, Australia

The University of Tasmania provides a Researcher Development Program to support researchers across all academic cohorts to develop a culture of research excellence and to conduct high quality, impactful research. Previously the development program supported the research vision outlined in the strategic plans and researcher development activities focused on the key research endeavours of funding, publications and outputs, and higher degree research (HDR) load and completions. Activities were offered as a ‘smorgasbord’ of opt-in workshops, seminars, on-line programs and information sessions.

While researcher development activities were very well supported by HDR candidates and researchers and individual attendees can attribute research successes to attending the researcher development activities, the university needs to continue to develop its research funding and outputs portfolio and enable research quality and excellence.

A new approach to a Researcher Development framework has been established to better align researcher development activities with researcher milestones to be achieved for each academic career stage across a researcher academic timeline - from HDR to research leader. The program is also more tailored to individuals and is supported by a suite of development sessions targeting discipline specific interests as well as building a broad researcher skills portfolios.

We present a dynamic representation of the annual lifecycle of a career researcher, and the pathway from identifying researcher needs through to the outcomes of individual academic performance and career development conversations.

Poster 2 Revolutionising the conference poster
Ms Ruth McConchie¹, Ms Jennifer Warburton¹, Dr Julia Kuehns², Ms Kathryn Lindsay³
¹University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

What is the future of the traditional printed conference poster in the digital age? How can we better prepare graduate research students for the research communication landscape?

The University of Melbourne has met these challenges by transforming the traditional printed poster session into a digital poster competition for Higher Degree by Research (HDR) students of all disciplines and all stages of candidature. The now-national “Visualise Your Thesis” competition challenges HDRs to develop a dynamic audio-visual ‘elevator pitch’. With a time limit of 60 seconds, students can include video, sound, animation and visualisations in a standalone, embeddable presentation which can be exhibited online, or shared on social media, to promote the University’s research activities.

This innovative concept offers exciting development and training opportunities for HDR students to hone communication, digital literacy and graphic design skills while describing complex research in a way that is accessible to a non-specialist audience. Harnessing commonly-used tools that allow for full customisation and easy dissemination, the competition appeals to participants of varying levels of technical proficiency.

This poster will introduce the competition as a framework for the next generation conference poster in an age of short attention spans and information overload.

Poster 3 When is an industry-funded HDR scholarship a job?
Mr Damien Maurice¹
¹University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia

Universities are seeking to grow their industry-focussed higher degree by research (HDR) training opportunities to improve industry-university collaboration. Increasing engagement between higher education institutions and industry is a priority for the Commonwealth Government, and recent reviews of HDR training have made specific recommendations aimed at connecting HDR candidates with industry-led research problems (e.g. the Commonwealth’s 2015 Review of Research Policy & Funding Arrangements; 2016 Australian Council of Learned Academies’ Review of Australia’s Research Training System). The rapid growth of industry-funded HDR scholarships that has resulted presents fresh challenges that require new protocols and procedures for HDR candidature managers and research administrators. Factors that must be considered prior to an industry-funded HDR candidate commencing include: is the industry partner fully funding the scholarship? Will the candidate spend time at the funder’s premises? Will the funder be involved in their supervision? Has the scholarship been advertised? How has the candidate been selected? Is the selection process sufficiently arms-length from the funder? Is there an expectation that certain outcomes will be achieved by the candidate? What is the benefit to the industry?
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Poster 4 Writing for success – training HDR science students in the art of communication
Dr Anne Drake1, Dr Jane Allardyce1, Dr Anne Brocklebank Proud1
1Deakin University, Geelong, Australia

In late 2016 Deakin University launched PhD Xtra, a revised HDR program which aims to provide students with a broader learning experience. In addition to the traditional thesis-based HDR model students now have the opportunity to develop an individualised learning plan (ILP) of activities designed to enhance their student experience and prepare them for their transition to the work force. A suite of training programs is available to students, who are also encouraged to undertake a career pathway placement relative to their field of study. In addition to the short-course training programs, all students are required to complete a minimum of one core unit of course work relevant to their study discipline.

In the Faculty of Science, Engineering and the Built Environment (SEBE) students complete the unit SSC900 Academic Writing and Communication in their first year of candidature. The unit provides students with writing teaching that is directly relevant to their work. It focusses on the essential elements of academic writing, including clarity, precision and the use of discipline-specific structure and style. Students complete and receive detailed feedback on writing exercises, which culminates in the completion of the first draft of their literature review. Unit content is delivered online to be accessible to all students, regardless of their location. Since Trimester 1, 2017, 214 students have successfully completed the unit and feedback from both students and supervisors has been extremely positive.

Poster 5 Animal Ethics Simplified
Ms Mel Perry1, A/Prof Jayson Semmens1, Dr Jane Dunnett1
1University of Tasmania

This poster will explore the University of Tasmania’s (UTAS) Animal Ethics Committee’s (AEC) simplification of their existing Minimal Risk Initial Application form, allowing researchers to efficiently complete the required ethics application. The University of Tasmania’s Animal Ethics Committee requires that research that will only involve observing live animals that are free-ranging and where there is no intention to alter the animals’ behaviour or physiology in any way or use devices or strategies which might alter behaviour or physiology (e.g. lures or baits) must submit a Minimal Risk Initial Application for review by the Animal Ethics Committee. This requirement ensures that institutional project risk is being appropriately managed and allows the AEC to have central oversight of all research involving animals. This decision posed some challenges to UTAS’s AEC as researchers often expressed frustration towards the cumbersome nature of completing a detailed ethics application, where there was minimal impact on the animals. Despite this, it is important, as interruption of animal populations and intrusion into animal habitats does have the potential to affect social interaction or breeding of an animal population and could cause unintended consequences or adverse impact. The simplified Minimal Risk Initial Application Form strikes a balance between capturing the necessary information to allow the AEC to assess the project risk and enabling researchers to quickly and succinctly relay and justify this information to the AEC. The form has only recently been revised, but, to date researchers have commented on the ease they can complete the streamlined application.

Poster 6 Are we doing it right?
Ms Sarah Bascomb1, Dr Kerryn Butler-Henderson1
1University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia

Universities are large organisations, and it can be hard for Associate Deans Research to know how every research project in their School is performing. In collaboration with an Associate Dean Research, Research Integrity Advisors and the Research Integrity and Ethics Unit a self-audit checklist for research projects was developed. The checklist was first piloted in one School, and it currently now being rolled out School by School across the University.

The checklist is very short, and can be completed anonymously online or in hard copy. The questions are based on the sections of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, and require researchers to answer in the affirmative (compliance) or the negative (non-compliance). This poster will detail the consultation process undertaken in the development of the checklist, the uptake by researchers and the interesting results obtained so far. Further, the poster will include the initiatives implemented with the detailed knowledge obtained through completion.
of the checklists. This includes new resources, targeted training sessions and School level awareness programs.

The checklist is a strategic project of the University’s Research integrity and Ethics Committee and is seen as an important part of the Committee’s continual drive to foster a culture of responsible research. This poster will showcase this initiative and share learns so that others may consider similar practices in their institutions.

**Poster 7 Celebrating excellence**

**Ms Sarah Bascomb¹, Ms Adele Kay¹**

¹University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia

Through the University of Tasmania’s Research Integrity and Ethics Committee, the Division of Research oversaw the development and successful roll out of the inaugural Research Integrity and Ethics award in 2017. The award was considered an important aspect of the Committee’s, and the Research Integrity and Ethics Unit’s, continual mission to foster and embed a culture of responsible research conduct. The nomination criteria for the award were kept deliberately broad so as to celebrate and highlight excellence in any activity or activities that supported or promoted a responsible culture of research at the University. Examples included: Leadership in the formulation of research integrity and ethics standards; Innovation in research integrity and ethics policy implementation; Behaviour above and beyond the normal ethical requirements (e.g. innovation in adherence to the three R’s of animal ethics); Advancing the application of the six ethical values in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander research. A prize pool of $4,000 was provided by the Office of Research Services.

Fifteen nominations were received, and ranked by a panel of judges that included Ethics Committee Chairs, an Associate Dean Research and the Manger, Research Integrity and Ethics. Two nominations were considered suitable winners and shared in the prize pool. The award was considered a success by the Committee and in 2018, ongoing funding in being sought to ensure the award continues as an important aspect of the ethics and integrity culture at the University. This poster will showcase this award and share learnings for others to consider similar positive celebrations of best practice research initiatives.

**Poster 8 Research Integrity Advisors: champions of responsible research**

**Dr Catherine Nie¹, Ms Kim Gilliland¹, Ms Elise Grosser¹**

¹The University Of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

The network of Research Integrity Advisors (RIA) at the University of Melbourne is a central component of the University’s commitment to fostering a culture of research integrity. The Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (the Code) requires that institutions appoint one or more senior staff members as RIAs to provide advice to anyone at the University who may be unsure about research conduct or are considering raising a complaint. This is recognised as an innovative Australian contribution to research integrity.

The University of Melbourne currently has appointed 31 experienced researchers as RIAs embedded across the different academic divisions and affiliated research institutes. Recently, The University of Melbourne has implemented a number of professional development initiatives to support the role of the RIA, including the appointment and training to expand the network, and the development of supporting materials, workshops and resources to support their role. Research integrity education and training initiatives have also been developed, driven by RIA input in identifying gaps in knowledge in their local areas and ways to fill these gaps. These initiatives will professionalise the role of the RIA and promote the RIA network at the University as champions of responsible research conduct.

**Poster 9 What to do when it goes wrong?**

**Ms Heather Vail¹, Ms Sarah Bascomb¹**

¹University of Tasmania, Research Integrity & Ethics Unit, Hobart, Australia

To enable the University of Tasmania’s Research Integrity and Ethics Unit (RIEU) to efficiently manage concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research project approved by the University’s Ethics Committees. An effective process has been developed to guide unit staff down the appropriate pathway when receiving or identifying a complaint or concern.

When a complaint/concern is received or identified, a nominated person is responsible for administratively managing the complaint/concern.
All relevant information is entered into a tracking log, which enables the RIEU to continually track the progress of a complaint or concern and provide a history of all referrals and action taken, as well as the dates of receipt and resolution of the complaint.

The complaint/concern is moved through a process, which identifies whether expert or legal advice is required and whether the Manager (RIEU) should be informed along with the Executive Director, Research Operations (EDRO).

The relevant Ethics Committee Chair may instigate an investigation of the complaint/concern and its validity, refer the matter to the relevant Head of School, refer the matter to the full Ethics Committee or refer the matter to the University’s Managing Allegations of Research Misconduct Procedure.

The RIEU also provides helpful a ‘Tips and tools document for assessing and managing breaches at the local level.’ This is provided to assist Heads of Schools with their role in managing the complaint/concern.

This poster will explain the complaints/concerns process step by step.

**Poster 10 Approaches for balancing the needs of Researchers, Universities and external partners**

Dr Lindus Conlan¹, Deepa Balakrishnan¹

¹La Trobe University

The success of collaborative research projects often depends on the quality of interactions between Researchers, Universities and their external collaborators. How the post award stage of research projects is managed can significantly impact collaborative research relationships during the project and for future research opportunities. This is particularly true when the parties have competing priorities, such as differing time frame expectations, obligations, policies and internal processes.

Here we discuss a hypothetical case and different approaches that research management professionals can employ to positively enhance collaborative relationships. These approaches include developing greater awareness of the priorities and non-negotiables for each party, communication strategies, and balancing flexibility and stringency.

**Poster 11 Building member engagement through remote delivery formats: enabling wider audience participation for NSW ARMS members**

Ms Debbie Docherty¹, Dr Yordanka Krastev², Ms Emily Brennan³, Dr Ross Hill³, Ms Louise Dwyer³, Mr George Carayannopoulos³, Ms Kathy Homan³, Ms Yamini Sandiran⁴, Ms Annette Harris⁵, Ms Rachel White⁶

¹UNSW Sydney, Sydney, Australia, ²Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia, ³Sydney University, Sydney, Australia, ⁴University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, Australia, ⁵Charles Sturt University, Australia, ⁶ANSTO, Sydney, Australia

Research management and administration is a broad and rapidly changing field. To meet the needs of the NSW Chapter, we utilised the ARMS 2016 feedback survey and identified the five core needs as a basis for the ongoing calendar or development activities in 2017/18. In response to this feedback the Committee agreed on the following principles that all Chapter events should adopt:

- Be at no cost to members;
- Incorporate interactive formats;
- Include flexible delivery options;
- Deliver a practical outcome;
- Use a common evaluation feedback mechanism.

The ARMS NSW Chapter conducted 10 training and networking events in 2017 (7 accreditation modules and 3 workshops), hosted by the member organisations and encompassing representation across the entire membership.

We evaluated the events by circulating a feedback survey containing four common questions. The feedback received was analysed quantitatively and qualitatively and summarised into four themes:

- Quality of the speakers and relevance of the presentations;
- Value of the networking opportunities;
- Utilisation of web video-conference capability of Zoom;
- Duration of workshops and suggestions for follow up activities.

The focus of this paper is on enabling participation from regional universities and an analysis of the tools and methods for achieving this to help meet the goals outlined by the NSW Chapter. It will address some of the current barriers towards participation and how these are being overcome.
The lessons learned may be applicable across ARMS individual chapters and related events, as well as through broader considerations of how professional development opportunities may be structured into the future.

**Poster 12 Challenge-Led Interdisciplinary Research Programs – towards a whole-of-institution, curatorial approach**

Dr Tamantha Stutchbury¹, Prof Chris Gibson¹, Prof Geoffrey Spinks¹, Prof Lorna Moxham¹, Prof Clive Schofield¹, Dr Kerrylee Rogers¹

¹University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia

Signals across the higher education sector increasingly point towards the need to manage and fund research differently in order to harness expertise across multiple specialties. Challenge-led research programs are an innovative response to the need for a new approach to building interdisciplinary capacity.

Since 2013, the University of Wollongong (UOW) has invested in a major new strategic whole of institution research program, Global Challenges: Transforming Lives and Regions¹, which brings researchers together in novel combinations so as to develop ambitious projects that respond to identified research challenges.

The Global Challenges Program (GCP) aims to foster ideas and frontier research from within specialist disciplines, but also address significant global problems in collaboration across fields of knowledge, and between researchers, communities and external organisations.

We will present here a case study of the first 5 years of the GCP. Key theme to be discussed include our successes in Early Career Researcher leadership opportunities and gender equity. We will discuss key features of success, challenges, and learnings from the establishment and operation of an interdisciplinary challenge-led research program in the Australian Higher Education setting.

**Poster 14 Getting on the same page**

Ms Mandy Pink¹, Ms Katherine Shaw¹, Ms Leslie Watson¹

¹University of Tasmania

Some researchers struggle to communicate their research across disciplines and for the purpose of research administration. A University of Tasmania internal survey among collaborative researchers found that language was a common obstacle in cross-disciplinary research. In addition, providing evidence that a research activity meets the definition of research and clarifying the involvement of human participants in the research are difficult tasks for many researchers.

How can research administrators help bridge these difficulties to create a successful shared research language? Our poster will explore three areas where research services can provide best practice examples to researchers on communication; research funding; integrity and ethics; and research reporting. In particular, we will look at how finding the right choice of words can help creative arts researchers and researchers from other disciplines who are working collaboratively with the creative arts.

**Poster 15 RMIT University’s Enabling Capability Platforms – using innovative organisational structures to provide multidisciplinary solutions to complex problems**

Ms Alice Bolandi¹, David Bugg¹, Rosy Calabro¹, Amrutha Sakuru

¹RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia

Multidisciplinary research brings together diverse capabilities to deliver high impact research. In 2016, RMIT University established a virtual structure of eight Enabling Capability Platforms (ECPs) to bring researchers and higher degree by research students together from across the university to create high impact. The 8 ECPs are: Advanced Manufacturing and Fabrication; Advanced Materials; Biomedical and Health Innovation; Design and Creative Practice; Information and systems (engineering); Social Change; Global Business Innovation; and Urban Futures. These multi-disciplinary platforms were developed to partner with communities and industry, not for profit and government agencies.

We will investigate some of the challenges of managing virtual platforms in traditional university structures, including funding mechanisms, aligning priorities and determining success measures ie how do the virtual platforms create value?

We will also examine the strategies available to encourage collaboration within and across ECPs, such as internal funding; postdoctoral and research fellowships; and research scholarships, and the associated policy, processes and coordination required to facilitate this.

As these virtual platforms are only one of the many moving parts of the research and innovation system, this poster will also explore governance models that assist in defining key responsibilities for stakeholders across the research and innovation system.
A central theme to our case study will be a reflection on the role of research managers and administrators in facilitating such a strategic vision and implementing the activities needed to i) embed these platforms within the university and ii) deploy RMIT’s research beyond the university sector.

**Poster 16 Coordinating ARC End of Year Reporting at The University of Melbourne**

Ms Veronica Loew, Ms Leah Sullivan, Dr Carina Nandlal, Ms Jaffa Ko

The University Of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia

The ARC End of Year Reporting process is an important mechanism to capture information about the progress of a Project including information about any significant issues which have occurred during the past 12 months and the end of year financial position of the Project. Input into the reporting process involves researchers, the Research Accounting team, Faculty and Department Research Administrators and Finance Officers, the Research Office, and often the corresponding teams at other universities. Throughout the reporting cycle we are also communicating regularly with the ARC about the progress of individual Projects. With data being sourced across diverse teams and institutions, the reporting process involves managing relationships and collaborations between different areas of the University and complex data analysis and reconciliation. There are also the challenges of being able to produce a large volume of reports (UoM had 676 in 2017) by the ARC deadline of 31 March at a peak time in the grants administration calendar. Over the past two years the Research Office has joined forces with the Research Accounting Team to coordinate a Survey to collect the required information. The aim has been to improve organisational processes and capabilities and to help us to conform to ARC Funding Agreements. This poster will outline the challenges and opportunities in collaborating across the University to manage the ARC End of Year Reporting process.

**Poster 17 Grant application support: What do Researchers value and why?**

Ms Anne Coco1, Ms Sophie Cleaves1, Ms Anna Giannios1, Mr Frank Anastasopoulos1

1University Of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia

Support offered to Researchers at the pre-award stage of high volume schemes such as NHMRC Project Grants and NHMRC Fellowships varies between Institutions. In general, most Research Administration Offices communicate scheme information, review applications (with significant variation in the type of review offered), provide a final application compliance check and then submit applications to the sponsor.

At the University of Melbourne, ‘application review’ is not compulsory, and for the 2018 NHMRC major grant round, only 60% of our applicants requested ‘application review’ from our office. Data indicates our review process adds value to applications. The service provided by the Research Administration Officers managing NHMRC schemes during the major grant round in 2018 received a 96% satisfaction score from researchers surveyed. Clearly applicants who take up our service are satisfied and applications are improved as a result, our challenge is to encourage more applicants to engage in our support.

We will outline our key steps in the provision of pre-award support to applicants and will present aspects of our support that Researchers told us they valued. We welcome discussion on how other Institutions provide support and methods used to engage their applicants.

**Poster 18 Teamwork makes the Research Funding dream work**

Dr Natasha Wiggins1, Dr Fiona Taylor1, Mr David Hope1, Mrs Danielle Ryrie1

1University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia

A cohesive team environment is integral to navigating the evolving nature of the research funding world. As new challenges and opportunities arise, working effectively in a team can create momentum, improve morale and collectively achieve greater success. As research administration is a key client service area, where new requests for assistance arrive continuously and often in an unpredictable manner, and where individual portfolio workloads can vary dramatically throughout funding cycles, the effectiveness of the team can be driven by a cohesive team environment. So what makes a unified research administration team, and how does this translate into a positive service culture environment that provides quality research support? We posit that the psychology of teamwork can contribute to a highly effective team - where collaboration, communication and the acknowledgement of a common purpose are key. A cohesive research administration team can be achieved by a number of factors, including (i) identifying skillsets and personality types that offer to create a positive team environment; (ii) fostering team building activities; (iii) supporting and providing development opportunities on a continual basis; and (iv) collectively celebrating individual- and team-based advancements. Here,
we explore factors that we believe have contributed to creating and nurturing a cohesive research administration team, which has led to a positive and successful service culture in research administration at the University of Tasmania.

‘The strength of the team is each member. The strength of each member is the team.’
Phil Jackson (1945 - ) former professional basketball player and coach.

**Poster 19 Teatime: the power of informal interactions in enhancing academic-administrator relationships**

**Dr Helen Stephens**, **Dr Rebecca Dorgelo**, **Ms Mandy Pink**

*University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia*

The use of email in a university context is part of the landscape, and brings with it challenges in communication: differences in effectiveness, a neutrality or negative effect (receivers often perceive emails more neutrally or negatively than senders intend), and a task-oriented approach.

Despite the potential for negativity, there are strategies and mitigating effects that work to maximise the usefulness of email: the most important of these is knowing the person you are emailing – hence the importance of research administration staff being imbedded in academic units, attending school events, and having informal chats over the kettle in the tea room. Research has shown that individuals communicating electronically tend to evaluate unknown senders more negatively than from senders they know.

In a research funding context, knowledge of these factors is important in our daily tasks, but is especially vital when reviewing researchers’ grant applications and providing feedback on their work. If we are mindful of the negativity effects that can be present in written electronic communication, and of factors such as length of relationship with those we are communicating with, we will be better placed to provide advice that is trusted, well received, and adopted.

This poster will provide our results from a study to explore these challenges in the research funding administration context.

**Poster 20 The Elusive Cat3: Capturing philanthropic support for research funding**

**Mrs Rebecca David**, **Ms Weisi Zhao**

*RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia*

At RMIT we recognise that we have an opportunity to better report on Category 3 funding. We’re seeking to maximise and ensure accuracy of income reporting for the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC).

This can be achieved through the improved collaboration between Alumni and Philanthropy, and the Research Office.

The clear delineation of roles and functions sees major gift fundraising for philanthropic giving come under the remit of Alumni and Philanthropy. This then largely bypasses the Research Office, the process and support we can offer, as well as subsequently leading to under reporting of Cat3 funding.

So how do we collaborate effectively to account for philanthropic research funding at RMIT? What impact will the 2019 new financial standards have and how will we accurately reflect philanthropic support as research funding? How do we take a holistic view without creating redundant processes or double dipping?

Our poster will discuss the above questions in the context of pre and post award services and cross University collaboration.

**Poster 21 Use “Guidelines to the Guidelines” to Assist Researchers with Grant Applications**

**Mrs Katherine Christian**

*Cure Cancer Australia, Sydney, Australia, 2Federation University, Ballarat, Australia*

Every research office manager knows that grant applications provide challenges to the applicants. This is particularly so in the sciences, where the researchers will typically need to supply complex detail because there is significant funding at stake. There will often be many collaborators involved and rounding up the team is like herding cats.

The researcher’s attention will usually be given to the science of the project. While this focus is essential, the parts of the application which seek information about the investigators, the track record and additional questions, tend to be neglected. From the view of the funding body, this failure to take the opportunity to properly explain who they are and why we should fund
them is disappointing. We want to support good science, but we also want to support the people who stand out from the crowd, the people who are the future leaders.

At Cure Cancer Australia “Guidelines to the Guidelines”, posted on our website assists applicants to provide us with the information we are looking for, and has proven to be beneficial. A generic version recently published (Christian, 2018) includes tips you can use to help your grant applicants with tasks they find so difficult, including:

• Career disruption
• Track record relative to opportunity
• Applicant’s role in key publications
• Research and other experience
• Relevance of the research
• Reason for choosing the place of work
• Consumer involvement


Poster 22 Beware of data overload! Providing accurate, timely and strategic research information

Dr Jo Ann Gan1, Mr Alistair Duncan1, Mr Weiyu Jiang1, Ms Erin You1
1La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia

Higher education providers are extremely rich; in data, at least. As the sector grows more competitive with shifting student mobility, funding cuts and policy changes, leaders are looking to data analytics and business intelligence to inform critical decisions and strategy. In spite of this, there is relatively little mention of research metrics and analytics in the literature beyond bibliometric analysis, a problem attested to by most universities and major international ranking agencies across the globe.

To provide a full picture of the research performance in a university, not only does one need to integrate intricate datasets ranging from staff and students to publications, income and IP, which are often managed through multiple systems, but also fluid datasets from external data sources that provide quality measures, benchmarks and insights into sector trends. The diverse nature of the why, what, when and who the data will be for, along with the ethical, technological and cultural challenges, add another layer of complexity and increase the dilemmas associated with the research ecosystem.

This presentation will discuss the current limitations, challenges and opportunities in managing, reporting and implementing analytic solutions to complex research-related datasets and systems in higher education. The presentation will also draw on the current model and practices of research analytics at La Trobe University and the direction in which it is headed.

Poster 23 COMPASS: Negotiating our way through an implemented online approval system

Ms Shoshannah Beck1, Dr Felicity Lose1, Dr Inez Mahony1, Mrs Alix Stubbs1, Mrs Geraldine Fitzgerald1, Mrs Angela Cathcart1, Mrs Michelle Searle1
1University Of The Sunshine Coast, Sippy Downs, Australia

In 2015, the University of the Sunshine Coast (USC) implemented an online, electronic approval system for research grants & contract research applications called COMPASS. This e-form replaced a hard copy document and allows academics to provide their external research funding applications for review and approval by Line Managers/ Heads of School, Executive Deans, the DVC (Research & Innovation) and the Office of Research (OR), through logging into an online system with their USC credentials anywhere, anytime. Focus groups were conducted with selected end users at all levels prior to implementation of the new system to ensure usability, without compromising USC internal approval requirements. With data flowing directly from COMPASS into ResearchMaster5 (RMES), this new system was initially met with optimism and the promise of a streamlined process. Feedback from end users in the Faculties has been positive, saving academics from spending time “paper-chasing” as they can now log in to COMPASS and see exactly where their application is waiting for approval. COMPASS also creates a digital timeline providing exact dates when proposals were sent to Heads of School, Executive Deans and the OR for approval prior to submission to the funding body.

However, the system has several flaws, most of which affect the OR directly. The biggest issue has been that, after every approval step, COMPASS overwrites RMES data previously entered by the Research Development or Research Finance Teams. Not only does this cause problems for the OR’s workflow, but as this has been unable to be resolved, COMPASS also cannot be used by academics to provide any post-award information as this function has had to be disabled. Additionally, the system is not able to provide academics with a way to easily indicate when a proposal is for a competitive grant scheme or contract research. A 5-week lead time prior to the ‘external deadline’ was required to allow for meaningful feedback between Researchers and Heads.
of Schools/Executive Deans, however if the researcher wanted to submit an application closer to the deadline – the Office of Research had to login and provide an override. So whilst COMPASS has assisted in improving USC research proposal work flow in certain areas, there are improvements that could continue to be made. We hope that by sharing our Office’s experiences with other Research Offices intending to make the leap from hard copy funding application coversheets to an online system, their transition may be easier.

**Poster 24 Farewell to Data Management Plans, UQ’s Research Data Manager is here**

**Dr Rebecca Deuble**, **Dr Andrew Janke**, **Mrs Sandrine Kingston-Ducrot**

1University Of Queensland, St Lucia, Australia

The University of Queensland is committed to adopting the highest standards of excellence in research data management. As part of this commitment, the UQ Research Data Manager (UQRDM) was launched in January 2018, following an 18-month pilot. The platform provides a one-stop interface for researchers to describe, securely store, and share their project’s data with UQ collaborators and beyond. The service includes outreach training sessions, online guides and dedicated support for the UQ Research community.

Following extensive communication preparations, UQ began a staged rollout of the UQRDM to Research Units in January. The implementation to each Unit starts with a two-week preparation period to gather information about the Unit’s specific research data needs, with the help of its Executives. All Unit’s researchers and HDR students are then invited to a workshop which explains why and how to best use the UQRDM, based on the information gathered with the Executives.

As of 3 April 2018, 548 project records have been created within the UQRDM with more than 1,100 unique users, and 3 million files. The large majority of these records have been set up as collaborative projects with 70% including two or more collaborators. These figures emphasize the swift uptake of a non-mandatory system, among the UQ Research Community.

This presentation will detail the UQRDM rollout strategy and explain how the UQRDM service will continue to drive culture change in how UQ thinks about, manages, and values research data.

**Poster 25 Helping researchers shine: Capacity-building in research metrics at Deakin University Library through a design-based research approach**

**Ms Caitlin Savage**, **Ms Linlin Zhao**

1Deakin University Library, Geelong, Australia

It is of strategic value and significance for researchers and universities to understand, measure and showcase the reach, visibility and impact of their research. In research evaluation and benchmarking, research impact is usually demonstrated by research metrics analysis, i.e., the analysis of the active use, consultation, consideration, discussion, or citation/referencing of a piece of research.

At Deakin University, several Divisions contribute to the understanding, demonstration and maximisation of the impact of University research. However, these analysis and reporting services are mostly performed at the university, faculty, school or research centre level. There is a growing demand to provide individual researchers support with research metrics. As the University’s partner in research and research training, Deakin University Library identified a strategic goal in 2016 to expand its role and streamline its existing services in bibliometrics and research impact support. Following the design-based research approach, the Library has successfully designed and implemented a new branded service, ReMAS (Research Metrics and Advisory Services). The key aim of ReMAS is to assist and empower individual researchers to develop a deep understanding of research impact and build skills in selecting appropriate methods to measure and demonstrate their research impact.

This poster presentation will outline the iterative design and implementation process of ReMAS, discuss the pitfalls and solutions we have learned from the process, and share the design principles with other institutions facing similar challenges.

**Poster 26 Identity crisis management: how data talks when researchers can’t**

**Mr Samuel Rowland**, **Mr Tom Devereux**, **Mrs Roop Kanwal**

1University of Melbourne, Australia

In the world of institutional bibliographic data capture, quality author profiles ensure the accurate flow of data from external indexes, but the level of researcher engagement required to build accurate author profiles is significant, and engaging with busy researchers is difficult.
Capturing and maintaining quality bibliographic data for thousands of authors at the University of Melbourne presents challenges, including disambiguation of similarly named authors; prolific authors with publications spanning multiple institutions; and the relatively small number of research management staff whose job it is to assist in the capture and reporting of the published results of their hard work.

To mitigate the need for significant researcher engagement in this case, research data and systems management staff at the University of Melbourne have designed a range of reports and processes which facilitate the capture and maintenance of accurate author profiles using existing data.

Through this innovative use of system functionality and reporting, support staff are taking greater control of bibliographic data within internal systems–data quality is improving as a result, and with minimal engagement required, researchers can focus less on administration and more on research.

**Poster 27 Problem solving, patience and passion: Research administrator skills & qualities for effectively supporting Non-Traditional Research Output (NTRO) reporting**

Ms Catherine Synnott¹, Ms Priscilla Gundelach¹, Ms Sarah Taylor¹, Dr Joseph Toltz¹, Ms Leanne Mumford¹

¹The University of Sydney, Australia

Although Non-Traditional Research Outputs (NTROs) account for a small proportion of all research outputs in Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) submissions, they make a significant contribution to some Fields of Research (FoRs) - as much as 84% in 1905 Visual Arts and Crafts. The high degree of variability and complexity, and the lack of publication conventions, such as the absence of standard citation information, make the reporting of NTROs challenging for both researchers and research administrators. This poster shares some answers to the question ‘What skills, personal qualities and experience do research administrators need to successfully support researchers reporting NTROs?’ Five experienced administrators at the University of Sydney identify four important skills and four valuable personal qualities. We present reporting challenges faced by both researchers and research administrators, and some examples of administrator experience contributing to more effective support of researchers. Ultimately, a good mix of problem solving, patience and passion can enable a research administrator to contribute to a high quality NTRO component in an institution’s ERA submission.

**Poster 28 To Herd or Not to Herd...Cats & Robots: Free Range Researchers and Software Objects versus the Data Governance Corral**

Mr Lawence Hogan¹

¹Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

In today's world of rankings and league tables precise reporting on research performance and external collaboration is a vital function for any university.

Controlled data fields are essential for this level of reporting.

Nevertheless:

- How do you balance the need for clean data and data entry compliance with a Researcher focussed Research Information system (RIS)?
- How to best utilise modern automated research output publication harvesting technology?
- What strategies keep Researchers, Administrators and Robots engaged if they feel they ‘can’t work the system’ and not beat them over the head with a compliance hammer?

At Monash, we have solved these problems with a team to ‘keep what we need clean’. Specifically, we maintain a controlled list of institutions and organisations - the Top 500 External Organisations.

Our top 500 External Organisations is a weighted list of those who fund our research, co-author our outputs and undertake research with us. Using our RIS we continually check and merge the ‘Top 500’ to give us effective clean data to report on. This takes the administrative burden off our researchers, administrators and publication harvesting system ‘robots’, who no longer have to worry about complying with a strictly controlled list of organisations.

A data governance framework controls the top 500, with business stakeholders from across the University involved.

We don’t have to herd ‘them’ they can stay ‘free range and engaged’, we just effectively corral the data after the ‘cats & robots’ have finished with it for the good of the University.
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Poster 29 Deconstructing the Doughnut: strategies to assist our academics in the age of Altmetrics

Dr Heidi Auman1, Dr Nicole Collie1, Mrs Louisa Forbes1, Mr Harko Werkman1, Dr Natalie Collie2

1University Of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia, 2University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

Objectives: This study explores, via three case studies, successful strategies used by researchers to maximise the social media impact of their research.

Methods: We investigated Altmetrics parameters from articles published by highly successful UTAS researchers, including communication trends across the lifecycle of a publication, the resulting attention received and influence of their research.

Results: We found that ‘successful’ research in terms of social media presence was a combination of strategy and other unexpected factors.

Conclusions: We provide a set of recommendations to assist researchers boost their discoverability by engaging with a diversity of social media and other non-traditional routes of communication.

Poster 30 Ideas to Impact: Creating change through connected activities

Dr Venetia Joscelyne1, Ms Ella Horton1, Dr Regina Magierowski1

1University Of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia

Engagement and Impact are the latest buzzwords in research, but what do they mean, what is the difference, how do they relate to research end-users, and where do they occur in the traditional research pathway?

To help University of Tasmania researchers and professional staff answer these questions, we developed a visual summary of where and how engagement with research end-users can be embedded into the research pathway to generate impact.

This graphic can be added to the toolkit of any researcher or research professional to:

1. Improve understanding of engagement and impact, both in theory and practice
2. Inform research planning
3. Support participation in government reporting exercises
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