ROPE Consultation Feedback Template

1. Submission Process

Please use this template to address the questions you consider relevant to you and/or your organisation.

Questions should be answered in conjunction with information provided in the Research Opportunity and Performance Evidence (ROPE) consultation paper available at: www.arc.gov.au/consultations.

The ARC prefers to receive feedback electronically at the email address below.

Deadline

The due date for stakeholder feedback is **COB Friday 21 April 2017**.

Contact

Contact: Strategy and Governance Section
Postal address: GPO Box 2702, Canberra ACT 2601
Email: ARC-SG@arc.gov.au
Telephone: +61 2 6287 6633

2. Privacy Collection Statement

All submissions, excluding optional information as listed below, will be treated as public documents and may be made available to the public, in full, on the ARC website, unless you indicate that you would like all or part of your submission to remain in confidence. Automatically generated confidentiality statements in emails do not suffice for this purpose.

Respondents who would like part of their submission to remain in confidence should provide this information in the respondent details section below. Legal requirements, such as those imposed by the *Freedom of Information Act 1982*, may affect the confidentiality of your submission.

You may also make submissions anonymously or using a pseudonym.

The ARC may be required to release submissions for other reasons including for the purpose of parliamentary processes or where otherwise required by law (for example, under a court subpoena).

Relevant legislation and resources
- Privacy Act 1988
  - Australian Privacy Principles (APPs)
- Archives Act 1983
- Freedom of Information Act 1982

3. Respondent details

Mandatory information	
Name*	Christina Parolin
Submitting as individual or institution*	*Institution*
Institutional affiliation (where relevant)*	Australian Academy of the Humanities
Would you like your response to remain confidential and/or anonymous?	No
Contact email	christina.parolin@humanities.org.au
Optional information	
Category that best describes your current role	*Select from the options provided.*
If other, please provide details	*Enter 'other' details here.*
Gender	*Select from the options provided.*
Title that best describes your academic status (where applicable)	*Choose an item.*
If other, please provide details	*Enter 'other' details here.*
Age	*Choose an item.*
Number of years since your PhD (where applicable)	*Choose an item.*
Category that best describes your field of research (if applicable)	*Select from the options provided.*
Would you be willing to discuss your comments in confidence with an ARC staff member?	*Select from the options provided.*
* may be made public	

4. Consultation Questions

For all respondents

Question 1: Should the ROPE components be streamlined (see **ROPE consultation paper**– **Table 1**)?
Select: *Yes/No*
If Yes, what changes would you suggest?

> *Click or tap here to enter text.*

Question 2: Are the current time periods allocated for consideration of the ROPE components appropriate (see **ROPE consultation paper–Table 2**)?
Select: *Yes/No*
If No, what changes would you suggest?

> Feedback we received noted the ability to report on total career publications rather than these being limited to 10 years was an important change which should be retained.

Question 3:   Should the page limits for the common components of ROPE be harmonised across the NCGP funding schemes (see **ROPE consultation paper–Table 3**)?
Select: *Yes/No*
If Yes, how?

> *Click or tap here to enter text.*

Question 4:   Are the details of the ROPE components appropriate? See the ROPE statement (see **ROPE consultation paper–Attachment A**) and Instructions to Applicants (see **ROPE consultation paper–Attachment B**)?
Select: *Yes/No*
If No, what changes would you suggest?

> *Click or tap here to enter text.*

Question 5:   ROPE is a part of the 'Investigator' selection criterion. Is the allocated weighting to this selection criterion appropriate (see **ROPE consultation paper–Figure 1**)?
Select: *Yes/No*
If No, why not?

> *Click or tap here to enter text.*

Question 6:   Is ROPE meeting its objective, that is, do applicants have suitable opportunity to compete on a level playing field by addressing their research performance evidence in the context of their opportunities to conduct research?
Select: *Yes/No*
If No, why not?

> Feedback received from AAH Fellows is that ROPE is generally working well, though there are indicators to suggest that improvements could be made. The dominance of senior researchers in successful grants could indicate a reluctance of assessors to take the ROPE rubric seriously in terms of how ROPE is measured and applied. It would be helpful for the ARC to give more guidance about how to apply these criteria so as not to tilt the playing field in favour of the most experienced researchers, or to discriminate against candidates who have experienced career interruptions. The feedback we received from Fellows is that it is very difficult to quantify how a ROPE issue has directly impacted on research performance unless the panel is told in these terms. More precise information on the impact of ROPE issues on research outputs is needed. We would therefore strongly support a table as suggested in Q9 (below).

Question 7: Does ROPE advantage one discipline group over another, for example, in terms of evidence sought? Is there alternative evidence that could be considered?
Select: *Yes/No*
If Yes, please suggest other evidence.

> We have no evidence to suggest that the current arrangements discriminate against humanities scholars. Again we would make the point that the evidence presented should be precise and specific to enable assessors to determine the impact of the ROPE issue on an applicant's outputs.

Question 8: Are the ROPE requirements clear and easy to understand?
Select: *Yes/No*
If No, why not?

> One suggestion we received was that it would be helpful if a shift from full-time to part-time was explicitly allowed as an interruption.

Question 9: Could the structure of the information requested on career interruption be improved? For example, would it be preferable to ask researchers to identify career interruptions in a table like the one below?

From when	To when	Reason

Select: *Yes/No*
If Yes, please provide details:

> Yes, we support the inclusion of a table. The feedback we received is that this area of form is often poorly done because applicants do not follow the instructions for what they need to put in each of the numbered sections. Including a table for interruptions would help alleviate this issue and would allow much easier and more direct comparisons between candidates.

Question 10: Are there any other comments you wish to make?

> *Click or tap here to enter text.*