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Submit your research output along with a 200 word research statement to the research output repository [https://search.ror.unisa.edu.au/](https://search.ror.unisa.edu.au/)

The Research Outputs Repository (ROR) is UniSA’s institutional repository. Once your output is lodged in ROR it will show up on your Staff Home Page and your Academic Staff Activity Report.

The Non-traditional Research Outputs Working Group (NTRO WG) was established to conduct peer review and processing of non-traditional outputs. Once your output has been reviewed by the NTROWG it can be used for ERA.

ASAR is endorsed for promotion, probation and performance management.
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1. What is an NTRO?

NTRO stands for Non-Traditional Research Output

Eligible research output types include the following NTRO types:

| Original Creative Works | Visual art work  
|                        | Design/architectural work  
|                        | Textual work  
|                        | Other  
| Live Performance of Creative Works | Music  
|                                    | Play  
|                                    | Dance  
|                                    | Other  
| Recorded/Rendered Creative Works | Audio/visual recording  
|                                    | Performance  
|                                    | Inter-arts  
|                                    | Digital creative work  
|                                    | Website/web based exhibition  
|                                    | Other  
| Public Exhibitions and Events | Web based exhibition  
|                                    | Exhibition/Event  
|                                    | Festival  
|                                    | Other  
| Research Reports for an External Body | Public sector  
|                                    | Industry  
|                                    | Not-for-profit  
|                                    | Other  

In Australian higher education, research outputs are reported through the Excellence for Research in Australia (ERA) evaluation process (held every three years and managed by the Australian Research Council (ARC)). ERA assesses the quality of research performance in Australian universities against Australian and world benchmarks.

Research outputs may consist of any form of publicly available material embodying research, whether produced by writing, making, composing, designing, performing, or curating. For the ERA evaluation process, the ARC distinguishes between what it calls ‘traditional outputs’ – scholarly books or monographs, chapters in scholarly books, scholarly articles in refereed journals, and refereed conference papers – and ‘non-traditional research outputs’ (NTROs), which comprise a wide variety of other outputs that differ in their form and mode of production, and are classified differently for administrative purposes.

Any NTRO submitted must meet the ERA definition of research:

...the creation of new knowledge and/or the use of existing knowledge in a new and creative way so as to generate new concepts, methodologies, inventions and understandings. This could include synthesis and analysis of previous research to the extent that it is new and creative.²

---

¹ ERA Submission Guidelines 2018 p.36. Available online at: ARC ERA 2018 Submission Guide
In considering NTROs, research is defined in the same way as it is for traditional outputs as the creation of new knowledge and/or the use of existing knowledge in a new and creative way, to generate new concepts, methodologies, and understandings in the relevant discipline area(s). This might include the synthesis and analysis of previous research to the extent that it is new and creative in itself and/or leads to new and creative outcomes. Consistent with a broad notion of research and experimental development – whether defined as Basic, Strategic, Applied, Practice-as-research, or Interdisciplinary – the research for traditional and non-traditional outputs alike will be undertaken on a systematic basis in order to increase the stock of knowledge (including knowledge of humanity, culture and society) or to use this stock of knowledge to devise new applications.

Institutions must provide digital documentation of any NTROs submitted for ERA peer review, as well as the associated research statements. These must be available via the institution’s digital repository.

2. Definitions of Non Traditional Research Outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Creative Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In order for research outputs to be eligible as original creative works, the relevant eligible researcher must be the creator of the creative work, rather than, for example, the curator of an exhibition of creative works produced by others. Institutions can use the exhibition of an original creative work to demonstrate that the work is publicly available, but can claim each instance of such a research output only once. Institutions can submit exhibited creative works as either:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● a single item exhibited as an individual creative work (equal to one research output)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● a portfolio of works exhibited as a cohesive/thematic collection of the work of a single creator (also equal to one research output).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-categories are as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual art work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/architectural work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Live Performance of Creative Works

For live performance of creative works, institutions claim the actual public performance for ERA peer review.

Sub-categories are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>New work or a demonstrably new or innovative interpretation or production of an existing work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play</td>
<td>New work or a demonstrably new or innovative interpretation or production of an existing work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>New work or a demonstrably new or innovative interpretation or production of an existing work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other live performance of creative works not listed above. New work or demonstrably new or innovative interpretation or production of an existing work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recorded/Rendered Creative Works

For recorded/rendered creative works, the research component is contained within the recording/rendering. Simple documentations of live performances of creative works without a research component are not eligible for submission. However, institutions may submit the documentation as supporting material under live performance of creative works.

Sub-categories are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audio/visual recording</td>
<td>Research outputs presented in an audio-visual format, such as films, documentaries or audio-visual presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Performances (in music, dance, theatre, etc.) created specifically for a recorded medium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-arts</td>
<td>Recorded/rendered creative works, often experimental, produced in association with other researchers in other disciplinary fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital creative work</td>
<td>Digital creative works, including creative 3D models, digital outputs of architectural and design projects, computer programs, games and visual artworks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website/web based exhibition</td>
<td>These are eligible as recorded/rendered creative works if the eligible researcher is the creator of the creative works featured in the website. Curated web based exhibitions of the creative work of others must be submitted as curated or produced substantial public exhibitions and events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other recorded/rendered creative works not listed above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Public exhibitions and events**

The public exhibitions and events research output type aims to capture research undertaken by producers and curators, rather than artists. To be eligible, the exhibitions and events must be substantial in nature. Institutions must submit exhibition catalogues as original creative works, in the ‘textual work’ subcategory.

Where a curator is an eligible researcher, the curator may claim exhibitions, festivals and other events as research outputs. Artists may claim exhibitions of their original creative works under the original creative works research output type, where the exhibition of the creative works is used as evidence that those works are publicly available.

Institutions cannot count multiple exhibitions/events as multiple research outputs where the repeated exhibitions/events do not introduce a new research component to the work. For example, institutions can count a touring exhibition only once. Institutions may count multiple exhibitions/events where each subsequent exhibition/event introduces a new research component to the work that builds upon the initial research component of the original exhibition/event.

Institutions may submit recurring exhibitions and events. For example, the Biennale of Sydney is a recurring event with each occurrence being unique rather than a repeat of the previous occurrence.

Sub-categories are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web based exhibition</td>
<td>The curation and/or production of an internet website presenting a collection of creative works where the internet is the medium of the exhibited works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition/Event</td>
<td>The curation and/or production of creative works exhibited in a recognised gallery, museum or similar venue, in order to show new works or a different arrangement of works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festival</td>
<td>The curation of a festival bringing together innovative work or existing works in an innovative format or through a theme that provides new perspectives and/or experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Curated or substantial public exhibitions and events that do not fit into the above sub-categories of the curated or produced substantial public exhibitions and events research output type.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research reports for an external body
A research report for an external body is a written research output commissioned or solicited by an external body such as a government department or private company.

Portfolios are eligible for submission in this sub-category only within FoRs flagged with “other NTRO”

The following examples are unlikely to be eligible for submission under this sub-category:
- Submissions to public inquiries and consultations, including government or parliamentary inquiries.
- Policy blogs or online commentaries/articles.
- Briefing notes.

In some cases, the above items may be eligible as part of a portfolio. Institutions must only submit items that are publicly available (no sensitive publications).

Sub-categories are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>A research report undertaken for an Australian, state, territory, local, foreign or international government body or organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>A research report undertaken for a company, industry organisation, industry peak body, or an employer/employee association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
<td>A research report undertaken for a body or organisation operating in the not-for-profit sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>A research report undertaken for an organisation not covered by the above sub-categories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portfolio

NB: Portfolios are for the ERA evaluation process only. Discuss with your line manager if you want to submit research outputs as a portfolio of work.

A portfolio is a collection of research outputs that institutions submit as a single NTRO. It is made up of research outputs from the same underlying research endeavour that on their own may not meet the definition of research, but when collected together have coherent research content. All items within the portfolio must fall within the ERA reference period.
3. Why report NTROs?

- Once lodged in UniSA’s Research Outputs Repository (ROR), an NTRO will display on your staff home page, increasing the visibility and discoverability of the research.
- Reporting NTROs broadens the collection (and definition) of a research output beyond traditional books, journal articles and conference papers.
- NTROs lodged in ROR can potentially be tracked by online attention tools (e.g. Altmetric Explorer) providing another way to monitor people’s engagement with your research.
- NTROs demonstrate the nature, scope and quality of an individual’s research activity and productivity. (Note that UniSA collects and compiles data on individual research performance. These data are used in performance conversations, by promotion committees, in university reviews such as the Provost’s Curriculum Innovation Project, and in academic staff activity reports).
- NTROs contribute to UniSA’s ERA submissions.
- NTROs can demonstrate that an individual has met the requirements of their employment contract.

4. Preparing your NTRO submission

Each NTRO must:

- meet the ERA definition of research
- be published/made publicly available in the reporting year
- be the first showing of an original creative work
- be exhibited in a recognised gallery, museum or performance venue or a site specific installation exhibited as part of a recognised event
- include a by-line identifying the author with the University of South Australia
- be accompanied by a 200 word research statement.

Other supporting evidence of peer review

You are required to submit other supporting documents/evidence if available:
1. print or electronic critical or scholarly essays or citations, articles, reviews, conference papers, etc., acknowledging the output and written by peers
2. recognition through short-listing, prizes, awards or honours, reviewed and judged by a panel of peers, selection for further exhibitions, events or publications
3. commissioning through a peer review process
4. competitively funded grant schemes.

Preparing your evidence

For original creative works submission, it is highly recommended that high-resolution images are inserted into a blank presentation in Microsoft PowerPoint.

However, the following file types are also acceptable:

- Adobe PDF (i.e. .pdf)
- Image (i.e. .gif, .jpg, .jpeg, .bmp, .png, .tif, etc.)
- Microsoft Word (i.e. .doc, .docx)
- Text (i.e. .txt)
• Popular Video/Audio format (i.e. .mp3, .mp4, .avi)

The following file types are NOT acceptable:
• executable and script based files (i.e. .exe, .bat, .sh)
• ZIP archives (i.e. .zip)
• compilation environment dependant files (i.e. .asp, .jsp, .cgi)
• RODAs that contain ‘callbacks’ and additional network transactions.

Preparing the research statement

Examples of research statements are provided in the Appendix (page 14-17).

In addition to meeting the definition of research, NTROs must be accompanied by a research statement, which identifies the research component of each output. The statement must be no more than 2000 characters including spaces (approximately 250 words) and cannot contain any embedded links. The Research Statement should address the following:

1. Researcher
2. Research Output
3. Research Background
4. Research Contribution
5. Research Significance.

RESEARCHER:
Name

RESEARCH OUTPUT(S)
Identify if research resulted in multiple outputs i.e. a portfolio. Provide title of output(s), title of exhibition(s)/publication(s), name of venue(s), date(s).

RESEARCH BACKGROUND
Provide the disciplinary and conceptual context for the research.
Field: Disciplinary area in which the research has been undertaken and outcomes produced.
Context: The theoretical context in which the research was conducted. The context for the outcomes produced. Is it a curatorial project, an invited or competitively selected work for an exhibition, or commissioned work, or a textual work in a publication?
Research aim

RESEARCH CONTRIBUTION
Identify the nature of the contribution of the research to the discipline.
Innovation: How has the research (embedded in the outcomes) made an innovative contribution to the discipline? How has it improved, developed, or expanded existing applications or processes?
New knowledge: What new knowledge has the research contributed to the discipline?

RESEARCH SIGNIFICANCE
Provide evidence that demonstrates the significance of the findings of the research to the discipline. This could be demonstrated by:
Dissemination of the research findings: The significance of the publication or exhibition in which the findings have been published/shown.

Acknowledgement of research significance through peer review: Citations in quality journals, reviews by significant critics, purchases of outcomes for major collections. Selection of the creative work by experts in the field for further exhibitions, events or publications.

These requirements are in keeping with ERA submission requirements.³

5. How to submit

The current process for submitting NTROs at UniSA:
1. Output exhibited/Performed/published.
2. Staff member (or student) submits the NTRO to the Library online Research Outputs Repository (ROR) via the ‘Deposit’ function http://search.ror.unisa.edu.au/
3. The Non-traditional Research Outputs Working Group (NTROWG) peer reviews the submission (More information on the role of the NTROWG is in the next section).
4. NTROWG conducts peer review and assesses outputs using the evaluation framework.

³ ERA Submission Guidelines 2018 p.64. Available online at: ARC ERA 2018 Submission Guide
6. UniSA NTRO Working Group (NTROWG)

The function of this working group is to:

1. support the processes to ensure Non-traditional Research Outputs (NTROs) are entered into the Research Outputs Repository in a timely and accurate manner
2. provide expert advice to colleagues and the broader university on the nature and value of NTROs
3. peer review all NTROs produced by UniSA staff or students to ensure they meet the criteria for the research assessment processes as stated in the NTRO Submission Guidelines
4. support regular reporting of NTROs internally and externally.

The working group should comprise:

1. experts from the School of Art, Architecture and Design (AAD) and School of Creative Industries (CI) and seconded experts as required from other disciplines with a national and/or international reputation
2. a chairperson appointed within the group to provide leadership
3. Library staff with knowledge of the NTRO submission process
4. professional staff from the School of Art, Architecture and Design (AAD) and School of Creative Industries (CI) to help put together the submissions and to follow up with creator(s) regarding incomplete submissions
5. professional staff from Business Intelligence and Planning to provide executive support to the NTROWG.

Meetings will be twice yearly, in April and early September, to coincide with key business processes.

The NTRO Submission Guidelines document provides detailed information on NTRO definitions and the process of peer review. Broadly the NTRO Working Group assessment approach includes the following:

1. Business Intelligence and Planning (BIP) reviews the Research Outputs Repository (ROR) and extracts the NTROs that require academic peer review, and updates the NTRO Working Group (NTROWG) Sharepoint site.
2. Business Intelligence and Planning checks the employment status of the creator (current or non-current).
3. Academics check the submission, and evidence submission.
4. Academics verify and confirm that the submission meets the requirements as stated in the NTRO Submission Guidelines.
5. Academics review and verify that the exhibition/performance venue/commissioning organisation is consistent with the established research assessment criteria in the NTRO Submission Guidelines.
6. Professional staff from schools follow up with the creator(s) in their school for incomplete submissions that require clarification, further supporting documents or missing evidence.
7. Academics provide a decision about the reported output based on evidence presented and record the decision in the NTROWG Sharepoint site. Each submission requires two peer reviews.
8. The Library updates the status of the peer-reviewed submission in the Research Outputs Repository. This final status will be used to support key business processes across the university.

Non-traditional outputs are evaluated using the following evaluation criteria:

- **Standing:**
  - International
  - National
  - State

- **Exhibition:**
  - 1st Tier
  - 2nd Tier
  - 3rd Tier

- **Quality:**
  - Exceptional
  - High
  - Standard
7. Example from ERA 2018 Submission Guidelines

(Contents of research statement for ERA peer review of NTROs from ERA 2018 Submission Guidelines)

The following is an example of an acceptable visual arts research statement:

**Research background**
Current international developments in painting have identified the need to establish complex forms for representing identity in terms of facial expression. While this research recognises the significance of facial expression, it has overlooked the unstable nature of identity itself.

**Research contribution**
The paintings Multiple Perspectives by Y address the question of the unstable nature of identity as expressed in painterly terms through a study in unstable facial phenomena using the philosophical concept of ‘becoming’. In doing so, it arrives at a new benchmark for the FoR in understanding visual identity, namely that identity is not bound to stable facial phenomena but, like other forms of meaning, is constantly undergoing change.

**Research significance**
The significance of this research is that it overcomes barriers for visually understanding the complex nature of identity and its expressive painterly possibilities. Its value is attested to by the following indicators:
- Selection of the painting for inclusion in the international exhibition Documenta, Kassel, Germany.
- Its inclusion as a case study in the renowned Courtauld Institute, University of London, Issues in Contemporary Art graduate seminar series.
- Its being the subject of a chapter in the book Identity Reframed published by Thames and Hudson and authored by the renowned art historian Z.
- Its forming part of a competitively funded ARC project.

---

4 ERA Submission Guidelines 2018 p.64. Available online at: ARC ERA 2018 Submission Guide
8. Example of previous submission 1

HCA cluster 2 Research statement

Researcher: Odette England

Research output: *Thrice Upon A Time*, major group exhibition of photographs, Photographic Resource Center (Boston, MA) 2012 – guest curator Alison Nordstrom of the George Eastman House International Museum of Photography and Film

Research Background
Today’s predominance of screen-only interaction has made the importance of the photograph as a memory-based object more beguiling. This research probes the processing and surfaces of photographs in the digital age using a collaborative and performative method to investigate the inherent value of photographic materiality.

Research Contribution
The research adds a new, necessary perspective to contemporary debate regarding photographic remembrance, inviting other lens-based artists to reconsider the physicality of art-making; specifically, the opportunities that collaboration engenders. Furthermore, by examining the provocative power of family snapshots and the locations they depict, it emphasises the evolution of photographic conventions within image-making discourse.

Research Significance
*Thrice Upon A Time* showed in two-person exhibitions at the New Mexico Museum of Art and at KlompChing Gallery (New York) in 2012. Group exhibitions of the work include the Philadelphia Photo Arts Center, Cohen Gallery at Brown University, Providence Art Club, Galerie Huit (France), and China House, Malaysia. In 2012 it won the US$5,000 CENTER 2012 Project Launch Award (juried by Virginia Heckert, Associate Curator, J. Paul Getty Museum) and a US$3,000 New Work Grant from the Rhode Island School of Design. Features and critical reviews ensued in the *Chicago Maroon, Chicago Reader, American Photo, Feature Shoot, Boston Globe, Fraction Magazine*, and *Providence Journal*.

Artefact/Evidence


9. Example of previous submission 2

HCA cluster 2 Research statement

Researcher: Simon Biggs

Research output: reRead, Language Games, Academy der Kunste, Berlin, 2009

Research Background
Research within the creative arts and human-computer interaction allows insights into and development of technical forms of human augmentation. reRead explored human-machine communication and the social implications of human augmentation, as an assemblage, through employing multi-modal interactive technologies and generative grammar systems. The project was commissioned by Berlin Literature Werkstatt for presentation at Language Games, an exhibition and conference in Berlin, 2009.

Research contribution
The project incorporates software developed by the artist, including a bi-directional generative grammar system (automatically writing simultaneously forward and backward). This research proposes an innovative form of automatic writing, contributing to research in electronic literature and media arts.

Research significance
The project was premiered as a large-scale interactive installation at the Language Games Exhibition and Conference at the Academy der Kunste, Berlin, 2009. It was subsequently exhibited, as an interactive installation, as part of the 2010 Electronic Literature Organization Conference at Brown University, Providence and in the International Exhibition Electronic Literature in Italy, at the Palazzo del Arti, Naples, 2011. The project and related research has been critically discussed in ‘Metalanguage in Lewis Carroll’s Jabberwocky and Simon Biggs’ reRead’, Asuncion Lopez Varela, In Comparative Literature and Culture, 16(5), 2014, Purdue University Press, USA; Beyond the Screen, eds: Schafer, J; Gendolla, P; Transcript, Germany, 2010; The Cambridge Companion to Creative Writing, eds Morley & Nellsen, Cambridge University Press, UK, 2012; Electronic Poetry: How to Approach it? Giovanna di Rosario, Textol, XVII(1/2), Institute Ferdinand de Saussure, France 2012.
10. Example of previous submission 3

NTRO Research Statement
(Research Report for External Bodies - Public Sector)

Research Output:
Researcher: Scarino, Angela
Title of Work: Engaging with diversity: A case study of the intercultural experiences of Muslim and non-Muslim students in an Australian school
Date/Year: 2015
Pub ID: 9916026779401831

Research Background:
While there have been studies that consider the experience of Muslim students in Australia, there are fewer studies in the context of secondary schools, and fewer still that consider the phenomenon of linguistic, cultural and faith-based diversity while keeping the multiple perspectives in play.

Research contribution:
This study contributes to an understanding of how people make sense of and manage learning and being together in the context of a highly diverse high school in which there are a large number of Muslim students. The findings highlight a problem created by making sense of diversity in terms of a distinction between students based primarily on their religious affiliations, without taking into consideration the many other dimensions of diversity that are in play. Nevertheless, openness to religion and the value of creating spaces in which diverse languages, cultures and faiths can be mediated, is shown to be significant in creating cohesion in such a context of diversity.

Research Significance:
The importance of attending to language, in particular the role it plays in including or excluding people has also been a key contribution of the study. The experience of living and learning is both a multicultural and a multilingual endeavour, in which students draw on their linguistic and cultural repertoires in their learning and being. This does not happen in a vacuum however, as the study shows how students and staff reflect on and manage reflexively their experiences of interaction and the potential for tensions arising from social discourses within and beyond the school community. This is understood as an ongoing dialogue and a dynamic process of engagement and reciprocity, through which a shared school culture of learning and understanding in the context of linguistic, cultural and faith-based diversity is created.

ROR URL: http://researchoutputs.unisa.edu.au/11541.2/117564