# UNIFORM FACULTY RESEARCH EXPECTATION MODEL

The Faculty has adopted a uniform research expectation model (since May 2012). It is as follow:

# School of Law Minimum Yearly Research Expectations



**Workload Allocation for Research**

**Level**

**20%**

**30%**

**40%**

**50%**

**60%**

Professor (E)

1 point

2 points

3 points 4 points 5 points

A/Professor (D)

1 point

2 points 2.5 points 3.5 points 4.5 points

Senior Lecturer (C)

0.5 points 1.5 point

2 points 3.0 points 4 points



Lecturer (B)

0.5 points

1 point

1.5 points 2.5 points 3.0 points

A/ Lecturer (A)

0.5 points 0.5 point 1.5 points

N/A

N/A

# School of Law Research Points Model (based on the University Research Model)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Research Activity or Outcome** |  | **Maximum** | **Comments** |
| **Conducting research … Recognised publications** | Points | Points |  |
| Research Book or major Creative Work | 5 |  | \* Approved by Head of School |
| Research Book chapter or Creative Work | 2 |  | \* Approved by Head of School |
| Published Article - A\* | 3 |  |  |
| Published Article - A | 2 |  |  |
| Published Article - B | 1.5 |  |  |
| Published Article - C and other \* | 0.5 | 1 | \* Approved by Head of School |
| Approved Research Reports | 0.5 | 0.5 | \* Approved by Head of School |
| Approved Research Activity | TBD | TBD | \* Approved by Head of School |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| \* This is a form of quality checking. For example, self-published books are unlikely to be approved. | | |
| **Grant applications** | Points | Maximum |
| National competitive applications cleared through RSD | 1 | 1 |
| Non-competitive grant applications cleared through RSD | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| **External Grant Income** | **per**  **$1,000** | Points per $1,000a |
| National competitive income | 0.1 | - |
| Other external research funding | 0.07 | - |
| a Thus, if a team got a $30,000 grant, each team member would receive 30 \* 0.07 = 2.1 points | | |

**JOURNAL RANKING LIST**

**Rationale for Journal Ranking List Applied at the Law School**

1. There are over 2,000 law journals.
2. Any ranking methodology, will involve a degree of subjectivity, but an imperfect system is better than none at all.
3. The grading system of A\*, A, B and C has recognition and should be maintained.
4. In establishing a list, in order to maintain a genuine quality measure, it is important that there is not too much inflation in relation to the number of journals that are rated A\* and A (and to a lesser extent B).
5. It is not reasonably feasible for a committee to start afresh and rank every journal according to agreed and universally accepted criteria. Certainly, this should be a last resort given the time and labour commitment involved and the possibility of failure.

1. Established ranking lists have the advantage that they are already developed.
2. This no single law journal ranking list that is comprehensive.
3. There are three incomplete ranking lists.
4. They are ERA2010; the ABDC (2013) list and Washington Lee.
5. The problems with ERA2010 are that it lists less than two- thirds of journals (1280); it is out-dated; it will not be updated; it is expressly repudiated by ERA and is too Australian-centric - there are a number of top 50 ranked US journals (the gold standard for American academics) that are ranked C (eg Wake Forest Law Review; Lewis and Clarke Law Review). Other exceptional US journals are ranked B (eg University of Illinois Law Review and the Connecticut Law Review). The advantages of the ERA2010 list are that it had considerable acceptance until it was repudiated and is well-known.
6. The problems with the ABDC list (law specific) is that it ostensibly it relates to business law journals (although in fact it contains many generalist journals) and it only ranks a small number (205) of journals. The advantage of the list is that it id relatively current and will continue to be updated.
7. The Washington Lee list is the most comprehensive (1646 journals); it is updated annually and the least impressionistic given that it uses objective metrics (citations and impact). The disadvantage is that it is too US-focused; there are only 11 non-US journals in the top 500 (8 from the UK; 2 from Canada and one Israel). The highest ranked Australian journal is the Sydney Law Review -  at 531.

1. In terms of ratios of A\*, A, B and C journals, ABDC2013 is slightly more generous than ERA2010 – the respective ratios are: A\* (5%; 6.9%); A (15%; 20.8%); B (30%; 28.4%); C (50%; 43.9%).
2. The most efficient manner in which to create a ranking list is to use a combination of the above lists, while minimising the deficiencies of each list.
3. In terms of overall ratios of A, A\*, B and C, the ratio applied by in the ABDC list is preferable to ERA. It has a slightly higher ratio of A and A\* journals but this is consistent with the actual high number of quality law journals. This will also serve to minimise debate regarding the evaluation of any particular journal. Additionally, there is no basis for preferring one list to another – none is demonstrably superior.
4. For non-US journals, a combination of ERA2010 and ABDC2013 should  be used. Thus, a journal which is ranked on both lists will receive the highest ranking in either list (if there is a disparity). This does not lead to an undue A\* or A or inflation. For example the ABDC list only has 15 A\* journals and 11 of these are also A\* on ERA2010. Hence combing these two lists adds only another 4 A\* journals, meaning that the ratio of A\* remains under 6.9%.
5. For US journals, the Washington Lee list is well-established and accepted. It is comprehensive and objectively validated. The top 6.9% of journals in this list should be  A\*; the next 20.8% should be A, and so on.
6. The Washington and Lee list could be confined to only the US journals (989) or expanded to include all journals (1646). In reality the contrast between these options is minor given that nearly all of the top 500 (ie those that would be ranked A or A\*) are US based. The number of journals included in an adapted list will of course  impact on the number of US journals that are rated A\*  or A. If the longer list (1646 journals) is preferred then the top  114 journals are A\* (ie 6.9% of 1646), while the shorter list (989) results in the top 68 ranked journals receiving an A\* rating. The longer list is preferable because in reality every US journal in the top 100 (or thereabouts) of Washington and Lee is of exceptional quality. There is no argument for quality inflation because the capacity for Australian academics to publish in these journals is not high.
7. Accordingly, the most valid raking system is to (i) use the best of ERA2010 and ABDC2013 for non-US journals and (ii) the Washington Lee list for US journals (with A\* equating to the top 6.9%; A the next 20.8%; B the next 28.4% and C the remaining 43.9%). Thus, there would be two separate lists: one for non-US journals and the other for US journals.
8. If a premium is to be added for simplicity then the preferred model is to merge all three lists and rate each journal on the basis of the highest ranking in any of the lists. This ostensibly can give the impression of A\* and A inflation. But the reality is to the contrary. Adding Washington Lee to the merged ERA2010/ABDC 2013  list does not inflate the number of A\* and A journals because virtually all of the A\* and A journals in the Washington Lee and list are US based. It is for this reason that Deakin has endorsed this approach. The combined list is attached.
9. Of course, there remains the issue of (i) how to rank new journals and journals not on the merged list and (ii) how to update journals that derive their highest ranking on the ERA 2010 list. These issues need to discussed and resolved separately to the initial ranking list.
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