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Annual Research Plans at the GSA

- need for ARPs arose in part from the outcome of the REF 2014 assessment
- peer-reviewed (but not openly available) ARPs aim to enable research time to be allocated more effectively, with a view to maximising the number of high quality submissions to the next REF
- RADAR as a home for the ARP template:
  - repository played a key role in supporting the GSA’s REF 2014 submission
  - researchers already using RADAR, so no need to learn a new system
- May 2016: 145 ARPs submitted / peer-reviewed, and decisions communicated
- Feb. 2017: template adjusted (following feedback) and relaunched
The ARP template

If you would like to register any mitigating circumstances of relevance to your ability to undertake any aspect of research this year, please do so using the relevant proforma, available on the GSA VLE.
The ARP template (continued)

Please provide up to 500 words describing your research track record, suitable for publication on the GSA Website. Include:

- i) areas of interest and relevant GSA strategic theme(s);
  - Themes: Architecture, Urbanism and the Public Sphere (APS); Design Innovation (DI); Digital Visualisation (DV); Education in Art, Design and Architecture (EADA); Contemporary Art and Curating (CAC); Health and Wellbeing (HW); Material Culture (MC); Sustainability (SUS).) ii) plans for next 12 months.

Nicola Siminon is the Institutional Repository and Records Manager at the Glasgow School of Art. She is responsible for the management of RADAR, the GSA research repository.

Summary of research activity since last ARP:

Please provide up to 500 words describing the research activity you have undertaken within the previous ARP period.

To be completed.

174/3500

15/3500
The ARP template (continued)
The ARP template (continued)

Submit your ARP

Please submit your completed ARP by clicking on the box below, then select the green “SAVE AND RETURN” button.

Please note that submitting your ARP will create an archived version of your ARP, which will no longer be available for you to edit.

WARNING: If you still wish to edit your ARP, please ensure the box below is NOT ticked.
What happened next?

Initial draft of the peer review process for ARPs in RADAR
Integrating the peer review process into RADAR

• discussions initiated with EPrints autumn 2016
• development commenced spring 2017
  • more extensive than that of the initial ARP template:
    4 incremental work packages, with thorough testing and feedback in the interim
• peer reviewer comments collected electronically, for later transfer into RADAR (once functionality available)
• panel chair’s summaries were entered into the system, and released to ARP authors through RADAR successfully
The ARP peer review process

1. Researcher writes and submits their ARP in RADAR (by 30th March)
2. RADAR Admin. provides Head of Research (HoR) with report of all ARPs submitted
3. HoR provides RADAR Admin. with list of peer reviewers, their panel membership and their allocated ARPs
4. RADAR Admin. adds relevant permissions to peer reviewers and panel chairs in RADAR, then creates the review panels and allocates the ARPs to the appropriate peer reviewers within RADAR
5. Peer reviewers receive email reminders via RADAR to alert them that they have reviews to complete; they write and submit their reviews within RADAR
6. Review panels meet face-to-face, with the panel chair capturing the discussions (based on the reviews) and the overall recommendation (normative, enhanced or no research time)
7. Panel chair enters their summary and the recommendation within RADAR, which are then released to the researchers; HoR also emails researchers individually
ARP review and panel management

(note that ARP author names have been removed from this screenshot)
Lessons learned

• testing can only take you so far…
• tweaks needed for next round of ARPs
  • increase prominence of summary and decision for the researcher
  • more differentiated fields for peer reviewers
  • ability for reviewers to link to and from an output from within an ARP?
  • RADAR Admin. search tools for panels and reviews
  • enhanced reporting
• partial roll-out this year – but successful release of feedback summaries and research time decisions to researchers, and proof of concept demonstrated
Conclusions

• the ARP peer review process has been integrated into RADAR, and will be fully tested next year
• the continued development of (and investment in) RADAR is bearing fruit
  • as more researchers use the repository and add outputs, and visibility and downloads are increasing – enabling the GSA’s research to become more impactful
• this work has “led to increased user engagement, and […] demonstrated a new use for the repository beyond its scholarly communication function”
• thanks are due to EPrints colleagues for all their work over the last few years
  • and in memory of Tim Miles-Board, who was involved with building RADAR at the start
Further information

- Article:  [http://radar.gsa.ac.uk/5296/](http://radar.gsa.ac.uk/5296/)
  - Pike, Dawn and Siminson, Nicola Jane (2017) *Making the most of what we have got: Enhancing the RADAR repository to support research planning*. New Review of Academic Librarianship. ISSN 1361-4533

- Repository Fringe 2016:  [http://radar.gsa.ac.uk/4686/](http://radar.gsa.ac.uk/4686/)

- RADAR repository:  [http://radar.gsa.ac.uk/](http://radar.gsa.ac.uk/)

- Contact details:  n.siminson@gsa.ac.uk