ARMS

Australasian Research Management Society

ARMS ACCREDITATION PROGRAM POLICY AND PROCEDURES

CONTENTS

1. ACCREDITATION PROGRAM BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

A survey of ARMS members in late 2011 identified accreditation and increased professional identity as one of the greatest opportunities facing the profession. Accreditation is a means of providing independent verification of the skills and knowledge of those engaged in research management to both employers and practitioners.

This purpose of this policy document is to provide the framework for the management, maintenance and the delivery of the ARMS Foundation Level Accreditation Program and the ARMS Advanced Level Accreditation Program (previously the Professional Level Accreditation Program).

This is a "live" document which will be updated as new policies are developed by the Accreditation Council.

2. POST NOMINALS

The ARMS Board has approved the use of the following post nominals:

Accredited Research Manager (Foundation) or acronym ARM(F) is designated to individuals that have successfully completed all of the assessment requirements for the Foundation Level Accreditation Program as detailed in this document.

Accredited Research Manager (Advanced) or acronym ARM(A)[1] is designated to individuals that have successfully completed the assessment requirements for the Advanced Level Accreditation Program as detailed in this document.

3. FOUNDATION LEVEL ACCREDITATION PROGRAM

The Foundation Level Accreditation Program is designed for individuals who are either:

a) New to research management/administration (less than 5 years);
b) Not new to research management/administration but seeking to update their knowledge;
c) Those seeking to learn more about research administration, or
d) Not new to research management but may be new to a specific element of it – for example, a Grants Officer moving into a specialised Research Ethics role wanting to fast track their research ethics knowledge.

3.1 STEPS REQUIRED TO OBTAINING ACCREDITATION AS AN ARM(F)

There are two steps in obtaining accreditation at the Foundation Level:

Step 1: Successful completion of **five modules of learning** (three compulsory and two electives) and successful completion of the assessment for five modules of learning by multiple choice questions (refer to section 3.3 for assessment requirements). A full listing of modules is provided in *Appendix A.* Registrants will be required to **select relevant country specific modules** from 1.1 - 1.2 as well as 1.3. In addition, registrants will be required to select and successfully complete the assessment requirements for two additional elective modules from selections of their choosing provided in *Appendix A*; and

Step 2: Successful completion of short answer questions to a case study within 12 months of completing the last module of learning.

The ARMS Board is aware that some individuals may not be able to access module workshops readily, especially for those individuals located in regional or remote areas. At its meeting of 16 November 2018, the ARMS Board endorsed a move to delivery some of its Foundation Level Accreditation Modules online. The ARMS Accreditation Council (refer to Section 7) will be working with the ARMS Executive Office to determine an appropriate accreditation pathway given for online delivery of our programs.

---

[1] Previously Accredited Research Manager(Professional) Level or ARMP

3.2 ARM(F) ASSSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

To obtain ARMS Accreditation as an ARM(F), an individual must fulfil the requirements described in section 3.1. The registrant must also successfully complete a multiple choice assessment for each of the five modules (two must be country specific compulsory modules, and compulsory module 1.3: Understanding Research and Researchers as well as and two electives of the individuals choice – Refer to *Appendix A for full list of modules.*

The multiple choice assessment requirements are summarised in Section 3.3.

3.3 MULTIPLE CHOICE ASSESSMENTS

Following attendance to the workshop, participants are provided with a link to a randomised multiple choice assessment of up to 20 multiple choice questions.

Multiple choice assessments are typically completed t*wo weeks after notification*, variations may apply under extenuating circumstances as determined by the ARMS Executive Office.

Registrants must receive a minimum score of **75% to pass a multiple choice assessment** (or 15/20 questions).

If a registrant **does not pass a multiple choice assessment** the first time, she/he will be given an opportunity to re-sit another multiple choice assessment.

In circumstances where a registrant **does not pass the multiple choice question set on her/his second attempt**, she/he will be offered mentoring and an opportunity to discuss results of the failed questions with an authorised ARMS workshop presenter (also known as ARMS Training Fellow). Following this discussion with the Training Fellow, the registrant will then be offered the opportunity to sit the multiple choice assessment for a **third and final time**.

If the registrant fails the multiple choice assessment **on her/his third and final attempt,** she/he will be required to attend the relevant workshop again at no additional cost.

Should the registrant fail after her/his fourth attempt she/he will need to register for the workshop and pay the advertised workshop fee.

3.4 CASE STUDY ASSESSMENTS

Upon successful completion of the multiple choice assessments for five compulsory and two elective modules (refer to section 3.3), the registrant will then be invited to sit a case study assessment to obtain accreditation as an ARM(F).

There will be **two opportunities** during the calendar year to sit a case study (typically May and October).

Case Study Assessments will be reviewed by an authorised Case Study Assessment Markers (refer to Section 3.12) on the following basis:

- **Merit Pass** – Awarded to an individual who demonstrated an exceptional understanding of the subject matter and provided responses to the question sets over and above the minimum standard. A Merit Pass is only awarded to the top 10% of registrants.
- **Pass** - Awarded to an individual who demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter and provided good responses to the question sets completed.
- **Re-sit Assessment** - Assigned to an individual who did not demonstrate an adequate understanding of the subject matter and provided responses to the question below the minimum standard.   A person with this score will be offered the opportunity to discuss her/his results with the ARMS Business Development Manager, Education and Professional Development and to **re-sit** another case study assessment.

Note that: Registrants who had not successfully completed a case study assessment will be offered mentoring by the ARMS organised via the ARMS Executive Office and given an opportunity to re-sit a different case study assessment. The Registrant will also be given feedback on their specific assessment.

In the event that a registrant fails to pass the case study assessment on her/his second attempt, it may be necessary to attend and re-sit such modules as the Accreditation Council deems appropriate prior to a third and final attempt.

In the event that a registrants fails to pass the assessment a final time, she/he will be required to re-sit all modules including the assessment (refer to section 3.3) and re-sit another case study (section 3.4).

3.4.1 Composition of Case Study

Registrants will be provided with a case study based on a fictitious plot. This case study is not based on actual events but is designed as a composite of situations that a research management professional may face in the course of their duties. There are no "trick" questions – the case study aims to:

(a) Draw out the registrant's understanding of issues involved in research administration; and
(b) Ensure that their responses would accord with legislation, guidelines, policy or established practice.

Registrants will be provided with a range of questions (typically up to 10) and instructed to complete a series of compulsory questions and select three (additional questions from the remaining pool of questions as required.

Candidates will also be advised to provide brief responses that clearly demonstrate an understanding of the issues involved in each question. It is recommended that 1-3 paragraphs for each question will be sufficient. There is a maximum word limit of **1500 words** in total for this assignment.

3.5 RECORDING OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

The ARMS Executive Office will maintain a register of all module enrolments, amendments and results of the multiple choice assessment and case study assessments on the ARMS Portal.

3.6 TIMEFRAME FOR COMPLETION OF THE FOUNDATION LEVEL ACCREDITATION PROGRAM

Modules may be completed over a three (3) year period, commencing from the delivery date of the first module.

An additional twelve (12) months is permitted to complete the case study assessment.

Registrants may only have up to *one deferral* of the case study assessment over a twelve (12) month period. However, special dispensation may be granted to this policy under circumstances such as carers/parental responsibilities or illness etc. Please consult the ARMS Executive Office for further clarification.

Registrants will be offered two opportunities to sit a case study assessment each year. These are typically in May and October. The case study will be assessed by case study markers (refer to section 3.11) that have been authorised by the Accreditation Council.

3.7 ARMS TRAINING FELLOWS

ARMS Training Fellows are individuals who have been authorised by the Accreditation Council as having the knowledge, experience and skills to present the module material. A list of fellows is available at the ARMS website.

To become an ARMS Training Fellow, the individual must have formally responded to a call made by the ARMS Executive Office seeking nominations for this role. The person must have completed an approved nomination form which has been reviewed by the Accreditation Council. The Accreditation Council recommends all new ARMS Training Fellows to the ARMS Board for its endorsement. A full list of Training Fellows is available on the ARMS website.

Appointment conditions for **ARMS Training Fellows** as approved by the Accreditation Council are as follows:

- ARMS Training Fellows are a select group across the geographical spread of ARMS reach, who have been authorised by the Accreditation Council to deliver material for the following Foundation Level Accreditation modules:
- The term of each appointment will be two years with renewal for a further term through an approval process as required by the Accreditation Council;
- ARMS Training Fellows must remain "active and financial member" of ARMS during the term of their appointment;
- ARMS Training Fellows must maintain currency in their knowledge of the approved area of delivery;

- ARMS Training Fellows undertake their work on a voluntary basis and are asked to discuss any possible workload implications with their current employer (though expenses incurred in attending workshops for module delivery will be reimbursed); and
- ARMS Training Fellows will be required to provide feedback on the review of workshop materials including the pool of multiple choice assessment questions.
- Members of the Accreditation Council *are not eligible for appointment* as ARMS Training Fellows.

3.8 POST MODULE SURVEY

Immediately following the delivery of each module workshop, registrants will be asked to complete an online survey. The feedback from this survey is important in helping to further refine the Foundation Level Accreditation Program.

The ARMS Executive Office will disseminate the survey link to all registrants. The results of the survey will be disseminated to each Training Fellow and further reviewed by the Accreditation Council and any concerns raised are followed up by the ARMS Executive Office.

It should also be noted that Training Fellows will receive feedback from their workshop by participants via an online survey. These results are also provided to the Accreditation Council annually for review. In instances where feedback has been unfavourable, the results will be discussed with a representative from the ARMS Executive Office.

3.9 REVIEW AND UPDATE OF MODULE MATERIAL

The Accreditation Council has recommended that all module materials (Body of Knowledge, power point presentations and multiple choice questions) be updated at regular intervals. B).

The Accreditation Council is responsible for assessing all revisions to these materials.

3.10 REVIEW AND UPDATE OF MULTIPLE CHOICE ASSESSMENTS

ARMS Training Fellows will be asked to provide additional question and answers, in addition to those provided by the module developers in order to extend the pool of questions offered as part of this assessment. The Accreditation Council considers that each module should be supported by a bank of approximately 100 + multiple choice questions.

3.11 SELECTION OF CASE STUDY ASSESSMENT MARKERS

The Accreditation Council has sought the assistance of a number of experienced research management professionals across the sector, typically at the Director of Research Office level (or equivalent) to act as case study assessors. It is the Accreditation Council's responsibility to identify and endorse all case study assessors.

As Foundation Level Accreditation modules continue to be offered at a local regional level, there will be an ongoing need to widen the pool of case study makers who the ARMS Accreditation Council can call upon with sufficient notice to review case study assignments.

 The case study assessors will be provided with a set of guidelines and instructions which include suggested standard responses to each of the questions in the case study. This is a quality assurance measure to ensure standard and consistent assessment across all assignments. The results of all case study assessors are collated by the Executive Office, reviewed and endorsed by the ARMS Accreditation Council. Should there be conflicting results, i.e. Pass/Fail or Merit Pass/Pass, a third adjudicating assessor shall be drawn from the pool of approved assessors at the discretion of the Executive Office.

3.12 DELIVERY OF MODULE MATERIALS

The Executive Office will work with the local Chapters to coordinate the delivery of Foundation Level modules on an annual basis. The Executive Office will assist with the coordination of all operational matters relating to the delivery of the modules, such as registrations, catering, dissemination of pre-reading material to registrants, etc. The Chapter where possible will assist with local room hire.

It is important that ARMS Training Fellows understand the broader context of the ARMS Foundation Level Accreditation Program in addition to the specific content of their module. For this purpose each ARMS Training

Fellow should familiarise themselves with the **"Guide to ARMS Training Fellows"** which is provided to each Training Fellow and made available via the ARMS Executive Office.

Registrants will also be provided with a copy of the Body of Knowledge, the PowerPoint slides and multiple choice questions ahead of the scheduled module delivery date. Each registrant will be instructed by the ARMS Executive Office to review the Body of Knowledge ahead of the scheduled module workshop delivery date as a pre-reading requirement.

Modules incorporate considerable group work and interaction and thus will be offered in face to face mode at the current time. Modules are developed to take between 3 ½ to 4 hours to deliver. Generally module workshops should comprise a minimum of 8 and maximum of 30 participants though this may be varied by discussion with the ARMS Training Fellow presenting the module workshop. It is essential that participants read the Body of Knowledge for the module prior to attending the workshop so that they can contribute effectively in group discussions. It is also necessary for registrants to read the Body Of Knowledge for each module undertaken as the ARMS Training Fellow may not be able to cover all material in depth during the 3 ½ hour workshop, i.e. registrants should not assume that all assessable material will be covered in the face to face workshop.

3.13 MODULE REGISTRATION FEE

The module registration fee is revised on an annual basis to include CPI increases. The revised fee is endorsed by the ARMS Board. Registrants will be advised of the Society's Cancellation and Refund Policy at the time of registration.

4. ADVANCED LEVEL ACCREDITATION PROGRAM

4.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The Advanced Level 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 program runs for approximately eight months and comprises of a mix of taught material, group discussions, one to one mentoring and written assignments. Successful conclusion of the program will allow participants to be designated Accredited Research Manager (Advanced) or ARM(A) also refer to section 2- Post Nominals of this policy).

The Advanced Level Accreditation Program is typically designed for:
- • Mid to senior level Research Managers who have worked in the sector for 5 or more years.
- • Senior academics and professional staff who are transitioning into a senior Research Management role.

4.2 PROGRAM ELEMENTS AND ENROLMENT REQUIREMENTS

Participants will join a cohort of between 12 to 20 research management professionals and participate in the following program elements:

Element 1: A comprehensive, two and a half day, face-to face workshop which focuses on leadership, management and strategic thinking skills (**20 hour commitment by participants plus pre-reading is required as advised**).

Element 2: Two, one day electives from a selection of specialist areas providing deeper knowledge of the topic chosen and implementation of a research management setting.

Understanding International Research Funding – Introducing specific major international programs including Horizon 2020 and a range of federal research funding initiatives from the USA.
Evidence based analysis of research performance, including bibliometric analysis of publication data, strategic management of research performance, national and international ranking scheme.
Assessing the societal benefit of research, i.e. research impact – an understanding of international trends in identifying and assessing research impact, identification of institutional impact, tracking and assessing impact, communicating the benefits of publically funded research.
Development of institutional research talent – developing HDR and ECR programs, supporting institutional training programs. This module is not intended to be a training package for Higher

Degree Researchers and Early Career Researchers, but rather a session on how to develop such training frameworks.

Research Governance, focussing more on medical research institutes and research conducted in hospitals, incorporating Responsible Conduct of Research Codes, managing clinical trials, harmonisation of multi-ethics centre applications.

Note: Additional Electives may be added at the recommendation of the Education and Professional Development Committee of ARMS or as developed.

Element 3: Participation in a workplace based assignment. Opportunities exist for individual workplace based assignments or, where there are multiple participants from the same institution it may be possible to construct group workplace assignments (**24 hour commitment by participants is required**).

Element 4: Participation in on-going group learning activities (**18 hour commitment by participants is required**).

Element 5: Professional mentoring and coaching activity (**12 hour commitment by participants is required**).

To enrol in this program, registrants must first respond to a call for an Expressions of Interest (EOI) which is made annually by the ARMS Executive Office. As there is a significant time commitment expected of all participants, it is essential that the individual has the relevant background and experience to complete the program and can commit the level of time required for each element of this program. The individual will also require the endorsement of her/his direct line manager.

All EOIs are reviewed by a sub-committee of the ARMS Accreditation Council. All EOIs will be formally acknowledged by the Executive Office. If an EOI has been approved by the sub-committee, the Executive Office will write formally to the individual, clearly articulating the terms and conditions associated with this program and re-iterating the time commitments necessary for its successful completion. An invoice for the registration fee shall be provided at the time of signing the terms and conditions. The registrant will also be provided with a guide which provides a more comprehensive description of the program and pre-reading resources.

It is important to reiterate that this program spans approximately an eight (8) month period, with the final piece of assessment being the workplace assignment (Element 3) – also refer to section 4.4.

If the *EOI has not been approved* by the sub-committee, the Executive Office will write to the individual stating that the applicant did not have the relevant skills and experience necessary for successful completion of this program.

The purpose of the EOI process is to ensure that the program is being pitched at an individual with the relevant skills and experience to complete the program. Therefore, applicants will be required to provide:
- Details of their length of time served in the research management profession
- A brief description of their backgrounds including relevant knowledge and experience gained.
- Details on what they expect to gain from completing the program, the workplace assignment they would like to develop;
- The two electives identified under Element 2 (as described above); and
- Details of the mentor they have identified to work with during the program. If a mentor is not identified, the ARMS Executive Office can assist with matching of mentors/mentee pairs.

4.3 ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ADVANCED LEVEL ACCREDITATION PROGRAM

All participants must:

- Attend in person the 2.5 day leadership program (Element 1). The presenters will record attendance at this workshop. There will no assessment at the completion of this Element.
- Attend and successfully complete the assessments requirements for two (2) x one (1) day electives (Element 2). Each participant will be provided an assessment at the end of each element to be completed within a designated timeframe set by the presenter. The type of assessment may vary (i.e. multiple choice or written) and shall be at the discretion of the presenter. To successfully complete the assessment, participants must receive a score of Merit Pass or Pass (refer to descriptors in section 3.4). Participants that do not successfully pass their assessments will be provided mentoring by the presenter and given a second opportunity to complete an alternative assessment.
- Must attend at least 75% of the scheduled cohort moderated sessions (Element 4). Attendance will be recorded by the moderator.
- Must make contact with their assigned mentor at least twice throughout the 8 month period (Element 5).
- Must submit a workplace assignment in accordance with the workplace assignment guidelines (also refer to workplace assignment section). The workplace assignment is typically due at the end of January in the year following enrolment. Candidates may delay submission of their workplace assignments under extenuating circumstances but must do so in writing to the ARMS Executive Office at **least one month** prior to the workplace assignment due date. If an individual fails to submit a case study assignment by the due date, the Executive Office will follow up with the individual in writing. If no response to the request is forthcoming or the individual decides not to submit the workplace assignment, then the requirements of this program have not been fulfilled and the individual will not be deemed accredited.

However, it should be noted that under extenuating circumstances, the individual may be given the opportunity to delay completion of any elements of the Advanced Accreditation Program in accordance with section 4.6 of this policy.

4.4 WORKPLACE ASSIGNMENT

A major objective of this program is the production of a written workplace based assignment demonstrating an understanding of the principles taught during the program (particularly Element 1).

The workplace assignment is a written body of work based on an agreed project/activity in the participant's workplace. It may be a freestanding work purely for the purpose of the Accreditation Program, or more beneficially, it may also be a document produced for consideration within the participant's institutional research governance structures. Candidates may also be required to present their project at a relevant ARMS meeting, i.e. Chapter meeting or at the Annual Conference.

The project will be agreed with the ARMS Accreditation Council prior to commencement and may comprise an individual project or a group project.

Participants will be expected to discuss their workplace assignment at scheduled group moderated sessions (Element 3), outlining progress made, issues faced in progressing the project and steps taken to implement activity.

The assignment is expected to be a significant body of work approximately 5,000-10,000 words and will be assessed by reviewers approved by the Accreditation Council.

Examples of workplace projects include, but are not limited to:
- Development and/or review of strategies to support research at the participant's institution;
- A review of institutional, national and or international practice in a specific area of research management, design; or
- Implementation of a workplace change activity

Assessment of this assignment will be against broad criteria including the:

- Significance of the work within the candidate's workplace;
- Quality of contextual discussion for the work; and
- Attention paid to how this body of work could be/is being implemented within the candidate's organisation.

4.5 RECORDING OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR ARM(A)s

The ARMS Executive Office will maintain a register of all module enrolments, amendments and results of assessments .

4.6 TIMEFRAME FOR COMPLETION OF MODULES

All elements of the Advanced Level Accreditation Program must be completed over a minimum eight (8) month period. However, under extenuating circumstances (i.e. change of employer or job role, unprecedented career interruptions such as child bearing or ill health) the Accreditation Council will permit further extensions of up to 12 months to complete any outstanding element of the program. Participants are instructed to contact the ARMS Executive Office to discuss their individual circumstances.

4.7 ARMS WINTER SCHOOL

ARMS will make available electives offered under Element 2 to the broader ARMS membership as part of its annual ARMS Winter School. Those that have registered to attend an elective but are not part of an approved Advanced Level Accreditation Program cohort, *may be* able to obtain credit for completed electives (i.e. electives where the participant has attended in person and has successfully completed the assessment requirements for the elective in accordance with this policy). Credit is also permitted within a two year period from the date of registration of the first elective.

5. MAINTAINING ACCREDITATION – CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION (CPE) FOR ARMAS AND ARMFS

Continuing Professional Education (CPE) helps those accredited, i.e. ARMFs and ARMAs to:
- Maintain relevant knowledge;
- Develop and implement research management practices in their workplaces;
- Develop their career; and
- Be an example or mentor to other research management professionals in their workplace.

It is a mandatory requirement for those Accredited as ARMAs and ARMFs (Accredited members) to complete CPE activities. CPE is regarded as an integral part of the professional occupation and being an Accredited member generally implies a commitment to updating and furthering one's education and skills in research management.
Accredited members will be expected to complete a minimum of **60 hours of CPE over each three year period following accreditation**. Activities and events should align to the research management profession, examples include but are not limited to the following:
- Formal postgraduate study and other tertiary courses relevant to research administration and/or management not undertaken as part of a degree course;
- Conference attendance, workshops, seminars and other similar activities delivered or facilitated by recognised practitioners in the field of research management – Note that the maximum for any conference attendance relevant to the profession shall be capped at 7 hours per day;
- Learning activities in the workplace which enhance research management knowledge or skills;
- Service to ARMS, sister societies or other similar bodies up to a maximum of 30 hours over a three year period;
- Preparation and/or presentation of courses, talks and other material at research management workshops and conferences;
- Any other structured activities not covered by the above but which satisfy the objectives of these Guidelines.

Special Notes:

If an ARMF chooses to undertake an elective as part of the ARMS Annual Winter School offerings (electives that also form part of the Advanced Level Accreditation Program), claims for CPE hours for undertaking these elective will be acceptable CPE for an ARMF.

If an ARMF is enrolled in the Advanced Level Accreditation Program, this person will not be able to claim the hours they have spent in undertaking the Advanced Level Accreditation Program as CPE hours for ARMFs. Conversely, an ARMA will not be able to claim CPE hours for ARMA requirements if that individual undertakes the Foundation Level Accreditation Program.

However, if an ARMA decides to undertake a stand-alone Foundation Level module for professional development purposes, then she/he will be able to claim the ARMA CPE hours.

5.1 Logging CPE Hours
Accredited members wishing to claim hours of CPE may do so at any time via completion of the CPE Claim function via the ARMS Portal. Hours may be logged in half hour units. **The onus is on the accredited member to demonstrate that an activity undertaken is relevant to the research management profession. Activities considered to be irrelevant by the CPE Assessment Group will not be accepted**.

5.2 Auditing of CPE Hours
A sub-committee of the ARMS Accreditation Council (CPE Assessment Group) will meet quarterly to review CPE hours logged to ensure that they comply with the guidelines under section 5 of this policy. Any documentation relating to CPE claims must be retained by the individual for a twelve month period. Verification of attendance is managed through the ARMS portal.

5.3 Grace Period for CPE
A grace period of 6 months will be granted to ARMAs and ARMFs who have not been able to meet the minimum threshold of minimum of 60 hours of CPE over each three year period following accreditation. After this period lapses, the registrant will be required to re-sit their country specific National Research and Innovation System module and complete the multiple choice assessment and pay the advertised workshop fee. The CPE will then be reset to commence a new three (3) year cycle. **Note that CPE will be hours will be pro-rated for registrants that work fractional time.**

5.4 CAREER BREAKS AND CPE
There may be extenuating circumstances where ARMAs and ARMFs are unable to complete the requirements for CPE, i.e. 60 hours of CPE over each three year period following accreditation. Examples of situations where it might not be possible to meet these requirements include, but are not limited to the following: illness, disability, career break, family responsibilities, including maternity/carers'/paternity leave). In these types of circumstances, the CPE Assessment Group will consider each individual case and deduct the period of interruption to complete the minimum CPE requirements.

6. RIGHT TO APPEAL
Registrants will be given the right to appeal the decision of the Accreditation Council but only against administrative process issues. In such cases the appeal will be referred to an independent assessor agreed between the parties

7. ACCREDITATION COUNCIL AND ITS INTERFACE WITH THE ARMS BOARD AND STANDING COMMITTEES

The Accreditation Council plays an important role in the accreditation process, overseeing quality standards of module content and delivery agents and providing a measure of independence from the ARMS Executive over accreditation recommendations. A list of members is available at the [ARMS website](#).

7.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE ACCREDIATION COUNCIL

The Council's **Terms of Reference** include:

1. To recommend accreditation status to the ARMS Board for those persons who have completed requirements for certification at Foundation or Advanced levels of accreditation.

2.

3. To provide advice to the ARMS Board and the Education and Professional Development Committee on development of new modules and new market groups for ARMS educational programs.

4. To provide ongoing advice to the ARMS Board on the design, content and assessment processes supporting accreditation such that accreditation programs and mechanisms will reflect contemporary best practice.

5. To assess research management related workshops, programs of activity or other education/training meetings, offered within institutions or by other educational providers, and recommend an appropriate credit for the purposes of ARMS Continuing Professional Education (CPE) hours.

6

7. To provide strategic advice to the ARMS Board on any other matters relating to the professional development and continuing education of research management and administration professionals.

8. The Accreditation Council reserves the right to co-opt additional members as may be needed from time to time to fulfil its purpose.

Membership comprises:

A person who served in the position of Pro or Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research)
A Person who served in the position of Director of a University Research Office
An ARMS Board. Ideally, this is likely to be the President
A member who has served in the position of General Manager/Chief Operating Officer of an Independent Medical Research Institute
Twomembers from key Australian Agencies and/or Organisations involved in the research and innovation system, including but not limited to CSIRO, ARC, NHMRC, the CRC Association
A member drawn from key New Zealand agencies involved in research and innovation
A member drawn from key Singaporean agencies involved in research and innovation

7.2 ARMS BOARD, ARMS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION COMMITTEE AND ITS INTERACE WITH THE ACCREDITATION COUNCIL

There are currently three main committees within the accreditation process – the ARMS Executive, the Accreditation Council and the Professional Development & Accreditation Committee (EPDC). The following sets out the roles and responsibilities of each of the three committees.

The ARMS Board – Responsible for:

- The financial viability and overall operations of the accreditation program;
- Approving membership of the Accreditation Council;
- The marketing of accreditation programs (through subcommittees and executive office support);
- Development of new modules and programs within the accreditation program after reviewing a business case, and
- Quality and standards of module material delivery.

The Accreditation Council (also refer to ToR in this document) – Responsible for:

- Quality and standards of module material (including review of existing material and new module materials);
- Quality and standards of assessment material, process and outcomes;
- Decisions concerning events on the CPE register and equivalence of training for CPE hours.

The Education and Professional Development Committee - Responsible for:

- Identifying and developing international best-practice professional development opportunities, including sourcing programs from sister societies and other education and training providers.
- Overseeing the implementation of the Society's own Accreditation programs, recognising that the quality of content, delivery and assessment of these programs is the responsibility of the Accreditation Council.
- Working with Members Services Committee on the delivery of appropriate professional development opportunities at the Chapter level.
- Assisting the Member Services Committee to deliver the Society's mentoring activities.
- Full Terms of Reference are available at https://researchmanagement.org.au/content/about-arms/arms-policies/arms-policies1

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Foundation Level Accreditation Program module offerings

The following Foundation Level Accreditation Modules are currently available for delivery:

COMPULSORY MODULES

The National Research and Innovation System in the country of choice: Covering the role of government, business, and higher education in the national research and innovation system; funding mechanisms; Codes and current issues.

Legislation as it affects research in the country of choice: covering the most common legislative framework affecting research.

Understanding Research and Researchers: The only "soft skills" module in the Foundation level program. Covers models of research, what drives researchers, how to understand and relate to researchers.

ELECTIVE MODULES

Research Ethics: Covering the legislative and regulatory obligations associated with human and animal ethics and the role of ethics administrators in supporting compliance.

Research Integrity: Covering the emerging international Responsible Conduct of Research Codes and examining institutional requirements of education, implementation, compliance and monitoring.

Pre-Award Grants Processes: Looking at the role of research administrators in pre-award grant processes, grants development programs, supporting researchers, and 'grantsmanship'

Post-Award Processes: Financial management and reporting requirements, institutional systems to support effective post award grants management, central vs devolved models, mechanisms for interaction with finance units, faculties, researchers and funders, IT support systems.

Research Information and Analytics: Management information systems, reporting, repositories, use of data to support strategy implementation; the emerging role of impact assessment.

Higher Degree by Research Scholarships: The purpose of this module is to provide an insight into the current and evolving practices around the management of scholarships for Higher Degree by Research (HDR) candidates.

Higher Degree by Research International Partnerships: The purpose of this module is to provide an insight into the current and evolving practices of international research training.

Higher Degree by Research Candidature Management: The purpose of this module is to provide an insight into the current and evolving practices around the management of Higher Degree by Research (HDR) candidates and candidature.

Higher Degree by Research Admissions and Completions: The module covers two critical stages of HDR candidature – the start (from application to enrolment) and the end (thesis submission,

examination and graduation) of candidature. These two stages are of critical importance for enhancing the candidate experience and the reputation of the HEP. The purpose of this module is to provide an insight into the current and evolving practices around the management of Higher Degree by Research (HDR) candidate admission and examination

Research Finance: This module looks at developing an understanding of how research is funded; key university finance processes as they relate to research; the cost of research and how its outcomes may be evaluated; managing the finances of research projects and allocations including reporting; effective costing and pricing of research projects; and key areas where things go wrong in research finance.

Working with Industry: This module examines different research drivers for industry and public research organisations; will examine the institutional strategies and parameters that build a culture of collaboration and will examine the role that the Research Office can play in ensuring industry collaborations are effective and beneficial to all parties.

Module	Full Name
Contextual Knowledge: *Has a contextual understanding of the research and research training sector of the relevant county*	
Module 1.1-Aus	Module 1.1-Aus: National Research and Innovation System in Australia (compulsory)
Module 1.1-NZ	Module 1.1-NZ: National Research and Innovation System in New Zealand (compulsory)
Module 1.1-Sing	Module 1.1-Sing: National Research and Innovation System in Singapore (compulsory)
Module 1.1-Viet	Module 1.1-Viet: National Research and Innovation System in Vietnam (elective)
Module 1.2-Aus	Module 1.2-Aus: Legislation as it affects Research in Australia (compulsory)
Module 1.2-NZ	Module 1.2-NZ: Legislation as it affects Research in New Zealand (compulsory)
Module 1.2-Sing	Module 1.2-Sing: Legislation as it affects Research in Singapore (compulsory)
Module 1.3	Module 1.3: Understanding Research and Researchers (compulsory)
New modules under construction	
Module 1.1-UK	Module 1.1-UK: National Research and Innovation System in the UK (elective)
Module 1.1-US	Module 1.1-US: National Research and Innovation System in the US (elective)
Module 1.1-China	Module 1.1-China: National Research and Innovation System in China (elective)
Module 1.1-EU	Module 1.1-EU: National Research and Innovation System in the European Union (elective)
The research funding cycle: *Understands and effectively manages the research funding cycle from inception to project closure*	
Module 2.1	Module 2.1: Pre-award Grant Processes (elective)
Module 2.2	Module 2.2: Post Award Grant Processes (elective)
Module 2.3	Module 2.3: Research Finance (elective)
HDR candidature cycle: *Understands and effectively manages the HDR candidature cycle from inquiry to graduation*	
Module 3.1	Module 3.1: Higher degree by Research Scholarships (elective)
Module 3.2	Module 3.2: Higher degree by Research International Partnerships (elective)
Module 3.3	Module 3.3: Higher Degree by Research Candidature Management (elective)
Module 3.4	Module 3.4: Higher Degree by Research Admissions and Completions (elective)
Ethics and integrity: *Understands and provides effective support to ethics and integrity committees and processes*	
Module 4.1	Module 4.1: Research Ethics – human and animal (elective)
Module 4.2	Module 4.2: Research Integrity (elective)
Data and Information management: *Collects and collates data to enable institutional and external reports*	
Module 5.1	Module 5.1: Research Information and Analytics (elective)
Engagement and impact: *Supports researchers in engagement activities with external end-users. Streamlines engagement with end-users*	
Module 6.1	Module 6.1: Working with Industry (elective)