



Response from *Council of Deans of Nutrition and Dietetics,*
Australia and New Zealand (CDND ANZ) to:

Review of the Australian and New Zealand Standard Research Classification
(ANZSRC).

Due Date for Submission: 7 June 2019

Background to Council of Deans of Nutrition and Dietetics, Australia and New Zealand (CDND, ANZ)

CDND ANZ was established in 2015 with representation from all Universities currently offering qualifications in Nutrition and Dietetics across Australia and New Zealand that are recognised for dietetics practice by the Dietitians Association of Australia or the Dietitians Board New Zealand. The CDND ANZ aims to provide a forum for discussion, feedback, consultation and advocacy on issues relevant to nutrition and dietetics in Australia and New Zealand, independent of the Dietitians Association of Australia, Universities Australia, Dietitians Board New Zealand, Dietitians New Zealand and Universities New Zealand. The Terms of Reference of the CDND ANZ include providing advice and advocacy on standards required for the teaching, research and practice of Nutrition and Dietetics in Australia and New Zealand.

Universities represented by the CDND ANZ and academic members and contributors to this response:

Bond University	AUS	Professor Liz Isenring
Curtin University	AUS	Professor Deb Kerr
Deakin University	AUS	Professor Sarah McNaughton
Edith Cowen University	AUS	Associate Professor Philippa Lyons-Wall
Flinders University	AUS	Associate Professor Rebecca Golley
Griffith University	AUS	Professor Lauren Williams
La Trobe University	AUS	Associate Professor George Moschonis
Massey University	NZ	Associate Professor Rozanne Kruger
Monash University	AUS	Professor Helen Truby
Queensland University of Technology	AUS	Professor Danielle Gallegos
The University of Auckland	NZ	Associate Professor Clare Wall
The University of Newcastle	AUS	Professor Clare Collins
The University of Queensland	AUS	Dr Michael Leveritt
The University of Sydney	AUS	Professor Margaret Allman-Farinelli
University of Canberra	AUS	Professor Shawn Somerset
University of Otago	NZ	Dr Sue MacDonell
University of the Sunshine Coast	AUS	Professor Fiona Pelly
University of Wollongong	AUS	Professor Eleanor Beck

The CDND ANZ also acknowledges input from:

Translational Research Institute Australia	AUS	Dr Katrina Campbell
University of Queensland	AUS	Emeritus Professor Sandra Capra
University of Wollongong	AUS	Senior Professor Linda Tapsell

CDND ANZ Contacts:

CDND ANZ, Chair Queensland University of Technology	AUS	Professor Danielle Gallegos danielle.gallegos@qut.edu.au
CDND ANZ, Deputy Chair University of Wollongong	AUS	Professor Eleanor Beck

Response

Following is the response from the CDND ANZ to the 'Questions to Guide Discussion and Feedback' (pages 11-12) given in the "Discussion Paper Australian and New Zealand Standard Research Classification Review 2019" undertaken and published by the Australian Research Council (ARC), Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), Statistics New Zealand (Stats NZ), and the New Zealand Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE).

ANZSRC Principles

1: Are the principles of the Review outlined in Section 2 of the Discussion Paper appropriate and sufficient? Do any further overarching principles need to be considered in developing the revised ANZSRC?

No further considerations.

ANZSRC Classifications

Type of Activity

2. What suggestions do you have to improve the ToA component of the classification?

Generally, there is value in following the *three categories under Frascati* to ensure the ANZ systems are easily matched to international systems.

3: Are there any other categories that should be added to the ToA? If so, how would they be defined?

Some potential considerations are:

The key suggestion is that there is not a category of 'translational research'. Presumably it currently sits under applied research but translation has further meaning.

Other methods which are not easily captured:

- Methodological research – development and validation of methods for undertaking scientific research in the discipline
- Evaluation research – critical inquiry into the impact and effectiveness of interventions and services (including education)

4: Is there ambiguity in the existing ToA categories? How could this be improved?

CDND generally support following the three categories under Frascati (as above), in particular there does not need to be separation between pure and strategic basic research.

A minor consideration is that there is ambiguity, and an underlying assumption that research occurs in one dimension/direction for example that 'applied' depends on 'fundamental' research.

5. Should ANZSRC adopt the Frascati Manual 2015 ToA definitions?

Yes

Fields of Research

The Frascati manual provides up to the 4 digit level (3. Medical and Health Sciences: 3.3 Health Sciences).

Current FoR codes for Nutrition and Dietetics:

Division: 11 Medical and Health Sciences

Group: 1111 Nutrition and Dietetics

For ARC Research Impact and Engagement, disciplines in Nutrition and Dietetics were part of 11-2.

6a: Should there be more or fewer levels to the hierarchy?

The levels of hierarchy should remain the same.

We recognise that that most activities occur at the 4-digit level rather than 6-digit. For individual research areas, the 6-digit level remains useful. However at present, in relation to FoR 1111 Nutrition and Dietetics, the 6-digit levels are currently not reflective of current research (see below).

6b: Would it be useful to have broad themes or 'one digit' classifications such as Sciences, Medicine, Social Sciences and Humanities, similar to the 'Sector' level of SEO?

There would be advantages to a single level code however there are a number of disciplines which would be split by such a coding system, even more than that which already occurs. For example, in Nutrition and Dietetics, research would be split in such a system between Social Sciences, Sciences and Medicine.

7a: What Criteria, in your view, should be applied to determine the boundaries between Division, Group and Field Classifications

Nil response

7b: Should research methodologies, publication practices, or any other factors be considered as key criteria for classifying research?

Yes, this must be considered. At present, the systems of classification are part of the recognition and value system which have a real impact (including funding) on the research conducted in the discipline. The systems vary between disciplines and therefore the way that research is performed (methods) and the way it is disseminated (formal publication or other) are relevant.

7c: Apart from the Principles described in Section 2, are there any other specific criteria that should be applied?

A consideration may be the translation or uptake of research in a range of settings, for example policy development. Each category (example: at a 4-digit level) may benefit from a translational category that incorporates translation to practice, policy or further research.

8a: What new or emerging areas of research should be allocated FoR codes (and at which level)?

CDND believes the 4-digit 1111 is correctly allocated to research likely to occur in the disciplines of Nutrition Science and Nutrition and Dietetics.

8b: Should any of the existing FoR codes be split, deleted or merged?

The current codes for Nutrition and Dietetics are not reflective of modern research.

Current FoR codes	Suggested FoR codes
111101 Clinical and Sports Nutrition	Clinical Nutrition
NEW CODE	Sport and Exercise Nutrition
111102 Dietetics and Nutrigenomics	Nutrigenomics and personalised nutrition
111103 Nutritional Physiology	Nutrition Science OR Nutritional Physiology and Biochemistry
111104 Public Nutrition Intervention	Public Health Nutrition
NEW CODE	Dietary Assessment and related methodologies
NEW CODE	Nutritional Epidemiology
111199 Nutrition and Dietetics not elsewhere classified	111199 Nutrition and Dietetics not elsewhere classified

8c: Should any of the existing Group or Field codes be moved to other places in the classification?

Nil response

8d: Is there ambiguity or redundancy in the existing FoR codes? (For example. areas where research could reasonably be classified in two or more different codes)

Nutrition and dietetics is underpinned by biochemistry and physiology. The domains of these fields relevant to the study of nutrition should remain in 1111 Nutrition & Dietetics.

8e: Where changes are proposed, please explain why the changes are necessary and what criteria you have used to determine the need for change.

Typically, research methods under the FoR Code “1111 Nutrition & Dietetics” would include methodologies from laboratory techniques (these could relate to chemical determination in food, or biochemical/haematological determinations measure effects of food/intervention), through to interventions with individuals, which could be based on nutrigenomics, and finally to public health nutrition interventions. Methodologies which span across individuals, groups and populations include dietary assessment and epidemiology.

The following criteria and considerations informed the proposed changes to FoR codes given in 8b:

- Consideration of how methods are used in the discipline of nutrition and dietetics. For example dietary assessment methodologies are used across a range of speciality areas in nutrition and dietetics. Dietary Assessment is also a method that spans across individuals, populations and groups. Therefore the new proposed code “Dietary Assessment and related methodologies” is needed.
- Currently all non-physiology laboratory-based research in Nutrition and Dietetics is placed under “111199 Nutrition & Dietetics not elsewhere classified”. A new code called “Nutrition Science” or “Nutritional Physiology and Biochemistry” enables both physiology and biochemistry based research to be captured. This is important as both physiology and biochemistry are the formative science aspects of nutrition and dietetics.

9: How can the FoR codes better capture Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, Māori Studies, and Pacific Peoples Studies research, and at what level (e.g. Field, Group, Division)?

We believe Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander research should be moved to a 4 digit code under Human Studies.

10: How can the FoR codes better capture interdisciplinary / multidisciplinary research, and at what level (e.g. Field, Group, Division)?

To capture interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary research there is a need to change the system to examine specific problems rather than define research by the methodologies used. For example, in nutrition, in an example where researchers were trying to develop a model of care in stroke patients, researchers work with food technologists, medical researchers, statisticians, social scientists. This would involve food development in texture modified meals, clinicians (medicine and allied health) to examine clinical outcomes and social science researchers to examine quality of life related outcomes. The methods applied are quite different but capturing the research under “improved care models in health” would capture the discipline interactions. This does not fit under the current model.

Council of Deans do not advocate for this model at this point in time.

Socio-economic Objective

11: Is the current overall structure appropriate?

Yes

11a: Should there be more or fewer levels to the hierarchy?

Status quo can remain

11b: Would it be desirable to change the Sector codes to numerical, rather than alphabetic, identifiers?

No comment

12: Are the Sector level categories well defined enough to capture all types of socio-economic objectives?

Yes

12a: Do you have specific feedback on the usability and interpretability of the current Sector categories?

Not at this time.

13: Do the Division level categories appropriately capture all types of research objectives?

Nil response

13a: Do you have specific feedback on the usability and interpretability of the current Division categories?

Nil response

13b: Are there emerging areas of economic development that should be better defined?

Nil response

14: Should any of the existing SEO codes be split, deleted or merged?

Missing categories might include

- links between food, agriculture and health (eg nutrition sensitive agriculture)
- under 9201 a category specific to overweight and obesity would be relevant
- under 9205, consider maternal health

14a: Where changes are proposed, please explain why the changes are necessary and what criteria you have used to determine the need for change.

The changes proposed identify emerging areas of research or reflect global priorities.

Nutrition-sensitive agriculture has been identified as essential in order to meet global development goals. There has been a call for empirical evidence to take into consideration contextual, cultural, economic and food environment factors, particularly in light of climate change. Currently the opportunity to administratively link agriculture, food and health is limited.

Given the ongoing global and national focus on the high prevalence of overweight and obesity, its determinants and solutions, a separate code for overweight and obesity would assist in highlighting research endeavour. Being able to identify administratively research undertaken directly in this area would be useful.

The first 1000 days is recognised as key to child outcomes. Maternal health is an integral component and links to both under and over nutrition. A separate code for maternal health (as opposed to women's health) provides scope to highlight this important period.

15: Is it easy or difficult to categorise large or complex research projects or programs under SEO? How could categorisation be simplified

There is a mixing of methods and outcomes in the SEO codes. Difficulties are related to the multiple disciplines represented. Direction related to the priority, primary outcome is required.

Therefore there are complexities related to allocation of SEO Codes, as an area of research may use methods of health promotion (for example) in prevention (primary, secondary, tertiary) of cardiovascular disease (for example).

Implementation

16. How do you (or your organisation) currently use ANZSRC?

Nil response

17. How would you (or your organisation) be affected if ANZSRC changes?

Nil response

18. What support do you need to implement ANZSRC (e.g. concordances for time-series mapping, coding tools etc.)?

Nil response

19. How frequently should the ANZSRC be updated in the future? What advantages or disadvantages would there be if, in future, ANZSRC was updated dynamically and on an ongoing basis in response to stakeholder feedback?

Nil response