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Overview

• ARC funding schemes (NCGP) – a bird’s eye view
• The funding envelope
• ASSH Disciplines
• Assessment process
• Questions and discussion
National Competitive Grants Program

**Discovery Program**
- Laureate Fellowships
- DECRA
- Discovery Indigenous
- Future Fellowships
- Discovery Projects

**Linkage Program**
- Centres of Excellence
- Co-Funded & SRIs
- ITRP
- Linkage Projects
- LIEF

Discovery Program Funding 2014-15: $549.9 million

Linkage Program Funding 2014-15: $325.8 million
Aims of the Discovery and Linkage Programs

1. Discovery Program

- Fund excellent, internationally competitive research by individuals and teams that will produce high quality outcomes
- Build Australia’s research capacity through supporting and facilitating research training and career opportunities for excellent Australian and international researchers
- Support research in priority areas that will deliver national benefits
- Enhance research capacity and outcomes through support for international collaboration
Discovery Projects Scheme

- DP is the largest scheme, supporting excellent basic and applied research by individuals and teams
- Success rate typically 20% to 22% in recent years
- Selection criteria (more detail on each in Funding Rules):
  - Investigator (40%)
  - Project Quality and Innovation (25%)
  - Feasibility and Benefit (20%)
  - Research Environment (15%)
- Funding up to five years, up to $500,000 per year
- No salaries for CIs/PIs
Aims of the Discovery and Linkage Programs

2. Linkage Program

- The ARC’s Linkage funding schemes aim to encourage and extend cooperative approaches to research and improve the use of research outcomes by strengthening links within Australia’s innovation system and with innovation systems internationally.

- Linkage promotes national and international research partnerships between researchers and business, industry, community organisations and other publicly funded research agencies.

- By supporting the development of partnerships, the ARC encourages the transfer of skills, knowledge and ideas as a basis for securing commercial and other benefits of research.

- The main Linkage schemes are: *Linkage Projects; Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities (LIEF); ARC Centres of Excellence;* and *Special Research Initiatives.*
LP Linkages
Australia
2011-14

Higher Education
Government
Commercial
Non-profit/other
LP Linkages
University of Melbourne
2011-14
Size of scheme and success rates (1)

*Discovery Projects 2008-2014: Success and Return Rates*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Proposals</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3234</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3307</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3143</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3299</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2756</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2693</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2831</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>63.80%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Size of scheme and success rates (2)

DECRA 2012-2014: Success Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Proposals</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td></td>
<td>277</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>13.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Size of scheme and success rates (3)

*Discovery Indigenous 2012-2014: Success Rates*

- **2012:** 19 proposals, 34.5% successful
- **2013:** 22 proposals, 31.3% successful
- **2014:** 16 proposals, 38.50% successful
Size of scheme and success rates (4)

*Australian Laureate Fellowships 2009-2013: Success Rates*

![Bar chart showing the number of proposals and success rates from 2009 to 2013. The chart indicates a steady number of proposals with a slight decrease in unsuccessful applications and an increase in successful applications. Success rates remain relatively consistent across the years.](chart.png)
Size of scheme and success rates (5)

Future Fellowships 2009-2013: Success Rates

- 2009: 775 proposals, 20.5% success
- 2010: 559 proposals, 26.4% success
- 2011: 458 proposals, 30.7% success
- 2012: 394 proposals, 34.7% success
- 2013: 1033 proposals, 16.29% success

Number of Proposals vs. Success Rate

Web: arc.gov.au | Email: Communications@arc.gov.au
Laureate Fellows 2014 Success by discipline

*BSB = Biological Sciences and Biotechnology; EMI = Engineering, Mathematics and Informatics; HCA = Humanities and Creative Arts; PCE = Physics, Chemistry and Earth Sciences; SBE = Social, Behavioural and Economics Sciences

Source: 2014 Selection Report Table 5
Centres of Excellence 2014 Success by discipline

*BSB = Biological Sciences and Biotechnology; EMI = Engineering, Mathematics and Informatics; HCA = Humanities and Creative Arts; PCE = Physics, Chemistry and Earth Sciences; SBE = Social, Behavioural and Economics Sciences
Source: 2014 Selection Report Table 1
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HASS disciplines highlighted

Source data: http://www.arc.gov.au/general/searchable_data.htm
FOR Network mapping..
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STEM disciplines highlighted

Source data:
http://www.arc.gov.au/general/searchable_data.htm
General budget items

• access to national and international research and infrastructure facilities;
• access to Workshop Services
• expenditure on Field Research
• expert services of a third party
• equipment (and its maintenance) and consumables
• personnel and higher degree by research stipends
• publication and dissemination of Project outputs & outreach activity costs
• specialised computer equipment and software
• teaching relief for CIs (not for recipients of ARC Awards or Fellowships)
• travel costs essential to the Project
• web hosting and web development specific to the Project workshops and conferences
Proposal assessment – overview

• ARC staff and Executive Directors assess eligibility etc., but do not decide whether proposals should be funded.
• All proposals are assessed against the selection criteria, and in accordance with the weightings for that scheme.
• Proposals are generally assigned to two College of Experts members and at least two external assessors.
• College of Experts meets to moderate judgments and to make final recommendations about fundable proposals and budgets.
• Under the ARC Act all recommendations are just that, and must be approved by the Minister.
Peer review by experts who assess individual research proposals

- Peer review by experts who assess individual research proposals within their field of research or across a broader disciplinary area on the basis of established selection criteria
- Processes under which arrangements for assessment are clearly articulated in published documentation
- Robust conflicts of interest processes to ensure conflicts are managed and transparent
- The receipt of proposals in confidence, except where required to be released under law, for example under the Freedom of Information Act 1982
- The provision of a right of reply to assessments (in most ARC schemes).
Enlarged ARC College

• In 2011 for 2012 meetings the ARC College of Experts was enlarged, the number of schemes it assessed was increased and the membership rotated between the major meetings.
• Previously the entire ARC College of Experts sat at the April and August meetings, and separate selection advisory committees met for specific schemes, e.g. Future Fellowships.
Assessment Process (1)

• The peer review process designed to be fair, thorough and transparent
• The ARC relies on two types of assessors - Detailed and General
• Detailed assessors drawn from the Australian and international research community
• Detailed assessors complete in-depth assessments of proposals by providing scores and comments against the scheme specific selection criteria
• These assessments are then taken into consideration by General assessors (ie College or SAC members) in the later stages of the peer review process
Assessment Process (2)

- General assessors are members of the College of Experts or a Selection Advisory Committee.
- General assessors take into consideration the ratings and comments provided by Detailed assessors and the applicant’s rejoinder, and assign their own ratings to the relevant scheme selection criteria.
- Once all assessments have been finalised and submitted to the ARC, Detailed and General assessments and Rejoinders are considered by the panels at the final selection meeting.
Rejoinder

• Where the ARC seeks external assessments, applicants are often given the opportunity to submit a Rejoinder
• The Rejoinder process allows applicants to respond to assessment comments made by external assessors
• Rejoinders are not viewed by external assessors but are considered by an ARC College of Experts Panel or SAC when deciding on the final recommendation for a Proposal
• Timeframes for applicants are typically up to ten working days
Selection Meeting

• The Selection Meeting is the final face-to-face meeting of the panel of General Assessors and is the conclusion of the peer review process
• The panels meet to consider which proposals to recommend to the ARC for funding, and recommended budgets for those proposals
• All recommendations are given to the ARC CEO, who then makes recommendations to the Minister
• All funding decisions are made by the Minister under the ARC Act
Discussion/questions