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ARC and the funding landscape
National Competitive Grants Program

*Discovery Program*

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

*Linkage Program*

- Centres of Excellence
- Co-Funded & SRI
- ITRP
- Linkage Projects
- LIEF

**Discovery Program Funding**

- 2013–14 $551.4 million

**Linkage Program Funding**

- 2013–14 $332.4 million
ARC NCGP funding by University ($m) 2007–2013
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Strength in Linkage and Discovery Schemes

Percentage of scheme funds obtained

- The University of Sydney
- The University of Melbourne
- The University of Queensland
- The University of New South Wales
- Monash University
- The University of Adelaide
- University of Wollongong
- Queensland University of Technology
- The University of Newcastle
- Macquarie University
- Griffith University
- University of South Australia
- University of Technology, Sydney
- RMIT University
- Curtin University
- University of Western Sydney
- La Trobe University
- Deakin University
- James Cook University
- Swinburne University of Technology
- University of Western Sydney
- Murdoch University
- Charles Darwin University
- The University of New England
- University of Canberra
- Southern Cross University
- Charles Sturt University
- Victoria University
- Edith Cowan University
- University of Southern Queensland
- University of Ballarat
- Australian Catholic University
- Central Queensland University
- Bond University
- University of the Sunshine Coast
Australian Research Grants Committee 1974—% funding share compared with ARC NCGP 2013

[Graph showing the percentage funding share for various universities and regions in 1974 and 2013.]
Mapping Engagement:

Linkage Projects vs. Discovery Projects
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ARC NCGP funding by 2-digit FoR (%) 2006–2013
Assessment process
NCGP Proposal Lifecycle
The Grants Peer Review Process

- All Disciplines
- Biological Sciences and Biotechnology (BSB)
- Engineering, Mathematics and Informatics (EMI)
- Humanities and Creative Arts (HCA)
- Physics, Chemistry and Earth Sciences (PCE)
- Social, Behavioural and Economic Sciences (SBE)
The Grants Peer Review Process

- Information flow

- Application
  - Applicant
  - External Assessors
  - ARC
  - College of Experts

- Funding result
- Final ranking
- 1st ranking
Final Proposal Score Calculation

• “Grouped Average” of all submitted assessments for the proposal
• This calculation results in a “Proposal Score”
• For the meeting proposal ranks are calculated for each panel
• Any proposals (within same panel) with equal Proposal Scores will have equal ranks.
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RANK
The Grants Peer Review Process

1. External Reviewer
2. Internal Reviewer
3. Rank
4. Committee Review
5. Recommendation to CEO
6. Minister Approval

$ $$$
Discovery Projects Grants rankings 2013
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Each symbol represents up to 2 observations.
Patterns of application and success by discipline/FoR
Total ARC funding by major scheme and selected HCA/SBE disciplines (2002–14)
Number of proposals received and funded by 2-digit FoR code

[past 4 years Discovery Projects and 5 years Linkage Projects]
Case study 1: 2103 Historical studies
Total funding for Historical Studies (2010 to 2014)
By scheme

No funding awarded in Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities (LIEF) scheme
HISTORICAL STUDIES (2103) by 6-digit level FoR code (all schemes, regardless of primary classification code, years 2010/11–14)

Size of bubble indicates the total percentage of a 6-digit level code in all projects funded.
Non-primary 4-digit FoR components in projects with primary FoR in Historical Studies (2010/11 to 2014), all schemes

Number shown is for percentage totals of the FoR
Case study:
2002 Cultural studies
Funding ($) for projects with primary 4-digit FoR in Cultural Studies by scheme (2011 to 2014)

No projects funded in LIEF scheme
Cultural Studies (2002) by 6-digit level FoR code (all schemes, regardless of primary classification code) (2010/11 to 2014)

Size of bubble indicates the total percentage of a 6-digit level code in all projects funded.
Percentage totals of 6-digit level code (2010/11–14)
(DP and LP)
Cross-disciplinary collaboration
Percentage totals of non-primary FoR codes in projects (2010/11 to 2014) all schemes
FOR Network mapping..
[Fruchterman reingold]

HASS disciplines highlighted

01 MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES
02 PHYSICAL SCIENCES
03 CHEMICAL SCIENCES
04 EARTH SCIENCES
05 ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
06 BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
07 AGRICULTURAL AND VETERINARY SCIENCES
08 INFORMATION AND COMPUTING SCIENCES
09 ENGINEERING
10 TECHNOLOGY
11 MEDICAL AND HEALTH SCIENCES
12 BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND DESIGN
13 EDUCATION
14 ECONOMICS
15 COMMERCE, MANAGEMENT, TOURISM
16 STUDIES IN HUMAN SOCIETY
17 PSYCHOLOGY AND COGNITIVE SCIENCES
18 LAW AND LEGAL STUDIES
19 STUDIES IN CREATIVE ARTS AND WRITING
20 LANGUAGE, COMMUNICATION AND CULTURE
21 HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY
22 PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES

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

[Fruchterman reingold]

HASS - ZOOM
Academic workforce issues and NCG success
National Competitive Grants Program

ARC Research Opportunity and Performance Evidence (ROPE)

• The ARC is committed to ensuring all eligible researchers have fair access to competitive funding through the National Competitive Grants Program.

• The ARC considers that Research Opportunity comprises two separate elements:
  – Career experiences (relative to opportunity)
  – Career interruptions

• The new ROPE Statement (released Feb 2014) is online at: http://www.arc.gov.au/applicants/rope_statement.htm
Participation and success of CIs in DP13 and DP14 by gender and career age
Success rate (%) of HCA/SBE CIs in *Discovery* by career age (years post PhD) 2002–14

(Note—fellow applicants have been included as funded on all funded projects)
Success rate (%) of HCA/SBE CIs in DP, by title and type of university (2002-14)

(Note—fellow applicants have been included as funded on all funded projects)
ARC Linkage projects
The *Linkage Projects* scheme objectives

- initiation and/or development of long-term strategic research alliances between higher education organisations and other organisations, including industry and end-users, in order to apply advanced knowledge to problems and/or to provide opportunities to obtain national economic, social or cultural benefits;
- scale and focus of research in Strategic Research Priorities;
- opportunities for researchers to pursue internationally competitive research in collaboration with organisations outside the higher education sector, targeting those who have demonstrated a clear commitment to high-quality research; and
- growth of a national pool of world-class researchers to meet the needs of the broader Australian innovation system.
Some Linkage Stats: Funding and Success Rates

Linkage Projects Funding and Success rate

Since 2005 there have been nearly 2200 instances of collaboration with Australian private companies, as partner organisations on linkage grants.
LP14

Number approved and partner contributions
Linkage—Instances of Collaboration by Org Type

- Non-Profit - International
- Non-Profit - Australian
- Higher Education - International
- Government - State & Local
- Government - International
- Government - Commonwealth
- Company/Industry Body - International
- Company/Industry Body - Australian

Other
LP Linkages

Australia

2011–14

Higher Education
Government
Commercial
Non-profit/other
LP Linkages
University of Melbourne
2011–14

Higher Education
Government
Commercial
Non-profit/other
Partner Organisation Views: Why Use LP Scheme?

1. Chance of success is reasonably high: 47% Important, 10% Not Important
2. Possible to obtain larger grants: 76% Important, 2% Not Important
3. Access to highly skilled research personnel: 88% Important, 2% Not Important
4. Opportunity to build longterm relationships with uni researchers: 92% Important, 2% Not Important
Average ARC funding, PO contribution and number of PO on each LP project

The Partner Organisation must make a significant contribution in cash and/or in kind, to the project that is equal to, or greater than, the ARC funding.
Number of projects (all schemes) involving GLAM, by 2-digit FoR code (2008 to 2014)

- Biological Sciences
- History and Archaeology
- Environmental Sciences
- Studies in Creative Arts and Writing
- Earth Sciences
- Language, Communication and...
- Studies in Human Society
- Chemical Sciences
- Physical Sciences
- Philosophy and Religious Studies
- Law and Legal Studies
- Information and Computing Sciences
- Technology
- Built Environment and Design
- Agricultural and Veterinary Sciences
- Engineering
- Commerce, Management, Tourism...
- Psychology and Cognitive Sciences

Number of projects (all schemes) involving GLAM, by 2-digit FoR code (2008 to 2014)