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The Australian Research Council (ARC) is an independent statutory agency within The Department of Education. The ARC’s main responsibilities are:

- providing funding for research through the competitive funding schemes of the National Competitive Grants Program (NCGP)
- providing policy advice on research matters to Government
- Evaluating research quality in Australia through the Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) exercise
- Together with the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC), administering the Australian Research Integrity Committee (ARIC).
2014–15 Federal Budget
(Approx. AU$415 Billion)
Australian Government support for science, research and innovation 2014–15 ($9.2b)

- CSIRO: 8.11%
- DSTO: 4.44%
- ARC: 9.53%
- NHMRC: 10.12%
- Australian Government R&D: 7.50%
- Industry R&D Tax Measures: 26.44%
- Block Funding: 21.19%
- Higher Education R&D: 0.47%
- Energy and the Environment: 1.37%
- Rural: 3.30%
- CRCs: 1.63%
- Other R&D: 1.95%
- Other Health: 0.63%
- Business Innovation: 3.30%
- Business R&D: 0.02%
- Rural: 3.30%
- Energy and the Environment: 1.37%
- CRCs: 1.63%
- Other R&D: 1.95%
- Other Health: 0.63%
- Business Innovation: 3.30%
- Business R&D: 0.02%
ARC funding by institute 2010–2014
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.
NCGP lifecycle
Process

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.
National Competitive Grants Program

**Discovery Projects**
- Laureate Fellowships: 5%
- Future Fellowships: 16%
- DECRA: 3%
- Discovery Indigenous: 5%

**Linkage Projects**
- Centres of Excellence: 7%
- Co-Funded & SRI: [Blank]
- ITRP: [Blank]
- Linkage Projects: 18%

5 year averages
The ARC has completely redesigned the way that potential assessors are matched to a proposal for assessment purposes.

Multiple areas of the proposal are mined for a set of keywords and presented to the person completing the assignments as a word cloud.
Last 3 years ARC total funding (2012 to 2014), selected schemes and disciplines

• This information is then matched to information stored against a potential assessor’s profile and presented in a similar word cloud.

• The most appropriate person is then selected and assigned to the proposal to assess.
NCGP and peer review

• Under larger schemes, such as *Discovery Projects (DP)* and the *Discovery Early Career Researcher Award (DECRA)*, all five panels of the ARC College convene for selection meetings. In other schemes, such as *Australian Laureate Fellowships* and *Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities* schemes, a single interdisciplinary Selection Advisory Committee (SAC) may be utilised. SAC members may be ARC College members and/or other eminent researchers.

• The five panels are: Biological Sciences and Biotechnology (*BSB*), Engineering, Mathematics and Informatics (*EMI*), Humanities and Creative Arts (*HCA*), Physics, Chemistry and Earth Sciences (*PCE*), and Social Behavioural and Economic Sciences (*SBE*).
Research opportunity

• 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: www.arc > information for applicants > ARC Research Opportunity and Performance Evidence (ROPE) Statement
ARC NCGP funding by university ($m)
2007–2013

Note—data on basis of FoR codes and those translated from RFCD for both two-digit and 4-digit disciplines
Total success rate (all schemes, start year 2002 to 2014) and number of proposals received in NCGP panels
Total success rate all schemes, selected disciplines (Commencement year 2002 to 2014)

Note—data on basis of original RFCD and FoR codes for both two-digit and 4-digit disciplines
Discovery Indigenous 2012–14: success rates

- **2012**: 19 proposals, 34.5% success
- **2013**: 22 proposals, 31.3% success
- **2014**: 16 proposals, 38.50% success

**Graph Details**:
- **Y-axis**: Number of Proposals
- **X-axis**: Year (2012, 2013, 2014)
- **Legend**:
  - Unsuccessful
  - Successful
  - Success rate

The graph shows the number of proposals made in each year and the corresponding success rates.
DECRA—success rates

Graph showing the success rates of proposals funded from 2012 to 2015. The graph includes bars for proposals not funded and proposals funded, with a line graph indicating the success rate percentage.
Future Fellowships—success rates
Which scheme is more important? Selected disciplines

13 Years' Funding (2002 to 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linkage - Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC Future Fellowships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITRP - Training Centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Indigenous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery - Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centres of Excellence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Laureate Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkage - Projects (APAI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Research Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC Future Fellowships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkage - Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Indigenous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Research Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Years' Funding (2012 to 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discovery - Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkage - Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITRP - Hubs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC Future Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITRP - Training Centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery - Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC Future Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkage - Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Laureate Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery - Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC Future Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkage - Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Early Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkage - Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note—data on basis of FoR codes and those translated from RFCD for both two-digit and 4-digit disciplines
### Success rate in selected disciplines and schemes (commencement year 2002 to 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme/Program</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linkage - Projects</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkage - Infrastructure</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Facilities</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Early Career Researcher Award</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery - Projects</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery - Indigenous</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Laureate</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC Future Fellowships</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**—data on basis of original RFCD and FoR codes for both two-digit and 4-digit disciplines
Total success rate in Discovery Projects and Linkage Projects (commencement year 2002 to 2014)

Note—data on basis of original RFCD and FoR codes for both two-digit and 4-digit disciplines
Discovery Projects (DP)—number of proposals received, selected disciplines, commencement year 2002 to 2015

Note—data on basis of RFCD and FoR codes for both two-digit and 4-digit disciplines
Success rate (%) in DP, selected disciplines, commencement year 2002 to 2015
Continued..
Number of proposals received and success rate (%), comparison between LP and DP in Commerce and Economics

Note—data on basis of FoR codes and those translated from RFCD for both two-digit and 4-digit disciplines.
ARC funding and number of projects funded in DP02 to DP15 and LP02 to LP14, for comparison

Note—data on basis of FoR codes and those translated from RFCD for both two-digit and 4-digit disciplines
## Future Fellowships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2-digit code discipline\Commencement year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposals submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce, Management, Tourism and Services</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce, Management, Tourism and Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce, Management, Tourism and Services</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Last 13 years ARC total funding (2002 to 2014)
Selected schemes and disciplines

- BUSINESS AND MANAGE...
- BANKING, FINANCE...
- MARKETING
- ACCOUNTING,...
- TRANSPORTATION ...
- COMMERCIAL SERVICES
- TOURISM
- APPLIED ECONOMICS
- ECONOMETRICS
- ECONOMIC THEORY
- OTHER ECONOMICS
- LAW
- MAORI LAW
- OTHER LAW AND LEGAL...

Note – data on basis of codes and those translated from for both two-digit and -digit disciplines
Note—data on basis of FoR codes and those translated from RFCD for both two-digit and 4-digit disciplines
Last 3 years ARC total funding (2012 to 2014), selected schemes and disciplines
Average number of researchers (including Partner Investigators) on each Discovery Projects proposal

- COMMERCE
- ECONOMICS
- EDUCATION
- LAW
- POLICY AND ADMIN
- POLITICAL SCIENCE
- PSYCHOLOGY
- SOCIAL WORK
- SOCIOLOGY
Total number of ARC projects, Partner Orgs (PO) and ARC funding for Linkage Projects (2002 to 2014)
Total Partner Org cash and in kind contribution (2010 to 2014)
Avg. cash contribution from Partner Organisations on each project in Linkage Projects
Avg. cash and in kind contribution from Partner Organisations on each project in Linkage Projects
Average number of Partner Organisations on each Linkage Project

![Graph showing the average number of partner organisations on each linkage project from 2010 to 2014 for different fields: Sociology, Political Science, Policy and Administration, Education, Economics, Commerce, Management, Tourism and Services.](image-url)
Thank you