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ARC Strategic Objectives

• To support excellence in research
• To build Australia’s research capacity
• To provide informed high quality policy advice to government
• To enhance research outcomes through effective evaluation
• To raise the profile of Australia’s research effort and be an effective advocate for its benefits
The ARC

National Competitive Grants Program
$810M in 11-12

Evaluation and Policy

Discovery & Fellowships
$502 M

Linkage & Centres
$308 M

Excellence in Research for Australia

- Statutory Agency established 2001
- Mission: to deliver policy and programs that advance Australian research and innovation globally and benefit the community
- Fund direct costs to Universities and partners
- All disciplines except clinical medicine & dentistry

Web: arc.gov.au  |  Email: info@arc.gov.au
The ARC aims to:

- Foster a range of different cohorts
- Create the right incentives for collaboration
### Australian Laureate Fellowships
- 2x PhD
- 2x Post-Doc
- 17 5-year awards

### Discovery Early Career Researcher Award (DECRA)
- $125,000
- 200 p.a. 3-year awards

### Researchers in Industry Training Awards
- $30,000
- 100 3-year awards (bi-annual)

### Future Fellowships
- Up to $143,000
- 200 p.a. 4-year fellowships

Web: arc.gov.au | Email: info@arc.gov.au
NCGP – the latest developments

- Evaluation of Linkage Projects
- Improvements to Peer Review (first stage)
- Changes to Discovery Projects and Discovery Indigenous
- New schemes (DECRA and RITA)
- Two additional Laureate Fellowships
- Simplified NCGP Funding Rules
- Removing Duplication
- NCGP
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ERA - Objectives

- Establish an evaluation framework that gives government, industry, business and the wider community assurance of the excellence of research conducted in Australia’s institutions;
- Provide a national stocktake of discipline-level areas of research strength and areas where there is opportunity for development in Australia’s higher education institutions;
- Identify excellence across the full spectrum of research performance;
- Identify emerging research areas and opportunities for further development;
- Allow for comparison of Australia’s research nationally and internationally for all discipline areas.
ERA 2010 Process Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume &amp; Activity</th>
<th>Ranked Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citation Analysis</td>
<td>Esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Income</td>
<td>Applied Measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer Review

International Benchmarks

Research Evaluation Committees
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ERA 2010 at a glance

• Unit of Evaluation is the 4 digit Code
• All 41 eligible institutions participated
• 2435 units of evaluation assessed at the two- and four-digit level
• Over 330,000 research outputs and 55,000 researchers represented
ERA 2010 Myths
ERA 2010 Ratings by Cluster (2 and 4 digit)

- Public and Allied Health Sciences
- Mathematical, Information and Computing Sciences
- Biomedical and Clinical Health Sciences
- Engineering and Environmental Sciences
- Biological and Biotechnological Sciences
- Physical, Chemical and Earth Sciences
- Social, Behavioural and Economic Sciences
- Humanities and Creative Arts

Rating Categories:
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
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ERA 2010 Ratings at world standard and above (2 and 4 digit)

- Public and Allied Health Sciences
- Mathematical, Information and Computing Sciences
- Biomedical and Clinical Health Sciences
- Engineering and Environmental Sciences
- Biological and Biotechnological Sciences
- Physical, Chemical and Earth Sciences
- Social, Behavioural and Economic Sciences
- Humanities and Creative Arts

Legend:
- Green: 3
- Blue: 4
- Yellow: 5
ERA 2010 submissions

- Institutional data submission smoother than Trial
- Institutional repositories generally functioned well
- Definition of research – still outputs being submitted which did not meet the definition in the view of the Committees; these are not eligible and should not be submitted
- Selection of peer review items – breadth of work in the 20%
- Supporting statements for NTROs and Portfolios
Changes to journals and conferences

- Refined journal and conference indicator for ERA 2012
- Ranks will not be used, instead outputs profiled by most frequent journals and conferences in the UoE, with drilldowns available as in 2010
- ARC will still produce a journal list – will not include rankings but will include FoR codes for citation analysis
- Strong feedback that ranked lists were having negative consequences in the sector
- ARC analysis suggested a refined indicator would produce improved results while removing negative consequences
The refined journal indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal title</th>
<th>Papers</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of X</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Journal of Law and Medicine</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Public Law Review</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Australian Journal of Administrative Law</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Law in Context</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Australian Journal of Family Law</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Company and Securities Law Journal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Torts Law Journal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Contemporary Issues in Law</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Law and Policy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 International Journal of the Legal Profession</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Australian Journal of Corporate Law</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Australian Journal of Labour Law</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Journal of Judicial Administration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Federal Law Review</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Australian Journal of Legal Philosophy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Forensic Science International</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Legal Theory</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Revenue Law Journal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 AIAL National Lecture Series on Administrative Law</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Journal of International Tax Review</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>465</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that this is not based on any university’s submission to ERA 2010.
Interdisciplinary and enabling research – the ‘clawback’

- Journal articles with $\geq 66\%$ content in a discipline can be apportioned to that discipline
- Approach was successfully trialled in 2010 for Mathematics
- Allows stronger recognition of interdisciplinary and applied research
- Aligns journals with other output types
Raising the threshold

- Low volume threshold for peer review disciplines raised to 50 apportioned weighted outputs (maintaining the 5:1 weighting for books)
- Threshold remains the same for citation analysis disciplines
- Aligns all disciplines at 50 outputs
- Recognises strong feedback from sector and from 2010 evaluators
- ERA units need sufficient volume
Eligibility of fractional staff

• Fractional staff: minimum 40% appointment at ERA census date
• Those below 40% can still submit with by-line or similar requirement (similar to existing approach for casuals)
• Addresses concern about ERA-driven “poaching”
• Recognises that in many cases those below 40% are legitimately employed – their outputs can still be submitted
Other changes for ERA 2012

- Patents, plant breeder’s rights and registered designs assigned to individuals now eligible for submission
- Cluster structure revised in the light of information from ERA 2010
- Some adjustments to indicator sets used in the discipline matrix (e.g. ICT disciplines)
- Construction of the pool of outputs for peer review (30%)
ERA 2012 – still to do

- Recruitment of Research Evaluation Committees
- Expansion of peer reviewer pool
- Submission Guidelines and Technical Documentation have been released
- Citation data provider has been announced – Scopus
- Submission and beyond
ASSH disciplines and ARC

- What are the areas you think need focussing on?

- How do you want to be involved?

- Don’t forget the Executive Directors
  - Professor Marian Simms (SBE)
  - Professor Andrew Wells (HCA)