Government Investment in Research

$8.5 billion in 2009-10

- Energy & Environment: 10%
- Other Science Support: 8%
- Rural: 7%
- DSTO: 5%
- CSIRO: 6%
- Other R&D Agencies: 4%
- Industry R&D Tax Concession: 10%
- Other Business: 9%
- Universities: 8%
- NHMRC and Other Health: 17%
- ARC: 2%
- CRCs: 4%

Web: arc.gov.au | Email: info@arc.gov.au
Statutory Agency established 2001

Mission: to deliver policy and programs that advance Australian research and innovation globally and benefit the community

Funds direct costs to Universities and partners

All disciplines except clinical medicine & dentistry

ANZSRC FoRs

2-digit

4-digit

6-digit

11 Medical and Health Sciences

1101 MEDICAL BIOCHEMISTRY AND METABOLICOMICS

1102 CARDIOVASCULAR MEDICINE AND HAEMATOLOGY

1103 CLINICAL SCIENCES

1104 COMPLEMENTARY AND ALTERNATIVE MEDICINE

110401 Chiropractic

110402 Naturopathy

110403 Traditional Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Medicine and Treatments

110404 Traditional Chinese Medicine and Treatments

110405 Traditional Maori Medicine and Treatments

110499 Complementary and Alternative Medicine not elsewhere classified

1105 DENTISTRY
**National Competitive Grants Program (NCGP)**

- Support for the highest-quality research leading to the discovery of new ideas and the advancement of knowledge
- Financial assistance towards facilities and equipment that researchers need to be internationally competitive
- Support for the training and skills development of the next generation of researchers
- Incentives for Australia’s most talented researchers to work in partnership with leading researchers throughout the national innovation system and internationally, and to form alliances with Australian industry.

**NCGP Funding**

- Funding for the NCGP in 2010-11 is $708,733 million
- Recently announced $376 million funding in Major Grants Announcement supporting 1126 innovative projects
- Announced $255.9 million in 13 new *ARC Centres of Excellence* to commence in 2011
Expert & Peer Review

- College of Experts appointed across five Disciplines
- Selection Advisory Committees appointed for specific schemes
- Individuals of international standing
- Confidential assessment process
- Rigorous expert review and peer review processes
- Assessors make funding recommendations

Expert & Peer Review – Discipline Panels

- Biological Sciences and Biotechnology
- Engineering Mathematics and Informatics
- Humanities and Creative Arts
- Physics, Chemistry and Earth Sciences
- Social, Behavioural and Economic Sciences

Multi-disciplinary Proposals are managed across these Panels
Expert & Peer Review

- Over 10,000 Assessors in ARC database currently
- Currently working to improve matching of Assessors to Proposals using Fields of Research (FoR) and keywords
- Increasing number of international Assessors

Research Opportunity & Performance Evidence

- Focus on Early Career Researchers (ECRs) Proposals and success rates in previous years
- Feedback from the sector and Assessors
- Focus on differences in success rates by gender
- Fellowship eligibility, reduce overlap and increase opportunities
**New NCGP schemes in 2011**

**Discovery – Early Career Researcher Award**

- ARC Discovery Program Consultation Paper launched Nov 3 2010
- Response from individuals or institutions by Dec 1 2010
- Response Pro-forma to DiscoveryConsultation@arc.gov.au

**New NCGP schemes in 2011**

**Research in Industry Training Award**

- Part of the Clean 21 Initiative, $23.4 million investment over 6 years
- Focus on emerging green industries and reducing environmental impact of existing industries
- Up to 100 awards in 2012 and up to 100 awards in 2014
- Valuable hands-on experience for postgraduate researchers
- Awards to institutions with research activity in key areas
Why is research assessment important for Australia?

Research assessment improves research quality

Source: Thomson ISI National Science Indicators
Quality assessment exercises overseas

1986—The United Kingdom
1993—Hong Kong
1997—Germany
1998—Ireland
2002—The Netherlands
2003—New Zealand
2005—France

ERA: A world-leading initiative

- Assessment of ALL research undertaken in Australian universities over the past SIX years
- Evaluate this research by disciplines (157 + 22)
- Apply discipline matrices to ensure effective evaluation
- Capturing research element of creative output
- Cutting edge bibliometric indicators
- Use of institutional repositories
The ERA Clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 1</td>
<td>Physical, Chemical &amp; Earth Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 2</td>
<td>Humanities and Creative Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 3</td>
<td>Engineering and Environmental Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 4</td>
<td>Social, Behavioural and Economic Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 5</td>
<td>Mathematics, Information and Communication Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 6</td>
<td>Biological Sciences and Biotechnology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 7</td>
<td>Biomedical and Clinical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 8</td>
<td>Public and Allied Health, and Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ERA 2010 Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Unit of Evaluation profile is characterised by evidence of outstanding performance well above world standard presented by the suite of indicators used for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Unit of Evaluation profile is characterised by evidence of performance above world standard presented by the suite of indicators used for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Unit of Evaluation profile is characterised by evidence of average performance at world standard presented by the suite of indicators used for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Unit of Evaluation profile is characterised by evidence of performance below world standard presented by the suite of indicators used for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Unit of Evaluation profile is characterised by evidence of performance well below world standard presented by the suite of indicators used for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Not assessed due to low volume. The number of research outputs does not meet the volume threshold standard for evaluation in ERA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why a matrix approach to indicators?

- Not all indicators are suitable for all disciplines
- Pick and choose what is right for each discipline
- The indicator suite must ensure comparable quality across a range of indicator types
- Journal Rankings are ONE indicator not THE indicator
ERA 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>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note – no weightings

Research Evaluation Committee

Final Reports

Next round of ERA is in 2012