Government Investment in R&D 2011-12

- Business & Innovation: 24%
- Investigator Driven: 4.5%
- CSIRO: 8%
- ARC: 9%
- NHMRC: 8%
- CRCs: 2%
- Universities: 21%
- Energy and the Environment: 5%
- Other Science: 4%
- Other Government: 11%
- Other Health: 6%
- Rural: 2%
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

Web: arc.gov.au  Email: info@arc.gov.au
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

[Diagram showing Research(ers) in industry, Women, Research-only, Indigenous, Teaching and research]
Encouraging Opportunity

**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

Web: arc.gov.au | Email: info@arc.gov.au
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>
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 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

**Example of the draft refined journal indicator for FoR 1801 for University X**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of X</th>
<th>1801</th>
<th>Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journal Title</strong></td>
<td><strong>Papers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Contribution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Journal of Law and Medicine</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public Law Review</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Australian Journal of Administrative Law</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Law in Context</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Australian Journal of Family Law</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Company and Securities Law Journal</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Torts Law Journal</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Contemporary Issues in Law</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Law and Policy</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>International Journal of the Legal Profession</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Australian Journal of Corporate Law</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Australian Journal of Labour Law</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Journal of Judicial Administration</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Federal Law Review</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Australian Journal of Legal Philosophy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Forensic Science International</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Legal Theory</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Revenue Law Journal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>AIAL National Lecture Series on Administrative Law</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Intertax; International tax review</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>465</strong></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 ≥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 focusing on?

• How do you want to be involved?

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