

ARC DISCOVERY

Analysis of scores: A – funded projects, B+ top 5% of unsuccessful bids, B – between 5-20% unsuccessful, C+ - between 10-25% unsuccessful, C – between 25 – 50% unsuccessful, D – between 50-75% unsuccessful, E – remainder of unsuccessful bids.

This year we increased our success rate from 12.5% to 19.4%, which brings us back to where we were in 2006 and 2007. We won 13 grants this year as opposed to 11 last year and 10 in 2008. Five of those grants were in the Faculty of Arts, where the size of grants is smaller than in Science and Health. This in part explains why we won \$1 million less than last year. However, several of the grants in SET were also quite small. This year we won \$3,172,464, as opposed to \$4,167,140 in 2009 and \$2,850,581 in 2008. In an effort to maintain a national success rate of 20% plus the ARC has significantly cut the size of grants awarded. One can debate the value of this strategy, my own view is that if you want good quality research you have to resource it properly as other countries do.

Our improved success rate is probably linked to having a rigorous peer review system. In several cases advice provided at the early stage of assessment resulted in successful bids. In order to improve our performance further I propose engaging some experienced external reviewers to assist colleagues with preparing their applications.

This year we had rather more of our unsuccessful applications scored D and E.

