Australian Academy of Science

Response to ARC consultation paper:

ARC Centres of Excellence for funding commencing in 2011

Respondent details	
Your name (optional)	Professor Bob Williamson AO FRS FAA FRCP FRCPath
Your position and organisation (optional) Contact details (optional)	Secretary, Science Policy, Australian Academy of Science Email: r.williamson@unimelb.edu.au
Please tick or highlight any category that describes your current status	□ Researcher / employee – past or current ARC Centre □ Partner organisation – past or current ARC Centre □ Researcher – university-based □ Researcher – other publicly funded agency □ Researcher - other □ Deputy vice-chancellor / pro vice-chancellor □ University research office staff □ ARC grant recipient □ ARC partner organisation □ ARC College of Experts member ☑ Peak body with interest in research □ Business group □ Other (specify)
Please tick or highlight the category that best describes your field(s) of research Would you be willing to discuss your comments in confidence with an ARC	 ☑ Biological sciences and biotechnology ☑ Engineering and environmental sciences □ Humanities and creative arts ☑ Mathematics, information and communication sciences ☑ Physics, chemistry and geoscience □ Social, behavioural and economic sciences ☑ Yes □ No
staff member?	Comment

Objectives	
Do you agree with the objectives of the ARC Centres of Excellence scheme?	✓ Strongly agree ☐ Mostly agree ☐ Agree with some ☐ Mostly disagree ☐ Strongly disagree
	Comment We believe that the Centres of Excellence program is of particular value because, amongst the ARC funding streams, it is one of the few that allows for generous funding for innovative and original research.

Targeting ARC Centres of Excellence Do you agree that new rounds of the ARC Centres of Excellence scheme should be open to proposals from all fields of research (except clinical medicine and dental research)? □ Strongly agree □ Mostly agree □ Mostly disagree □ Strongly disagree □ Strongly disagree □ Comment □ The Academy considers that well coordinated multidisciplinary research is to be encouraged

Innovative research with a higher degree of risk exposure		
Do you agree new rounds of	☑ Strongly agree	
the ARC Centres of	□ Mostly agree	
Excellence scheme should	□ Partly agree	
include research programs	□ Mostly disagree	
that carry a higher than	□ Strongly disagree	
normal element of risk, with		
the proviso that funding	Comment	
could be modified or		
terminated following a	The Academy strongly agrees that programs involving	
rigorous review process	a higher than normal element of risk should be	
before reaching the	supported and regards the proviso of redirection of	
maximum funding duration?	funds as providing flexibility while retaining	
	accountability.	

Minimum and maximum funding per Centre per annum **✓** Strongly agree Do you agree that the □ Mostly agree minimum annual funding □ Partly agree for a Centre should be \$1 □ Mostly disagree million? □ Strongly disagree **☑** Strongly agree Do you agree that the □ Mostly agree maximum annual funding □ Partly agree for a Centre should be □ Mostly disagree raised from \$3 million to \$4 □ Strongly disagree million? Comment The Academy regards the proposed \$1m p.a. to be a minimum level of Centre funding required to provide critical mass and supports an increase in maximum annual funding for Centres to at least \$4m p.a.

Duration of Centres	
What do you believe to be the optimal duration of a Centre (assuming that application in subsequent rounds is also possible)?	 □ 5 years (present duration) ☑ 7 years □ Should depend on the research program proposed □ Other (specify)
	Comment
	The Academy believes that Centres of Excellence should propose programs that justify 7 years of funding but that final years should be subject to and guided by formal review processes. This could be especially relevant where higher risk research delivers discovery which may have significant bearing upon original research plans and objectives.

Selection criteria Do you agree with the **☑** Strongly agree proposed selection criteria □ Mostly agree for Centres? □ Agree with some □ Mostly disagree □ Strongly disagree Do you agree with the □ Strongly agree proposed weighting of the **☑** Mostly agree selection criteria? □ Agree with some □ Mostly disagree □ Strongly disagree Comment The Academy agrees with the proposed selection criteria noting that they vary little from the existing criteria The Academy notes a growing need to foster early career researchers and the importance of knowledge transfer and collaboration. The proposed weighting of the selection criteria could be improved by giving additional weight to Criteria D. Research Training and Professional Development and Criteria E. Partner Support, End-User Engagement and Knowledge Transfer. It would also appear that Criteria C. Governance and Leadership and F. National Benefit and Linkages broadly overlap with other Criteria and could stand to be given less weight. Reporting and reviews Do you agree with the \Box Yes proposed in-principle **☑** In part arrangements for Centre □ No reporting and reviews? Comment The Academy party supports the in-principle arrangements for Centre reporting and reviews. As the 3 paragraphs provided in the consultation paper are limited in scope and detail, it should be noted that reporting and review obligations can be resource intensive and should be structured to provide value to both the Centres and the ARC. The Academy believes further consultation is warranted to develop appropriate reporting and review

Title retention	
Do you agree with the proposed time limit for title retention?	□ Yes ☑ No
	Comment The Academy supports a 1 to 2 year retention of the title following conclusion of ARC funding in order to properly transition any funding, Intellectual Property and publishing obligations.

Other comments **✓** Yes Do you have any other comments on the proposed □ No operation of the ARC Comment Centres of Excellence scheme? The Academy supports the existence of multiple mechanisms to fund research of high quality in Australia. We believe that the Centres of Excellence program is of particular value because, amongst the ARC funding streams, it is one of the few that allows for generous funding for innovative and original research. By its nature it focuses on Australian scientific research programs of the highest quality. It is important that this stream of funding retains both its focus on originality, and that funding is sufficient to achieve and maintain international competitiveness. To meet the needs of individual Centres of Excellence, we support flexibility in the duration of time that a Centres of Excellence can be funded, and the raising of the financial limit to \$4M per annum. A Centre of Excellence as a national foci for research in a particular fields will often be inter-disciplinary and cross-funded by other agencies. The rules for funding the Centres of Excellence should allow various funding streams, some of which may be unconventional and cut across usual Government barriers. For instance, appropriate Centres of Excellence should be encouraged to obtain State Government funding as well as ARC funding. There

may be times when funding across the ARC/NHMRC barrier will be appropriate, or funding with Commonwealth Research Agencies or with industry.

It should be a stated and transparent policy that ARC will encourage with flexibility any initiatives that will make a Centre of Excellence a stronger entity, working in the national interest. We appreciate that the ARC already calls upon Fellows of our Academy, and of ATSE, for help in assessing proposals for Centres of Excellence. We reiterate our willingness to participate, as the peak body for science research in Australia, in formal and informal ways to assist with future selection and assessment of Centres of Excellence.