

Group 1 – Investigators

Overview

This handout provides guidance for assessing the **Investigators** criterion across ARC schemes, together with examples of assessor comments.

Task: Working in groups, review the assessor reports aligned with the investigators criterion and:

1. **Discuss the quality** of the reports using the quality dimensions
2. **Identify** sections of the assessor reports that exemplify quality according to the guidelines
3. Detail your **key takeaways** for applying these guidelines in your own practice

ARC Assessment Criteria

Regarding criterion “investigators” the ARC guidelines for Detailed Assessors says:

Linkage – *Investigator(s)’ capability and quality of team*

Weighting: 20%

Assess the:

- Quality of the named participant(s)’ skills and experience, relative to opportunity, including evidence of potential to engage in collaborative research
- Experience in research training, mentoring and supervision
- Capability and capacity of the team to undertake and manage the project
- Evidence of previous history of successful collaboration between the named participant(s) and this or other Partner Organisation(s)

Discovery – *Investigator(s)/Capability*

Weighting: 30%

Taking into account research opportunity:

- Record of high-quality research outputs appropriate to the discipline
- Evidence of excellence in research training, mentoring and supervision (where appropriate)
- The capability of the investigator or team to build collaborations both within Australia and internationally

Future Fellow – *Investigator/Capability*

Weighting: 50%

Describe the quality of the candidate as detailed below:

Future Fellowship Level 1

- Research Opportunity and Performance Evidence (ROPE) including record of high-quality research outputs appropriate to the discipline/s
- Evidence of demonstrated capability for research training, supervision and mentoring
- Evidence of leadership capability and national research standing and
- Capability of the candidate to build collaborations across research organisations, industry and other disciplines both within Australia and internationally

Future Fellowship Level 2

- Research Opportunity and Performance Evidence (ROPE) including record of high-quality research outputs appropriate to the discipline/s
- Evidence of established capability and emerging leadership in research training, supervision and mentoring
- Evidence of leadership capabilities and national and emerging international research standing and
- Capability of the candidate to build collaborations across research organisations, industry and other disciplines both within Australia and internationally

Future Fellowship Level 3

- Research Opportunity and Performance Evidence (ROPE) including record of outstanding research outputs appropriate to the discipline/s
- Evidence of experience in initiating and managing large research projects

- Evidence of international research standing
- Evidence of excellence, experience and achievements in research training, supervision and mentoring
- Capability of the candidate to build collaborations across research organisations, industry and other disciplines both within Australia and internationally

Table 1. A-E scores and descriptors (DP27)

Score	Descriptor
A	Outstanding: Of the highest quality and at the forefront of research in the field. (~10%)
B	Excellent: Of high quality and strongly competitive (~15%)
C	Very Good: Interesting, sound and compelling (~20%)
D	Good: Sound but lacks a compelling element (~35%)
E	Uncompetitive: Has significant weaknesses (~20%)

Source: [discovery-program-detailed-assessor-handbook-dp27.pdf](https://www.acde.edu.au/discovery-program-detailed-assessor-handbook-dp27.pdf)

Assessment Examples

Example 1:

Investigator(s) (A)

The CI has an extremely strong track record overall. She has been a competitively-funded research fellow for her entire career with relatively few teaching duties and has made the most of these opportunities. Her research activities have made a significant contribution to her university department's international standing. The CI has published a large body of work and has made important contributions – particularly to our understanding of the capacity of mixed methods research to provide insights into complex social issues associated with diverse regional labour markets. It is clear that she has a high standing in this field internationally, judging from the citation of her work across a range of social science disciplines and invitations to speak at international conferences that focus on the design and implementation of mixed method research programs in key areas of social and economic policy. I note particularly the regular publication (averaging 5 papers annually over the last ten years) in very highly regarded international journals as well as second-tier journals that focus on the Australian policy environment. She is a corresponding author on well over half of these, which demonstrates that she is a major driver in these pieces of work. My only negative comment relates to the lack of a strong record of public outreach/engagement, however recent contributions to both The

Conversation (2017) and ABC Radio National interviews (2016, 2018) suggest a growing track record in this area.

Example 2:

DECRA Candidate (A)

The candidate's research performance to opportunity is excellent, demonstrated through highly regarded journal publications that are being cited by some very senior and well-respected researchers and policy makers. His position as first author on 15 of the 17 journal papers is a testament to the critical role that he has played in driving and executing this research. This is particularly impressive given the breaks in the candidate's career progression for challenges associated with a medical condition.

Example 3:

Investigator(s) (A)

The lead CI is one of Australia's most prolific political scientists as evident by 21 book manuscripts and more than 100 journal articles, many of which are in leading international journals. In addition, she has the required prior experience and necessary networks to facilitate project implementation across all three sites (one in Australia and two international). The project's PI is an early career researcher with an emerging record of high-quality publications and successful collaborations with more senior researchers in the discipline. The PI's record of designing survey instruments, and collecting and analysing survey data on sensitive political issues will be an asset to the project.

Example 4:

Investigator(s) (B)

Both Professors (CI1 and CI2) are extremely well-established scholars in the field of primary school education, with a clear track record of contributions to pedagogy and classroom practice which has spanned their careers. They are certainly amongst the leading scholars in their field and have both previously held ARC grants in this area. As an ECR, CI3 understandably has a less established record in the area, though he has published several good journal articles and appears to play a very active role in engaging with professionals within the education sector.

Example 5:

Investigator(s) (B)

There are 4 academics and 3 partner investigators on the team. The academics, all from a single university, are experienced researchers - some very senior with past competitive grant projects success. The expertise of the researchers is highly relevant to the project and the partners will play a significant role in providing context for the intended research. Though the senior academics adopt the lead researcher roles, the commitments of all researchers is 0.2 (each). While this may be workable, it is the case that the lead researcher could show a higher

commitment in time than the others to indicate a greater responsibility for seeing the project through. This is a minor quibble in what looks to be a strong team with runs on the board in terms of publications and research project experience.

Example 6:

Investigator(s) (C)

The investigators are an interdisciplinary team with appropriate expertise to study psychological, organisational and industrial factors that might be associated with physical work hazard exposure and resulting illness and disease. CI3 and CI4 bring expertise in organisational psychology and their publications evidence their expertise in relevant quantitative methods. CI2 has a strong publication history of applied occupational safety research particularly on shiftwork and operator fatigue, including studies of commuting among workers. CI3 and CI4 do not report experience conducting research in heavy industry contexts but have proven experience completing occupational health and safety research in the professional service sector. CI1 has a strong track record of publication in the area of management and labour relations and his significant publications include a very high proportion of outputs on which he is first author. However, it is not made clear how his core expertise as a historian will contribute to this project. Three of the CI team have experienced significant health or life events which would have affected their productivity for a period and all the CIs have experienced periods of heavy teaching and/or administrative demand during their academic careers. Nonetheless, each has built a substantial body of research outputs relative to their career duration, usually publishing in high quality journals in their area.

Example 7:

Investigator(s) (B)

Excellent background well suited to the project.

Example 8:

Investigator(s) (B)

Solid track record

Example 9:

Investigator(s) (C)

The team should have the appropriate skills and experience for the project research.

Example 10:

Investigator(s) (C)

Fair

Example 11:

Investigator(s) (E)

I have serious doubts about the lead CI's ability to deliver this project. I was unfortunate to collaborate with him on a number of publications in recent years, and partnered on an ill-fated DP application last year which fell apart due to his overbearing and tendentious manner. If this is how he behaves towards other researchers it is unlikely he will be able to bring this project, which requires extensive collaboration across institutions, to fruition.

Group 2 – Project Quality

Overview

This section provides guidance for assessing the **Project Quality and Innovation** criterion across ARC funding schemes, together with the assessment criteria for Linkage Projects, Discovery Projects, and Future Fellowships.

Task: Working in groups, review the assessor reports aligned with the [project quality and innovation](#) criterion and:

1. **Discuss the quality** of the reports using the quality dimensions
2. **Identify** sections of the assessor reports that exemplify quality according to the guidelines
3. Detail your **key takeaways** for applying these guidelines in your own practice

ARC Assessment Criteria

Regarding criterion “investigators” the ARC guidelines for Detailed Assessors says:

Linkage – *Project Quality and Innovation*

Weighting: 30%

Assess the:

- significance and innovativeness of the research in the context of previous research in the area
- Robustness and appropriateness of the conceptual framework, design, methods and analyses
- The adequacy and appropriateness of the budget, including cash and in-kind contributions pledged by the participating organisations, and value for money considerations

If the project involves Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander research, additional criteria include:

- The project's level of collaboration, engagement, relationship building and benefit sharing with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples, and First Nations Organisations and Communities
- The project's strategy and mechanisms for Indigenous research capacity building within the project
- The project's level of internal leadership of Indigenous research
- The project's adherence to the Australian Indigenous Data Sovereignty Principles
- The project's understanding of, and proposed strategies to adhere to, the AIATSIS Code of Ethics for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research and NHMRC's guidelines on Ethical conduct in research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples and communities

Discovery – *Project Quality and Innovation*

Weighting: 45%

Assess the:

- Contribution to an important gap in knowledge or significant problem
- Novelty/originality and innovation of the proposed research (including any new methods, technologies, theories or ideas that will be developed)
- Clarity of the hypothesis, theories and research questions
- Cohesiveness of the project design and implementation plan (including the appropriateness of the aim, conceptual framework, method, data and/or analyses)
- Extent to which the research has the potential to enhance international collaboration

If the project involves Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander research, additional criteria include:

- The project's level of collaboration, engagement, relationship building and benefit sharing with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples, and First Nations Organisations and Communities
- The project's strategy and mechanisms for Indigenous research capacity building within the project
- The project's level of internal leadership of Indigenous research
- The project's adherence to the Australian Indigenous Data Sovereignty Principles
- The project's understanding of, and proposed strategies to adhere to, the AIATSIS Code of Ethics for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research and NHMRC's guidelines on

Ethical conduct in research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples and communities

Future Fellow – *Project Quality and Innovation*

Weighting: 25%

Describe the:

- Contribution to an important gap in knowledge or significant problem
- Innovation of the research in the context of recent international advances in research in this area
- Clarity of the major research questions
- Cohesiveness of the project design and implementation plan (including the appropriateness of the aim, conceptual framework, method, data and/or analyses)
- Extent to which the research has the potential to enhance international collaboration

If the project involves Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander research, additional criteria include:

- The project's level of collaboration, engagement, relationship building and benefit sharing with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples, and First Nations Organisations and Communities
- The project's strategy and mechanisms for Indigenous research capacity building within the project
- The project's level of internal leadership of Indigenous research
- The project's adherence to the Australian Indigenous Data Sovereignty Principles (2018)
- The project's understanding of, and proposed strategies to adhere to, the AIATSIS Code of Ethics for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research (2020) and NHMRC's guidelines on Ethical conduct in research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples and communities (2018)

Table 1. A-E scores and descriptors (DP27)

Score	Descriptor
A	Outstanding: Of the highest quality and at the forefront of research in the field. (~10%)
B	Excellent: Of high quality and strongly competitive (~15%)
C	Very Good: Interesting, sound and compelling (~20%)
D	Good: Sound but lacks a compelling element (~35%)
E	Uncompetitive: Has significant weaknesses (~20%)

Source: [discovery-program-detailed-assessor-handbook-dp27.pdf](#)

Assessment Examples

Example 1:

Program of Research Activity (A)

The proposed program of research represents a new direction focused on regional life, well-being and access to economic resources among an ageing population. The program builds on and extends the CI's established areas of expertise. A key part of the application is to build capability at the Administering and Partner Organisations as an exemplar in the integration of social research methods to address key social and economic challenges. The suggested program of research is the first in Australia to adopt such an integrated and large range of disciplines (anthropology, information and communications technology, geography, psychology, sociology, economics and public policy) to this particular type of program. This approach has the potential to provide a much deeper understanding of the implications of the challenges and opportunities for regional Australia if it can address practical issues of cross-discipline communication and coordination. The CI's previous intellectual contributions and national and international networks, providing some confidence that these challenges will be addressed successfully. The application also carefully describes and justifies an appropriate budget for the significant administrative resources that will be required to manage successfully a large and geographically dispersed team. Overall, this exciting application has the potential to make major contributions to theory, applied research and policy.

Example 2:

Project Quality and Innovation (B)

The candidate demonstrates an excellent grasp of the sociological theories that underpin this project on technology in the workplace. The project is challenging and innovative, especially for an early career researcher who is in the initial stages of developing the type of international

networks required for a multi-site, international study of this nature. The participant samples are appropriate, but I have reservations as to whether the very broad scope of this project is practical for a three-year time-frame and modest budget. While I believe the project, as stated, could deliver excellent results with important implications for theory and policy, I am concerned that the scheduling and anticipated costs of data collection underestimate the requirements of the project as it currently stands. Challenges with data collection are likely to impose constraints on the analysis that can be undertaken, particularly if it compromises the number of sites and reduces the comparative nature of the project.

Example 3:

Project Quality and Innovation (A)

The research project is designed around three research questions, which are well defined and complementary in addressing the project's overall objective of understanding challenges to the Westminster system of democracy in three countries. Each research question focuses on a different unit of analysis and aligns with detailed plans for data collection and appropriate analytical approaches. The proposed data collection from individual citizens (research question three) is the most challenging but is also innovative and provides the largest potential for making an insightful theoretical contribution. Therefore, I believe the project makes a compelling case for both innovation and promises to contribute to knowledge as well as has important policy implications.

Example 4:

Project Quality and Innovation (D)

The project aims to refine the ABC learning program and evaluate its success with a well-specified and sensible selection of primary school environments. The research involves two streams of analysis: (a) refinement and piloting of the ABC learning program, with a consultative program that incorporates feedback from teachers, parents and education departments, and (b) a larger scale program of implementation and evaluation. It is certainly an interesting project, but it is unclear from the research description just how much this particular project will advance previous work which has already been undertaken by Smith, Nguyen and Miller. In what particular ways will this project take the program forward and how does it differ from the international and Australian studies cited in the application that are also investigating ABC programs? The proposed extensions to the ABC model appear to be incremental. There is a lack of clarity around the purpose and research outcomes associated with three different sets of focus groups. The analytical approach is also unclear with some sections of the proposal focussing on content analysis and others on emergent theories of teaching. The number of groups and individuals proposed in the research description (six groups and 40 participants) seems out of proportion to the breadth of the study – why so few across multiple sites with different stakeholders? There is also a discrepancy here with the interview transcription services provided for in the budget (over \$30,000 for 65 interviews). It would be helpful to have greater clarity on the focus groups' purpose, design and data analysis.

Example 5:

Project Quality and Innovation (C)

The projects' interest in the examination of the relationship of School-based learning outcomes and community sports participation is interesting and potentially important. There is a statement that this approach is based on earlier research projects undertaken by the CIs. My question then is not so much about the methodology itself but how this project can be framed as an innovative approach. A few of the participants have the "word" innovation in their titles, but there is little specific evidence that the methodology is innovative. The project design suggests that there will be substantial data generated by the project. Much of this data will cross the quantitative/ qualitative divide and while this is not unusual in projects such as these, the stated methods appear too general in the way they are both rationalised and outlined. There is a lack of specificity in how the data, once collected, will be analysed and then translated into outcomes with specific impacts.

Example 6:

Project Quality and Innovation (C)

The problem is important. The reason existing risk management regimes have become less effective in controlling related diseases in workers needs to be understood to underpin prevention efforts. The conceptual approach is not very novel, contradicting the CIs' claim of innovation. It uses fundamental, orthodox ideas of modern WHS. It is confusing that Figure 3 does not show the relation between hazards and health being mediated by other factors. The relevance to the study of the distinction between the current risk management approach to WHS regulation and the earlier prescriptive approach is not well-argued. Nor is it clear why behavioural approaches to health and safety are listed as approaches to regulation. The method captures a range of relevant data but will self-reported, historical work and exposure data. There is a legitimate concern as to whether this will be reliable and detailed enough for the intended purpose. A clearer statement is needed of how the sources of data, collected on different timescales, will be combined. The design will not include data relevant to workers health outcomes before the current increase in disease and so will preclude finding a change in substance characteristics related to change in disease occurrence.

Example 7:

Project Quality and Innovation (A)

This is a clear and persuasive application. The literature review is comprehensive, the core questions well defined, and the research design is appropriate and thoughtfully constructed.

Example 8:

Project Quality and Innovation (B)

This is a clear application and cross-national research is welcome, although it remains unclear how the research will relate to the initial problems which are presented in the opening section of the application. The research questions remain very descriptive rather than drawing upon clear

theoretical arguments and the existing research lit. And why not include a broader set of case studies?

Example 9:

Project Quality and Innovation (E)

The theoretical section is underdeveloped, weak, and confusing, with a lot of repeated assertions but no sense of what existing theoretical frameworks this is being built upon, which theories would disagree with the argument, what core propositions are being tested, and how the cases will contribute towards the answers. The case selection also seems ad hoc and the rationale for selection remains unclear.

Example 10:

Project Quality and Innovation (E)

The theory starts with a series of assertions but this reflects one perspective and the applicants should acknowledge extensive theory about rational workforce participation decisions in the context of household roles and obligations. Throwing in a few ad hoc and vague country names as examples is not evidence of anything. The 3rd sentence in the aims section (economic independence requires that...), followed by a series of diverse citations thrown together, is incomprehensible. The idea that economic independence can develop from greater welfare assistance is misguided and this certainly needs unpacking not just asserting. Overall the project description is very, very incoherent and confused. Not anywhere near the quality for fundable re “fair” or “poor and confused”

Example 11:

Project Quality and Innovation (C)

Not at the forefront but solid.

Group 3 – Feasibility

Overview

This handout provides guidance for assessing the **Feasibility** criterion across ARC schemes, together with examples of assessor comments.

Task: Working in groups, review the assessor reports aligned with the feasibility criterion and:

1. **Discuss the quality** of the reports using the quality dimensions
2. **Identify** sections of the assessor reports that exemplify quality according to the guidelines
3. Detail your **key takeaways** for applying these guidelines in your own practice

ARC Assessment Criteria

Regarding criterion “investigators” the ARC guidelines for Detailed Assessors says:

Linkage – *Strength of the Proposed Research Alliance*

Weighting: 30%

Assess the:

- Extent and nature of commitment to the project, including provision of research environment, facilities and personnel (where relevant), relative to the scale of the project and the capacity of the participating organisations
- Extent and appropriateness of proposed governance, structures and processes to support the project
- Capacity and intent of Partner Organisations to use the outcomes of the research
- Potential of partnership to lead to long-term collaborations

Discovery – *Feasibility*

Weighting: 10%

Describe the:

- Cost-effectiveness of the research and its value for money
- Time and capacity of investigator or team to undertake research
- Suitability of the environment for the research team and their project, and for HDR students where appropriate
- Availability of the necessary facilities to complete the project
- Extent to which the project's design, named participants and requested budget create confidence in the timely and successful completion of the project

Future Fellow – *Feasibility and Strategic Alignment*

Weighting: 10%

Describe the:

- Cost effectiveness of the research and its value for money
- Extent to which the Future Fellowship candidate aligns with and/or complements the core or developing research strengths and staffing profile of Your organisation
- Availability of the necessary facilities to conduct the research
- Resources You will provide to support the Future Fellowship candidate during her/his Future Fellowship
- Capacity within Your organisation to transition the candidate at the end of the Future Fellowship to a continuing position

Table 1. A-E scores and descriptors (DP27)

Score	Descriptor
A	Outstanding: Of the highest quality and at the forefront of research in the field. (~10%)
B	Excellent: Of high quality and strongly competitive (~15%)
C	Very Good: Interesting, sound and compelling (~20%)
D	Good: Sound but lacks a compelling element (~35%)
E	Uncompetitive: Has significant weaknesses (~20%)

Source: [discovery-program-detailed-assessor-handbook-dp27.pdf](#)

Assessment Examples

Example 1:

Mentoring/Capacity Building (A)

Capacity building: CI has an extremely impressive track record of obtaining research funding and building research capacity. Particular highlights include leadership of a major Research Centre at the admin org, which attracts significant external funding, alongside two ARC DP grants in the last 6 years. These, together with her other leadership roles, clearly demonstrate an ability to lead and to contribute to large initiatives that strengthen the admin organisation's and Australia's ability to carry out the highest quality research in the social sciences. Mentoring: The CI has worked with a number of mid-career researchers and supervised doctoral students who have graduated and later been awarded independent fellowships and research grants. These outcomes appear to have been supported by the CI's provision of lead authorship opportunities to early career researchers in the formative stages of their careers. I am unclear about the development opportunities in the long term for the named research assistants. Perhaps the CI could expand a little in this area if there is a chance to do so.

Example 2:

Feasibility (B)

Some issues regarding feasibility have been noted above with respect to the scope of the project and possible constraints on data collection. I also note a lack of international collaborations among the co-authors on the candidate's journal publications. Again, there is limited evidence that the candidate has succeeded in building the international and interdisciplinary collaborations that would facilitate project implementation and poses a risk to achieving its outcomes. A greater demonstration of building or working in international collaborations would provide confidence that an ambitious and well-designed project can be implemented successfully.

Example 3:

Feasibility (A)

The project is well designed and achievable within the proposed time and budget. It will build on an existing project and so much of the required infrastructure and networks are in place. The CI and PI have appropriate experience and training to conduct both proposed data collection and analysis. The established international links with seven highly relevant international research centres provides further assurance of a collaborative research environment that enhances the feasibility of the project.

Example 4:

Feasibility (D)

As noted, several aspects concerning the specific scope and breadth of the research are

unclear from reading the description of the research project (for example, timeframe, number of groups and participants), which makes it difficult to evaluate feasibility. That said, it appears to be a very substantial project and I wonder whether the CIs might benefit from additional consultation with others engaged in broadly similar projects.

Example 5:

Feasibility (C)

The case for feasibility is made in a section in the application under that title. It states how the research will be connected to patterns of the school year with the expectation that these will afford opportunities for researchers to align themselves to periods when students are undertaking community sports activities. There is a sense that this strategy has worked in the past and is being deployed here on that basis. Beyond this, the application establishes that the University's various research groupings provide organisational backing should and when it is required. Whether these argue successfully for feasibility is based on whether the idea that past practices and formally constituted maintenance groupings will ensure a successful project.

Example 6:

Feasibility (C)

The project timeline and budget generally seem feasible with some exceptions. For example, the part-time casual Research Assistant (RA) is expected to enter all employee surveys every year (p.12). This is unrealistic. Have sufficient funds been requested for adequate support staffing? The prolonged support of the Staff Advisers from Industry participants is critical to the success of the study. Will there be Ethical issues for them in providing data for the study? Some assurance of clear attention to the need for Human Research Ethics clearance would be helpful in assessing feasibility.

Example 7:

Feasibility (A)

Solid and clear

Example 8:

Feasibility and Benefit (C)

Fair

Example 9:

Feasibility (E)

Not feasible

Example 10:

Feasibility (E)
Poor and confused

Example 11:

Feasibility (C)
Generally OK.

Group 4 – Benefit

Overview

This handout provides guidance for assessing the **Benefit** criterion across ARC schemes, together with examples of assessor comments.

Task: Working in groups, review the assessor reports aligned with the [benefit](#) criterion and:

1. **Discuss the quality** of the reports using the quality dimensions
2. **Identify** sections of the assessor reports that exemplify quality according to the guidelines
3. Detail your **key takeaways** for applying these guidelines in your own practice

ARC Assessment Criteria

Regarding criterion “investigators” the ARC guidelines for Detailed Assessors says:

Linkage – *Impact*

Weighting: 20%

Assess the:

- Demonstration of the mutual benefit for participating organisations now and into the future
- Evidence of how the research will advance/address Partner Organisation(s)’s core strategy
- Potential contribution to Australian Government priority areas
- Potential economic, commercial, environmental, social and/or cultural benefits for Australia
- Appropriateness of strategies for adoption, commercialisation, promotion, and/or dissemination of research outcomes, including IP management arrangements

Discovery – *Benefit*

Weighting: 15%

Describe the potential benefits including the:

- New or advanced knowledge resulting from outcomes of the research
- Economic, commercial, environmental, social and/or cultural benefits for Australia
- Potential contribution to Australian Government priority areas

Future Fellow – *Benefit*

Weighting: 15%

Describe the potential benefits including the:

- New or advanced knowledge resulting from outcomes of the research
- Economic, commercial, environmental, social and/or cultural benefits for Australia and international communities
- Potential contribution to capacity in the Australian Government priority areas

Table 1. A-E scores and descriptors (DP27)

Score	Descriptor
A	Outstanding: Of the highest quality and at the forefront of research in the field. (~10%)
B	Excellent: Of high quality and strongly competitive (~15%)
C	Very Good: Interesting, sound and compelling (~20%)
D	Good: Sound but lacks a compelling element (~35%)
E	Uncompetitive: Has significant weaknesses (~20%)

Source: [discovery-program-detailed-assessor-handbook-dp27.pdf](#)

Assessment Examples

Example 1:

Mentoring/Capacity Building (A)

Capacity building: CI has an extremely impressive track record of obtaining research funding and building research capacity. Particular highlights include leadership of a major Research Centre at the admin org, which attracts significant external funding, alongside two ARC DP grants in the last 6 years. These, together with her other leadership roles, clearly demonstrate an ability to lead and to contribute to large initiatives that strengthen the admin organisation's and Australia's ability to carry out the highest quality research in the social sciences. Mentoring: The CI has worked with a number of mid-career researchers and supervised doctoral students who have graduated and later been awarded independent fellowships and research grants.

These outcomes appear to have been supported by the CI's provision of lead authorship opportunities to early career researchers in the formative stages of their careers. I am unclear about the development opportunities in the long term for the named research assistants. Perhaps the CI could expand a little in this area if there is a chance to do so.

Example 2:

Benefit and Collaboration(C)

The project as described has significant potential benefits for Australia's research profile in the sociology of technology and important implications for policy. Although there is an impressive academic publication plan, the scope of the proposed data collection and analysis makes it likely that much of the publication output will occur well after the completion of project funding and so will be, in part, contingent on the candidate's academic role and duties following the DECRA. The supportive letter from the administrative organisation is encouraging in this respect. It is also possible that systematic policy discussions may occur following the conclusion of project funding but there is limited information about such plans within the project description. I have already noted the advantages that could result from greater collaboration to assist with implementing the design of this project and so will just note that the candidate may benefit from greater attention to this aspect of the planned research activities.

Example 3:

Benefit (A)

The findings will provide important insights useful for scholars as well as policy-makers and non-governmental actors working in the area of citizen engagement and thus will have great benefits beyond academia. Outreach activities, including three workshops and an international conference are planned and supported with appropriate budget items and associated duties allocated to project personnel. The outcomes of this project can be expected to raise debate and have policy implications well beyond academia.

Example 4:

Benefit (C)

The proposed publication path is sound, and the plan of holding academic and practitioner workshops is also a good idea. Most of this is focused on an Australian audience, and some consideration could be given to international collaboration and engagement. On an organisational note, who would be responsible for organising the planned conference for year three and maintaining the project website? There is no mention of these activities in the roles of the project personnel.

Example 5:

Benefit (C)

Under the section with the title of benefit, a relatively brief section highlights the benefits the

project will return to students, the partner institutions and the University. As the main target of the research, the students should, in principle, be the main beneficiaries but the possible benefits are not well defined. Benefits to the partner organisations are implied rather than stated, although their participation in the project may provide some implicit evidence that benefits, while undefined, are expected. Finally the University is seen to benefit out of the expanded relationships to these institutions in the sporting community that will give the University a better profile as an actor with impact in local community organisations. I am not sure any hard evidence has been provided to demonstrate benefit here, however the likelihood of these benefits accruing is quite strong given the previous track records of the CIs.

Example 6:

Benefit (B)

Dissemination is not well considered. There is no aim to publish in specialist WHS journals or to brief Unions, Industry or Regulators. If done well, the results of a study such as this have the potential to benefit the Australian community by reducing the social and economic burden of occupational disease among Australian workers. The cost of the study would be small in comparison to the economic and other burdens of a resurgence of chronic debilitating or fatal illness in this industry. Many of the costs of conducting the study are minimised because sources of data that are already collected for other purposes will be used.

Example 7:

Benefit (A)

Good

Example 8:

Feasibility and Benefit (C)

Fair

Example 9:

Benefit (E)

Unrealistic

Example 10:

Benefit (E)

No benefit apparent.

Example 11:

Benefit (D)

Unclear.