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1. Key points

- New website and new search engine: ARC Grants Search (launched July 2015)
- ARC Grants dataset updated (November 2015)
- ARC released statement of support and expectation for gender equality – implication in the expectations of Administering Organisations
- Gender Equality Action Plan 2015-16
  - Monitor/Evaluate the impact of DECRA eligibility change
  - Improve gender balance of ARC selection committees
  - Raise awareness on parental leave and part-time arrangement for caring responsibilities
  - Investigate training for ARC college og experts and/or assessors
- Plans for 2016:
  - Review Research Opportunity and Performance Evidence (ROPE) policy (early 2016)
  - Review ARC Research Integrity and Research Misconduct Policy (early 2016)
  - Review ARC Medical Research Policy (mid 2016)
  - Public consultation on Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (mid 2016)
- The Sector is not participating enough in the linkage scheme.
- ARC is looking into new linkage scheme with re-evaluation of cash contribution requirements depending on size/type of industrial partner.
- The Australian Government has developed a set of Science and Research Priorities, they are:
  - Soil and water
  - Transport
  - Cybersecurity
  - Energy
  - Resources
  - Advanced manufacturing
  - Environmental change
  - Health
- The ARC is seeking evidence of outcomes and impacts of ARC-funded research, especially long term outcomes of research. Institutions can alert the ARC to any “good news” stories about ARC-funded researchers and groups at ARC-Publications@arc.gov.au
- Noteworthy best practices from other Universities:
  - DECRA workshops where Early Career Researchers work on their application together.
  - QUT: 2015 suppression of internal deadlines for ARC and NHMRC submissions and implementation of individual deadlines: allows a 24h/48h turn over by the reviewer and improvement in the service. They had over 80% participation to this process from academics. Too early to conclude whether it will also have an impact on the success rate.
2. A few statistics

ARC NCGP funding awarded by organisation (%) 2009-2014

ARC NCGP funding awarded by Fields of research 2002-2014

ARC NCGP funding by scheme 2006-2014
Participation and success of Chief Investigators by gender and career age from PhD:

- **DP13 and DP14**

- **DP15**

- **DP16**

*‘career age’ = years from PhD*
Return and Success Rates

- Discovery Projects

- Linkage Projects

Number of Partner Orgs on LP proposals

Linkage fraction vs Discovery fraction
3. National Competitive Grants Programme (NCGP) Update

**ARC College of Experts:**

- Expanded College
  - 170 people (up from 70 in previous years)
  - More flexibility in forming panels
  - Desirable to avoid members business
  - Capacity to provide late assessments

- ARC College of Experts 2016 - 170 Members (76 new and 94 continuing)
  - 41 second year, 53 final year
  - 36% female (up from 29% in 2015)
  - 35 organisations
  - 46% from Go8
  - Smaller and regional universities well represented

**Number of review panels:**

- Discovery Programme
  - Laureate Fellowship: 1 panel
  - Future Fellowship: 3 panels
  - DECRA: 5 panels
  - Discovery Indigenous: 5 panels
  - Discovery Projects: 5 panels

- Linkage Programme:
  - Centre of Excellence: 1 panel
  - Co-funded & SRI: 1 panel
  - LIEF: 1 panel
  - ITRP: 1 panel
  - Linkage Projects: 4 panels

**Discrepancy between detailed assessors and general assessors – scoring distribution:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detailed Assessors</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility and Benefit</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Environment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total             | 36| 34| 20| 5%| 9%| 2%

**Conflict of Interest – statistics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessors who assessed while conflicted</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mismatch between score and text</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief and unhelpful assessments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate comments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grant Relinquishments

- There have been 254 relinquishments from 2012 to Oct 2015
- 89 (35%) of these have been prior to commencement
- DECRA is the main scheme affected

Post-award—Most Common Issues

- Partner Org relationships—How are they being managed; contributions, reporting
- Partner Org agreements not being signed in time, contributions not being paid and not reporting to the ARC, resulting in the project being relinquished
- Student recruitment—deferrals, visa issues, difficulty in finding suitable candidates
- All of ARC funds being spent before Partner Org funds are spent, resulting in reporting issues and corrections needing to be made
- Transfers not reported correctly—unspent funds still being hidden and not reported
- Final Reports being submitted before the Project has been completed and all funds spent
- ARC not being informed of changes until the Final Report is submitted

Research Office RMS roles Update

- From the end of November there will be an additional Research Office role called Research Office Signatory
- The role Research Office Financial Administrator will be changed to Research Office EOYR Delegate

Adding an ORCID to a user’s profile

- From the end of the month, users will be able to link an ORCID iD to their RMS User Profile
- The functionality will connect directly to ORCID, and will allow the user to link a current ORCID account or will provide them with the ability to create an ORCID account
- Not be mandatory
- No information from the user’s ORCID account will be utilised in other parts of RMS at this stage
- Who can do it?
  - ORCID IDs must be authenticated by each user and each user must authorise the ARC to get the user’s ORCID ID
  - As such, there will be no ability for Research Office Staff to link an ORCID ID to a user’s account, either individually or through a bulk upload mechanism.
4. Post Award Changes

2015

- The ARC is transitioning to electronic acceptance of funding agreements and funding offers.
- Instructions on how to accept funding agreement and offer in RMS will be sent through to Research Offices in late November.
- Signed copies of the draft Funding Agreement will not be accepted.
- Modernisation of EOY and Progress Reports in RMS.
- Increased outreach and communication with the sector.
- Consultation/working groups:
  - RMS
  - Industry Collaboration
- Streamlining of Variation Funding Agreement (VFA) requests.
- Final Report assessments have streamlined and speed up.
- Reports are being assessed more regularly and feedback is provided when appropriate.
- January 2016:
  - Online Remittance
  - Updated EOYR

Future plans

- Post-award accessibility for Research Offices via RMS.
- Further improvement for EOY/Progress Reporting, Final Reports and VFA requests.
- Improved reporting capabilities.
- Auto-population of data collected by ARC will start to be accessible for other areas in RMS.

5. ARC Research Integrity and Research Misconduct Policy

- The policy took effect from the date it was issued, 13 April 2015.
- Financial fraud requires notification irrespective of the time of the incident or allegation.
- Purpose:
  - Safeguard confidence in the value of publicly funded research.
  - Make transparent the ARC’s role in research misconduct matters.
  - Safeguard the integrity of ARC processes and funding.
  - Highlight the importance of research integrity and of the possible consequences of integrity breaches.
- Review of policy:
  - Considering changes in response to feedback and to align with NHMRC.
  - Consultation with sector in early 2016.
  - Key change will be to the scope of policy.
    - Limit to ARC-funded research and researchers, applicants for funding, and those engaged in ARC business.

6. ERA/HERDC

ERA - ARC is looking to improve the process, including:

- EID tagging—better guidance on allowable article types, citation provider interactions (data corrections and timing).
- Repositories—citation/alt metrics on landing pages, are metadata links and landing pages required? possibly a direct link to the output (many Universities did this for ERA 2015)?
- Better guidance on what additional information can be provided (e.g. not a theatre programme).

ERA – Room for further improvement:

- Data quality—in general.
- Repository readiness—REC members reported some issues.
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- Explanatory statements—no alt metrics etc.
- NTRO research statements
  - Variable quality
  - REC members reported some were not at all helpful
  - Key issue is identifying the research component

**ERA-HERDC Alignment - Update**

- Consultation paper on options for alignment (8 December 2014 – 13 February 2015)
- Sector working group (3 July 2015 – 21 September 2015)
- Draft specifications completed
- Next steps—sector consultation on draft specifications – timeline TBA

7. ARC Industry working group

**Purpose and composition**

Purpose: to assist the ARC

- in exploring the challenges faced by universities in establishing and maintaining partnerships with industry and
- in identifying possible solutions.

Membership of the Working Group:

- Ms Louise Fleck, Macquarie University
- Ms Rebecca Bond, The University of Melbourne
- Dr Jodie Clyde-Smith, University of Tasmania
- Dr Ross McLennan, University of South Australia
- Ms Lyn McBriarty, The University of Newcastle
- Ms Michelle Searle, University of the Sunshine Coast

**Consultation**

- Working group established by ARC, project led by Liz Visher
- Survey – proposed by ARC and added to by Working group
- Sent to Research Office Directors
- Responses collated, sent to ARC, synthesised by Millennia Pullen (ARC)
- Synthesis discussed by Working Group

**Timelines - Challenges and suggestions**

Challenges:

- Timeframes for the selection process are lengthy resulting in reduced Partner Organisation (PO) interest
- PO environment is often fast-paced, changing
- Difficulty of POs committing so far in advance of expenditure

Suggestions:

- Offer the scheme several times per year or continuously
- Consider offering one year innovation grants to develop partnerships
- Some institutions offer internal seed funding and/or Linkage ‘near miss’ schemes

**Pre-award paperwork - Challenges and suggestions**

Challenges:

- Duplication in PO signing both support letter and certification
- Applications are focussed on research rather than problem identified by the PO
- ROPE is good in theory for PIs but often doesn’t seem to work out in practice
- Paperwork can be daunting particularly for smaller POs
Suggestions:
- ARC could reconsider the requirement for two forms of PO sign off
- Application form could be ‘turned around’ to focus more (at least the first part of the form) on the PO problem (but challenges relating to assessment)
- Could be alternative expression (and valuing) of PI expertise (but challenges relating to assessment)

Post-award paperwork - Challenges and suggestions
Challenges:
- Too much paperwork required for VFA (even for small LPs)
- Very wide variety of PO agreements, difficulty of negotiating PO agreements, but different requirements for different types of POs
- Difficulties caused by structural changes in the PO – mergers, identifying the key personnel, etc
- Contribution defaults – more likely to happen with smaller POs

Suggestions:
- ARC:
  - reconsider paperwork for some variations
  - consider posting ‘standard form’ agreements appropriate for different types/sizes of PO
- Research Offices:
  - provide training more consistently to researchers and research managers
  - provide guidelines/tips and tricks information sheets for researchers about establishing and maintaining partnerships
  - provide more support to researchers in building and maintaining partnerships (but challenges relating to resourcing, variable experience with business/research partnership development, business experience loses currency rapidly
  - provide more support to POs

Permitted expenditure - Challenges and suggestions
Challenge:
- No teaching relief permitted to allow researchers time in PO (but note difficulties created by promotion criteria, researcher career planning)

Suggestions:
- ARC to consider inclusion of teaching relief as an allowable budget item
- Institutions to consider revision of promotions policies

Relationship Management - Challenges and suggestions
Challenges
- All of the above...
- Researchers are predominantly responsible for finding partners and bringing them on board for a project
- Some researchers have very little experience or understanding of how to do this
- A balance must be found and managed between industry and researcher expectations
- POs are often risk averse
- Some researchers have very little understanding of industry
- Some industry players have very little understanding of universities and/or research

Suggestions
- More consistent and better training and information provided for both researchers and POs
- More support provided to researchers and POs in establishing and maintaining their partnerships in the form of:
  - people to advise and accompany researchers
  - guidelines/tips and tricks for both researchers and POs
  - Setting up project management committees or similar
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- Suggested standard forms of agreement
- Develop relationships that involve more than ‘research for money’
- Provide support for students and/or post-docs to spend time in POs
- Encourage POs to take a longer term view of research relationships

8. Best Practices: Dealing with Industry Partners
Professor Veena Sahajwalla, ARC Laureate Fellow, Director, SMaRT@UNSW, Centre for Sustainable Materials Research & Technology

Our journey of long-term partnerships with industry
- Moving from ‘idea’ to ‘impact’ – resulting in technological advances in Australia and exporting these advances to the world
- The collaboration between the research knowledge of academia and the practical skills of industry has led to win - win outcomes for both
- Moving beyond the first success to further successes for both industry and academia (eg ARC Hub)

What the Research Office could do to facilitate collaboration
Establish an Advisory Group, with complementary skills, to advise researchers well in advance of starting new collaborations with industry and enhancing existing collaborations – advising on, for example:
- Engagement strategy development (short term) and encourage ‘big-picture understanding’
- Opportunities for seed funding
- Terms of engagement and potential for developing long-term collaboration, enhancing intellectual capital
- Develop networks with SMEs and local councils
- Encourage strategic thinking

9. Detailed Presentation on ARC Selection Meetings
Two types of assessors:
- two College of Experts members (General assessors), and
- at least two Detailed assessors

Forming selection panels
- The ARC recognises the need to have a flexible approach to suit volume and disciplinary spread in each scheme
- The number of discipline panels varies by scheme – (Funds are apportioned according to demand)
- Proposals can be assigned across two panels to ensure appropriate expertise, and assigned to a breadth of detailed reviewers
- Some other schemes use a single multi-disciplinary panel (e.g. Australian Laureate Fellowships, LIEF, ITRP)

Number of review panels:
- Discovery Programme
  - Laureate Fellowship: 1 panel
  - Future Fellowship: 3 panels
  - DECRA: 5 panels
  - Discovery Indigenous: 5 panels
  - Discovery Projects: 5 panels
- Linkage Programme:
  - Centre of Excellence: 1 panel
  - Co-funded & SRI: 1 panel
  - LIEF: 1 panel
  - ITRP: 1 panel
  - Linkage Projects: 4 panels
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DP16—5 panels
- BSB—Biological Sciences & Biotechnology (790)
- EIC—Engineering, Information & Computing Sciences (857)
- MPCE—Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry & Earth Sciences (812)
- SBE—Social, Behavioural and Economic Sciences (690)
- HCA—Humanities and Creative Arts (435)

LP15—4 panels
- BEM—Biological Sciences, Biotechnology, Environmental, Medical and Health Sciences (149)
- ET—Engineering and Technology (222)
- HSE—Humanities and Creative Arts, Social, Behavioural and Economic Sciences (216)
- PMI—Physical, Mathematical and Information Sciences (123)

FT14—3 panels
- BEM—Biological Sciences, Biotechnology, Environmental, and Health Sciences
- HSE—Humanities and Creative Arts, Social, Behavioural and Economic Sciences
- PMI—Physical, Mathematical and Information Sciences and Engineering

Duration of selection meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Proposal numbers</th>
<th>Days of selection meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Projects</td>
<td>3584 (31)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including Discovery Indigenous)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECRA</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkage Projects</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIEF</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection Meeting
- The Selection Meeting is the final face-to-face meeting of the panel of General Assessors and is the conclusion of the peer review process
- The panels meet to consider which proposals to recommend to the ARC for funding, and recommended budgets for those proposals
- All recommendations are given to the ARC CEO, who then makes recommendations to the Minister
- All funding decisions are made by the Minister under the ARC Act

Before a Selection Meeting
- Panels are given access to final scores and rankings, and can review all (non-conflicted) proposals, not just those they have had carriage of
- Panel members are encouraged to note any issues they believe may have skewed the assessment/ranking of a particular proposal, or are noteworthy for panel discussion
- Members are also invited to closely scrutinise ROPE issues
- Panel members’ attention is drawn particularly to proposals around the likely funding cut-off, as these will need detailed discussion
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Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Band</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Outstanding: Of the highest quality and at the forefront of research activity. Approximately 10% of Proposals should receive ratings in this band.</td>
<td>Recommended Unconditionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Excellent: Of high quality and strongly competitive. Approximately 15% of Proposals should receive ratings in this band.</td>
<td>Strongly support recommendation of funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Very Good: Interesting, sound and compelling. Approximately 20% of Proposals should receive ratings in this band.</td>
<td>Support recommendation of funding with reservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Good: Sound, but lacks a compelling element. Approximately 35% of Proposals are likely to fall into this band.</td>
<td>Unsupportive of recommendation for funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Uncompetitive: Uncompetitive and has significant weaknesses or more fatal flaws. Approximately 20% of Proposals are likely to fall into this band.</td>
<td>Not recommended for funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal Score/Rank Calculation
- Grouped Average’ of all submitted assessments for the proposal
- This calculation results in a ‘Proposal Score’
- Proposal ranks are derived for each panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Numbers—some examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DECRA16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Projects 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkage Projects 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed Assessment numbers split - For example, for Discovery Projects 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments</th>
<th># of proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 178 assessments submitted by detailed assessors for DP15
Actual rating distribution—DP15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detailed Assessors</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility and Benefit</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator(s)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Quality and Innovation</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Environment</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Assessors</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility and Benefit</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator(s)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Quality and Innovation</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Environment</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross-assignment between panels

- DP 2015
- Assessing Interdisciplinary research

Managing Conflict of Interest during selection meetings
- Members will be asked to leave the room when they are conflicted on any proposal under discussion—this includes the Chair
- The Chair will not chair the discussion when Carriage 1 — the Deputy should step in
- All members must take great care not to refer to previously discussed proposals in a way that would identify them, as conflicted members may be present
- At any point members can declare any unforeseen conflicts for consideration and appropriate action

Running of Selection Meetings 1
- The Selection Meeting runs from 8.30am until 5pm
- Meetings are held at the ARC offices in Canberra
- Each panel room will have an ARC senior staff, plus several ARC staff to assist
- All panels run in parallel
Meeting Attendance and Expectations
- College of Experts must remain in attendance until work is completed
- Adequate preparation for meetings and duty of care is required
- Adequate time for assessment and consideration during the meeting is required
- Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality must be observed at all times
- ARC committee support is provided throughout the process

Preparation for Selection Meetings
- A great deal of work is already done over many months, and this is all captured in the pre-meeting rankings
- The recommendations do not just rely on the scoring calculation formula
- Access to the RMS meeting application in advance allows members to consider proposals around the funding line
- The ARC is also flagging proposals which may need special attention due to the disparate nature of the score

Skewness heat map
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General approach

- It is not expected that every proposal will be discussed in detail
- Little time is spent on proposals already ranked towards the bottom
- Panel members raise any proposals they feel need to be discussed by the panel
- Discussion will then commence at the top of the rankings, with funding decision and budget to be concluded at the same time
- No detailed discussion of each proposal’s research plan and merits unless it is contentious

Running of Selection Meetings

- In most cases Carriage 1 will represent the views of Carriage 2 to the panel
- Cross-panel proposals will be considered in the ‘main’ panel, i.e. where Carriage 1 resides
- Additional reads from College members are possible if required
- RMS will re-rank ‘on the fly’ if additional reads are entered or disregarded (for example due to CoI)

Preparing Budgets

- Carriage 1 will lead the discussion. If the Proposal is recommended for funding, the Carriage 1 will recommend an overall budget amount for each funding year of the Proposal
- Both Carriages should discuss the recommended budget before the Selection Meeting
- The entire Panel may then discuss the budget recommendation
- Carriage 1 prepares a one-line budget (i.e. a total amount for each year recommended for funding, not a detailed item-by-item budget) for each highly-ranked Proposal

How to prepare a one-line budget

- Note the budget items that are supported and not supported as outlined in the Funding Rules
- Note whether budget items are well justified in the Proposal, and if any budget items appear inflated based on your knowledge of costs relevant to the discipline
- Note the minimum/maximum funding amounts as outlined in the scheme’s Funding Rules

RMS Meeting Application

- To assist with the meeting preparation, panel members will have access to the RMS Meeting Application approximately two weeks prior to the meeting
- The Meeting Application allows College members to:
  - view ranks, assessments and rejoinders for all Proposals in your panel (except those on which they have a conflict of interest), and
  - view details of all Proposals in their panel, including PDFs (except those on which they have a conflict of interest).

Meeting app—member view
Scores table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Normalised</th>
<th>Raw</th>
<th>FT Cand</th>
<th>ProQual</th>
<th>StratAlign</th>
<th>CollOut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>22/28</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>23/34</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting process

- The selection process is a process of deliberation
- Voting is a tool to assist in deliberation and decision-making
- Voting is anonymous—Members’ individual votes will not be declared to the panel and will not be recorded by the ARC
- All non-conflicted members, including the Chair, are eligible to vote on a proposal

Voting in RMS

Please submit your vote for proposal FT1ID#

Yes  No  Abstain

Feedback session

- Funding Rules
- Selection Process
- Quality of applications
- Quality of Detailed assessors
- RMS