



**Australian Government**  

---

**Australian Research Council**

# General Assessor Handbook

A guide for **General** Assessors on the selection and assessment under the **Linkage Program** grant opportunity for

Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities - LE25

Release date: 8 May 2024

## Contents

1. Overview .....	3
2. The assessment process .....	3
2.1 General Assessors .....	4
2.2 Scoring and ranking assessments .....	6
2.3 Important factors to consider when assessing .....	7
3. General Assessors: Selection Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting preparation .....	8
3.1 Roles and responsibilities before the SAC meeting .....	8
3.2 Roles and responsibilities at the SAC meeting and information on the Selection Meeting .....	10
4. Ensuring integrity of process .....	11
4.1 Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest (COI) .....	11
4.2 Research integrity and research misconduct .....	11
4.3 Applications outside the General Assessor's area of expertise .....	12
4.4 Eligibility.....	12
4.5 Unconscious bias .....	12
5. Contact details for queries during the assessment process .....	13
Appendix: Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities Scoring Matrix and assessment criteria considerations	13
Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities (LE25) .....	13

# 1. Overview

This Handbook provides instructions and advice for **General** Assessors on the assessment process for:

## 1. Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities (LE)

This scheme is a part of the Linkage Program of the Australian Research Council's (ARC) [National Competitive Grants Program \(NCGP\)](#).

The ARC's Linkage funding schemes aim to:

- encourage and extend cooperative approaches to research; and
- improve the use of research outcomes by strengthening links within the innovation system in Australia and internationally.

The Linkage funding schemes aim to encourage and extend cooperative approaches to research and improve the use of research outcomes by strengthening links within the innovation system in Australia and internationally. Schemes under the Program promote national and international research partnerships between researchers and business, industry, community organisations and other publicly funded research agencies.

Through these partnerships, the ARC encourages the transfer of skills, knowledge and ideas as a basis for securing commercial and other benefits of research.

The specific objectives and assessment criteria for the grant opportunity covered in the Handbook is listed in the Appendix, and is also available in the relevant Grant Guidelines on [GrantConnect](#).

## 2. The assessment process

Peer review is the method used to assess ARC applications and is undertaken by 2 groups of experts known as General and Detailed Assessors. Experts from each group assess applications against the relevant grant opportunity assessment criteria and contribute to the process of scoring and ranking research applications. Detailed Assessors comments should be useful for both General Assessors and applicants. Detailed Assessors' comments and scores are considered by General Assessors as part of their assessment of applications, while Detailed Assessors' comments are treated in applicants' rejoinders. The objective of the assessment process is to ensure that the highest quality research applications are recommended to the ARC Chief Executive Officer (CEO) for funding. The CEO then makes recommendations to the relevant Minister who decides which projects will be allocated funding under the NCGP. While changes to the ARC Act 2001 will mean changes to the decision making approvals, these changes have not yet come into operation and will not affect the assessment process for the LE25 application round.

The [Research Management System \(RMS\)](#) is the online system used for the preparation and submission of research applications, assessments and rejoinders for the ARC. The [RMS User Guide for Assessors](#), assists **General** and **Detailed** Assessors to navigate the RMS assignment and assessment process. This User Guide is available on the ARC [Assessor Resources](#) page. Here, assessors can also find additional information about the peer review process.


General and Detailed Assessors have different roles in the peer review process. Key aspects of the role of General Assessors are outlined in Section 2.1.

Assessor scores and comments are now available to successful and eligible unsuccessful applicants once grant outcomes are announced in RMS. General Assessors need to be aware that the scores released to applicants are those submitted by General Assessors prior to the RMS Meeting Application being finalised for the SAC meeting.

## Order of the assessment process

The following diagram provides an overview of the assessment process.

### Diagram 1: Overview of the General Assessor Assessment Process



## 2.1 General Assessors

### RMS profile

It is important that General Assessors ensure that their RMS profile is up-to-date and contains the following details:

1. **Expertise text:** Please outline your expertise briefly. The following format is suggested “My major area of research expertise is in a, b, c. I have additional research experience in q, r, s. I would also be able to assess in the areas of x, y, z. The research facilities, techniques and methodologies I use are l, m, n”.
2. **Field of Research (FoR-2020) Codes:** Please include between 6 and 10 FoR codes at the 6-digit level that reflect your key areas of expertise.
3. **Employment History:** Please ensure that your employment history is kept up to date, to enable your organisational conflicts of interests to be identified in RMS.
4. **Personal Details:** Please ensure your personal details are up to date, including conflicts of interest and personal material interest declarations.

This information will be used to match assessors with applications and should accurately represent your research expertise.

### The Selection Advisory Committee

The Selection Advisory Committee (SAC) is responsible for reviewing applications, Detailed Assessors’ assessments, and applicants’ rejoinders, and for final deliberations and recommendations to the ARC Chief Executive Officer.

For each grant opportunity, Executive Directors select General Assessors to form a SAC. SAC members have a crucial role in the peer review process. SACs may include members from the ARC College of Experts (CoE) and other eminent members of the wider academic community and/or key industry groups. SACs may also be divided into panels of different disciplines depending on the scheme under assessment. SAC members are chosen to provide a combination of relevant expertise and experience to support the objectives of the grant opportunity.

Following the deadline for submission of applications, ARC Executive Directors assign each application to General Assessors. The lead General Assessor (Carriage 1) is usually closely associated with the application’s academic field and other General Assessor(s) (Other Carriage) have supplementary expertise. Carriage 1 has primary responsibility for the application, which will include speaking to the application and its assessments and rejoinder at the SAC meeting. Other Carriages have a responsibility to assist Carriage 1 in resolving initial recommendations, often through discussions in advance of the SAC meeting, and adding their evaluation to Carriage 1’s during the SAC meeting.

**Note:** General Assessors are not required to agree on or align their scores for an application, but if the scores are disparate, they need to understand why their opinions differ to facilitate discussion at the SAC meeting.

In the LE scheme, Detailed Assessors are assigned by the ARC Executive Directors.

Executive Directors will assign assessors to achieve a gender-balanced, organisation balanced and discipline appropriate evaluation of the application.

After the Executive Directors have completed assigning the required number of assessors in RMS and following the ARC's announcement of assignments, the Carriages may notice that some applications appear to need more assignments. This is due to the previously assigned assessors rejecting the assessment or not responding, but no action is required from the Carriages. The monitoring of assignments, acceptance, rejection and submission is managed by ARC staff. If the assigned Detailed Assessors and reserves become unavailable, an ARC Executive Director will assign additional Detailed Assessors.

### **Cross-panel applications**

Cross-panel applications are applications with General Assessors on more than one panel assessing the application due to the cross-disciplinary nature of the application. Cross-panel applications undergo the same assignment and assessment process as all other applications. Cross-panel applications are assessed in the Selection Advisory Meeting where the Carriage 1 is assigned.

The LE scheme has just one multi-disciplinary panel, there are no cross-panel applications.

### **General assessment process**

All General Assessors must declare any conflicts of interest (COI) and reject the assignment as soon as possible if a COI exists. This will assist the ARC with the timely re-assignment of applications (see [Section 4.1](#) for further information). If a General Assessor is unsure of whether a COI exists, they must seek advice from the ARC before proceeding with accepting an assignment by emailing [ARC-College@arc.gov.au](mailto:ARC-College@arc.gov.au) as soon as possible.

When assessing applications General Assessors must rely solely on the information provided within the application including referenced publications and preprints and should not seek additional information from any sources. This includes following any hyperlinks that may have been provided in the application. The inclusion of webpage addresses/URLs and hyperlinks is only permitted under certain circumstances such as publications (including preprints) that are only available online and Letters of Support. Webpage addresses/URLs and hyperlinks should not be used to circumvent page limits, nor should they provide information that is not contained in the application. All information relevant to the application must be contained within the application.

### **Saving preliminary assessments**

Following the assignment process, General Assessors independently read and assess all of their assigned applications against the relevant assessment criteria, based on an [A to E Scoring Matrix](#) (although the matrix provides guidance on the expected averages across the entire set of applications, each application must be marked on its own merits). These preliminary assessment scores should be saved as drafts in RMS (**but not submitted**). General Assessors enter scores into RMS; they do not enter text.

In the rejoinder process, applicants receive anonymised Detailed Assessors' comments only without the commensurate scores. The applicant then has an opportunity to provide a rejoinder to address any issues raised by the Detailed Assessors.

After the rejoinder process has closed, General Assessors review the Detailed Assessors' comments and scores and the applicants' rejoinder text. Detailed assessments and rejoinders will inform General Assessors' scores and at this point General Assessors can review and if necessary, revise and save their preliminary scores. General Assessors then ensure that their draft scores are entered in RMS (**but not submitted**) before the preliminary assessment due date determined by the ARC, enabling their co-Carriages to view the scores and to facilitate discussion and ensure that all co-Carriages have an opportunity to understand the reasoning behind any differences in Carriage scores.

**Note:** If a General Assessor is provided with an extension to enter their preliminary scores due to exceptional circumstances, the ARC will facilitate alternative arrangements for co-Carriages to discuss and address discrepancies.

## Revising and submitting final assessments

For applications that have a difference in scores between the General Assessors, Carriage 1 is responsible for contacting the other Carriage(s) to discuss their scores. General Assessors are not required to agree on or align their scores for an application, but if the scores are disparate, they need to understand why their opinions differ to facilitate discussion at the SAC meeting. Following this discussion, final scores and ranks should be **submitted in RMS** by the required final due date.

When all final scores are submitted, RMS produces a ranked list of all applications (see [Section 2.2](#) for further information). This list is used at the SAC meeting to assist with the identification of applications that are of sufficient quality to be fundable. The ranking of applications on this list is not final and the meeting process provides several opportunities for the SAC to discuss and review all applications, as outlined below.

## Inappropriate assessments

If General Assessors are concerned about the appropriateness of any assessment text or comments that do not match scores from Detailed Assessors, or identify a potential COI or potential breach of confidentiality, including but not limited to, the use of generative Artificial Intelligence technology<sup>1</sup>, then they **must** contact the ARC by sending an email to [ARC-College@arc.gov.au](mailto:ARC-College@arc.gov.au) as soon as possible. The ARC will investigate the concerns and decide whether an assessment should be amended by the Detailed Assessor or removed from the process. The latter happens only in rare circumstances and requires ARC Senior Executive approval.

If inappropriate assessments are identified early in the assessment process by the ARC or the applicant during the rejoinder stage, the ARC may ask the assessor to amend their assessment of the application or consider removal of an assessment as above.

## 2.2 Scoring and ranking assessments

### Scoring

When applying the Scoring Matrix, General Assessors should have regard for the specific grant opportunity objectives (see Appendix) and assessment criteria for the Scheme.

Scoring applications against assessment criteria can be a difficult exercise when Assessors might only look at a small sub-set of applications. Bands within the Scoring Matrix ideally represent a distribution across all applications submitted to a grant opportunity.

Only the very best applications should be recommended. As a guide, approximately 10% should fall into the top scoring band ('A'). These would have been assessed as near flawless applications across all assessment criteria.

A Scoring Matrix for the scores A to E is provided in **Table 1** below and should guide scoring by both Detailed and General Assessors.

**Table 1: Example Scoring Matrix**

Score	Criteria	Recommendation
<b>A</b>	<b>Outstanding:</b> Of the highest quality and at the forefront of research in the field. Approximately 10% of applications should receive scores in this band.	<b>Recommended unconditionally</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Excellent:</b> Of high quality and strongly competitive. Approximately 15% of applications should receive scores in this band.	<b>Strongly support recommendation of funding</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Very Good:</b> Interesting, sound and compelling. Approximately 20% of applications should receive scores in this band.	<b>Support recommendation of funding with reservation</b>

<sup>1</sup> [Policy on Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in the ARCs grants programs 2023.pdf](#)

Score	Criteria	Recommendation
D	<b>Good:</b> Sound but lacks a compelling element. Approximately 35% of applications are likely to fall into this band.	<b>Unsupportive of recommendation for funding</b>
E	<b>Uncompetitive:</b> Uncompetitive and has significant weaknesses. Approximately 20% of applications are likely to fall into this band.	<b>Not recommended for funding</b>

**NOTE:** This Scoring Matrix is an example only. Please see Appendix for the Scoring Matrix applicable to each individual grant opportunity.

## Ranking

Each application must have a unique rank. Although RMS will use the **overall application scores** to automatically rank an Assessor's assessments as these are completed in RMS, if multiple applications have the same **overall application scores** these applications will be flagged and an Assessor must assign a unique rank to differentiate equally scored applications. Differentiation should be based on how you compare the applications in relation to the Scoring Matrix.

**Note:** RMS will use your scores to automatically rank applications, and then use your rank order to differentiate equally scored applications.

Assessments should be submitted when all applications have been assigned 1) a score and 2) a unique ranking.

## 2.3 Important factors to consider when assessing

### Objectives and assessment criteria

Each grant opportunity has specific objectives and assessment criteria. Assessors must have regard to both the objectives and the assessment criteria as outlined in the relevant Grant Guidelines and the Appendix of this document.

To reduce duplication, the Application Form for Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities has been streamlined. When a question from the assessment criteria is covered in multiple sections of the application form, it has been removed as a separate heading in the Project Description question. Sections of the forms may also have been moved. For example, the 'Participant Details' assessment criteria is now in Part B, with some questions removed.

### National Interest Test (NIT)

Applicants must provide a separate response on the national interest of their research proposal, which is provided with other elements of an application recommended for funding for final consideration by the Minister.

The NIT statement provided by the researcher is part of their application, will be certified by the DVCR and will be available to all assessors. It should be considered as part of the assessment of the application. The National Interest Test is to be used with the rest of the information in the application to inform an assessor's assessment of the Assessment Criteria as included in the Appendix.

The ARC will accept the DVCR's certification as final and will not review or make requests for changes to a NIT. The ARC will include the NIT with the other elements of an application recommended for funding for final consideration by the Minister. Additional information regarding the National Interest Test is available on the [ARC Website](#).

### Research Opportunity and Performance Evidence (ROPE)

LE25 applications do not contain questions relating to Research Opportunity and Performance Evidence (ROPE).

### Interdisciplinary research

The ARC recognises the value of interdisciplinary research and the ARC's commitment to supporting interdisciplinary research is outlined in the [ARC Statement of Support for Interdisciplinary Research](#).

Interdisciplinary research can be a distinct mode of research, or a combination of researchers, knowledge and/or approaches from disparate disciplines. Under the NCGP, examples of interdisciplinary research may include researchers from different disciplines working together in a team; researchers collaborating to bring different perspectives to solve a problem; researchers utilising methods normally associated with one or more disciplines to solve problems in another discipline; and one or more researchers translating innovative blue sky or applied research outcomes from one discipline into an entirely different research discipline.

Assessors are required to assess all research on a fair and equal basis, including applications and outputs involving interdisciplinary and collaborative research. To assist with this, the ARC facilitates consideration of applications by relevant General Assessors with interdisciplinary expertise or where not feasible, applications are allocated to General Assessors who have broad disciplinary expertise regardless of discipline grouping. Interdisciplinary applications should be allocated to Detailed Assessors with specific interdisciplinary expertise or to Detailed Assessors from the different disciplines covered in the application.

### **Preprints or comparable resources**

General Assessors should consider the merit of publications including preprints and comparable resources that are listed in the application. Assessors may access hyperlinks and evaluate if a citation included in the application is a crucial part of the research discourse, and evaluate the suitability, quality and relevance of the research output to help them determine the quality and novelty of the proposed research. However, assessors should not use online search engines to identify or evaluate applicants' publications that are not included within the application.

Preprints or comparable resources can be included in any part of an application. This includes within the Research Outputs list and the body of an application. An application will not be deemed to be ineligible for the citing and listing of preprints or comparable resources.

A preprint or comparable resource is a scholarly output that is uploaded by the authors to a recognised publicly accessible archive, repository, or preprint service (such as, but not limited to, arXiv, bioRxiv, medRxiv, ChemRxiv, Peer J Preprints, Zenodo, GitHub, PsyArXiv and publicly available university of government repositories etc.). This will include a range of materials that have been subjected to varying degrees of peer review from none to light and full review. Ideally, a preprint or comparable resource should have a unique identifier or a DOI (digital object identifier). Any citation of a preprint or comparable resource should be explicitly identified as such and listed in the references with a DOI, URL or equivalent, version number and/or date of access, as applicable.

Inclusion of preprints or comparable resources within the body of the application should comply with standard disciplinary practices for the relevant field.

## **3. General Assessors: Selection Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting preparation**

### **3.1 Roles and responsibilities before the SAC meeting**

After the assessment period has closed General Assessors will:

1. be unable to access applications for a short period whilst ARC staff undertake administrative functions to prepare for the SAC meeting.
2. be advised by the ARC when the RMS Meeting Application (App) opens.
3. have access to all applications allocated to their panel in the RMS Meeting App where they do not have a COI.
4. be required to attend a pre-meeting videoconference to be updated on the SAC meeting processes.

### **Carriage 1: Reviewing applications in the RMS Meeting Application**

The RMS meeting application will contain a ranked list of applications. Prior to the SAC meeting, Carriage 1 should review the Detailed and General Assessors' assessments and scores, and the applicant's rejoinder, and consider whether they believe there are any applications that have received an inappropriate ranking.



Particular attention should be given to applications where an application has received less than the desired number of detailed assessments, or where an anomalous Detailed assessment may materially affect the ranking of the application. Carriage 1 should identify such applications by emailing [ARC-College@arc.gov.au](mailto:ARC-College@arc.gov.au) and prepare a recommendation for consideration by the SAC.

ARC staff will also identify applications with 'disparate' scores and will flag these for the attention of SAC members, noting that these applications are not automatically discussed at the selection meeting. SAC members can request these (or any other) applications to be tagged for discussion at the meeting. Carriage 1 will be expected to lead discussion on these applications.

It is recommended that SAC members read the summary of all highly-ranked applications and those tagged in RMS as 'To Discuss by SAC' (accessible through the RMS Meeting App) as they are expected to contribute to discussions for all applications during the meeting.

### **Carriage 1: Preparing a draft budget recommendation**

For highly-ranked applications or applications tagged for discussion in RMS as 'To Discuss by SAC', it is Carriage 1's responsibility to recommend a draft one-line budget amount for each funding year of the application to the SAC. The draft budget recommendation is entered directly into RMS (details are in the section below) prior to the SAC meeting.

The draft budget recommended for each year must not exceed the amount requested in the application. Budget recommendations are discussed by the SAC members and the recommended budget is forwarded to the ARC CEO as part of the SAC's funding recommendations.

Carriage 1 may need to discuss or justify their budget recommendation at the SAC meeting and should therefore bring their own notes to the meeting on how they arrived at their final recommended funding amount.

To prepare a one-line budget for each year of funding, Carriage 1 should consider the following:

1. The extent to which specific budget items are well-justified
2. Whether the budget items are supported or not supported as outlined in the Grant Guidelines for the relevant grant opportunity
3. The minimum/maximum funding amounts relevant to the specific grant opportunity's Grant Guidelines
4. The costs of any recommended remunerated participants
5. Whether they are satisfied that the project can still be completed with the recommended budget
6. Whether the budget for the application has been considered on merit and at this stage not compared to other applications

### **Carriage 1: Entering draft budgets in RMS Meeting Application before the Selection Meeting**

Following the ARC email confirming that RMS Meeting Application is opened, Carriage 1 can enter the draft budgets directly in RMS.

1. Prepare draft budgets for your Carriage 1 applications that are highly-ranked or tagged as 'To Discuss by SAC'.
2. Prepare a draft budget figure (\$) for each year of funding of your Carriage 1 applications.
3. In RMS, open specific scheme Meeting Application, e.g., DE22.



4. Under 'Carriage' select and filter the Carriage 1 applications and select 'Apply'.

Application Id

Grant Status

Awards

Discipline Groups

Carriage

5. Click on the application to enter the draft budget

a) Enter the draft budget total for each year, then select 'Save Draft'.

**Draft Budget**

Save Draft

**Editing Instructions:**  
Please enter your draft budget in the Funded field in the Total line (the top line of the budget) for each applicable year. Only enter in whole dollars to total field per year. Note: A red box will appear if you enter more than the requested amount. A blue box will appear if you enter less than the minimum amount of funding required.

Supported \$0 / \$359,997 (0%) Requested

Description	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
	Requested	Funded	Requested	Funded	Requested	Funded	Requested	Funded	Requested	Funded
Total	\$118,306	\$0	\$117,846	\$0	\$123,845	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Personnel	\$96,681	\$0	\$98,581	\$0	\$100,510	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Note:**

**Draft Budget**

Save Draft

**Editing Instructions:**  
Please enter your draft budget in the Funded field in the Total line (the top line of the budget) for each applicable year. Only enter in whole dollars to total field per year. Note: A red box will appear if you enter more than the requested amount. A blue box will appear if you enter less than the minimum amount of funding required.

Supported \$274,000 / \$359,997 (76%) Requested

A red box indicates you have entered more than the requested amount, you will need to reduce your draft total for this year.

Pink highlighting indicates unsaved changes.

Description	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
	Requested	Funded	Requested	Funded	Requested	Funded
Total	\$118,306	\$100,000	\$117,846	\$125,000	\$123,845	\$0
Unspecified Funding	\$0	\$100,000	\$0	\$125,000	\$0	\$0

### 3.2 Roles and responsibilities at the SAC meeting and information on the Selection Meeting

Each SAC meeting will comprise a Chair, Deputy Chair, SAC members (Carriage 1, Other Carriages and panel members) and ARC Staff. SAC meetings may also be divided into discipline panels, depending on the grant opportunity.

The role of the Chair is to:

1. lead the committee through the process to make a recommendation on the applications
2. call the panel to a vote for applications or where there is dissent and
3. ensure the meeting runs in a timely manner.

For applications where the Chair is conflicted and out of the room or is Carriage on an application, the Deputy Chair will act in the role. Where multiple conflicts arise, other SAC members may be called on to be acting Chair.

When you are Carriage 1 on an application, your role is to:

1. lead discussion for that application giving a brief summary of the strengths and weaknesses, and then making a recommendation to support, not support or vote
2. vote on applications when called by the Chair

3. recommend a one-line budget for applications that are recommended for funding (the draft budget should already be entered in RMS).

All other Carriages and panel members will:

1. contribute to discussions of whether an application should be supported, not supported or voted on
2. vote on applications when called to do so by the Chair

ARC staff are responsible for:

1. providing secretariat support for meetings
2. providing procedural advice to the SAC
3. ensuring that correct administrative procedures are followed
4. ensuring COIs and any potential inappropriate discussions are managed correctly

## 4. Ensuring integrity of process

### 4.1 Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest (COI)

The [ARC Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Policy](#) is designed to ensure that all COIs are managed in a rigorous and transparent way. It aims to prevent individuals from influencing decisions unfairly and to maintain public confidence in the integrity, legitimacy, impartiality and fairness of the peer review process.

Any individual who is reviewing material for the ARC must agree to comply with the confidentiality and COI statement and must clearly disclose any material personal interests that may affect, or might be perceived to affect, their ability to perform their role.

All Assessors must maintain an up-to-date RMS profile, including personal details, current employment details and previous employment history within the past 2 years. This information will assist the ARC with the identification and management of organisational conflicts of interest.

Assessors reviewing ARC grant application who have identified a conflict of interest must reject the grant application assigned in RMS to assist the ARC in the management of conflicts of interest.

Examples of material personal interests that are considered by the ARC to be COIs include holding funding with a named participant within the past 2 years or having been a collaborator or co-author with a named participant on a research output within the last 4 years. For more information on disclosure of COIs, including material personal interest declarations, please refer to the [Identifying and Handling a Conflict of Interest in NCGP processes](#) document.

**Note:** In RMS, Assessors will be asked to indicate their willingness to comply with this policy before proceeding to assess. They can do this by selecting the 'Accept' button.

### Extract from the ARC [Policy on Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in the ARC's grants programs](#) (July 2023):

The [ARC Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Policy \(2020\)](#) requires that all officials and individuals carrying out ARC business, including assessors and peer reviewers, are required to preserve the principles of confidentiality outlined in the policy. **Release of material into generative AI tools constitutes a breach of confidentiality and peer reviewers, including all Detailed and General Assessors, must not use generative AI as part of their assessment activities.**

Assessors are asked to provide detailed high quality, constructive assessments that assist the Selection Advisory Committees to assess the merits of an application. The use of generative AI may compromise the integrity of the ARC's peer review process by, for example, producing text that contains inappropriate content, such as generic comments and restatements of the application.

### 4.2 Research integrity and research misconduct

If in the course of undertaking an assessment you identify or suspect a potential research integrity breach or research misconduct, please notify the ARC Research Integrity Office ([researchintegrity@arc.gov.au](mailto:researchintegrity@arc.gov.au)) in

accordance with Section 5 of the [ARC Research Integrity Policy](#). Please do not mention your concerns in any assessment comments.

The ARC Research Integrity Office will consider whether to refer your concerns to the relevant institution for investigation in accordance with the requirements of the [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research \(2018\)](#). You should provide sufficient information to allow the ARC to assess whether there is a basis for referring the matter to the institution and to enable the relevant institution to progress an investigation into the allegation (if required).

Foreign financial support, foreign affiliations and foreign honorary positions. Participants applying for ARC grants are required to answer questions in their application relating to foreign financial support and foreign affiliations, including current and previous associations. Participants are required to declare:

- foreign financial support (cash or in kind) for research related activities
- current or past associations or affiliations with a foreign sponsored talent program (for the last 10 years)
- current associations or affiliations with a foreign government, foreign political party, foreign state-owned enterprise, foreign military and/or foreign police organisations

If in the course of undertaking an assessment you identify or suspect a potential issue of foreign interference, please send an email highlighting your concerns to the ARC via [ARC-College@arc.gov.au](mailto:ARC-College@arc.gov.au) as soon as possible.

**Note:** In RMS, Assessors will be asked to indicate their willingness to comply with this policy before proceeding to assess. They can do this by selecting the 'Accept' button.

### 4.3 Applications outside the General Assessor's area of expertise

The ARC receives applications from many scholarly fields. Occasionally you will be asked to assess an application that does not appear to correspond closely with your area of expertise. As a General Assessor, your views are valuable as they are being sought on the entire application, drawing on your expert knowledge as a researcher. If you are concerned about a particular application's research area and your ability to provide a robust assessment, **please contact the ARC via [ARC-College@arc.gov.au](mailto:ARC-College@arc.gov.au) before rejecting the assignment.**

### 4.4 Eligibility

If, while assessing an application, you have concerns about eligibility, ethics or other issues associated with an application, **you must not include this information in your assessment.** Please send an email highlighting your concerns to **the relevant scheme team via [ARC-College@arc.gov.au](mailto:ARC-College@arc.gov.au)** as soon as possible. The ARC is responsible for investigating and making decisions on these matters, and Assessors should not conduct investigations at any point. Please complete your assessment based on the merits of the application **without** giving consideration to the potential eligibility issue.

RMS has functionality to populate research outputs into applications from within a researcher's RMS profile. Researchers will have the flexibility to choose and add which outputs to include in the application. The ARC is aware of some research output display errors that are system issues and cannot be corrected by RMS users. Any applications that are affected will not be deemed to breach eligibility requirements and Assessors should disregard research output display errors in their assessment of applications. Examples of possible research output display errors include symbols, foreign language characters and subscript/superscript that does not render correctly.

### 4.5 Unconscious bias

General Assessors should also be aware of how their unconscious bias could affect the peer review process.

Unconscious biases are pervasive and may relate to perceptions about a range of attributes including:

1. gender and/or sexuality
2. social/cultural background
3. career path
4. institutional employer

## 5. discipline

The ARC encourages Assessors to recognise their own biases and be aware of them in their assessments. A selection of short, online tests for identifying unconscious biases is available via Harvard University's ['Implicit Social Attitudes' demonstration sites](#).

## 5. Contact details for queries during the assessment process

For all assignment and assessment, as well as accessibility enquiries, please email [ARC-College@arc.gov.au](mailto:ARC-College@arc.gov.au)

For all questions relating to the SAC and SAC meetings, contact [ARC-College@arc.gov.au](mailto:ARC-College@arc.gov.au).

## Appendix: Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities Scoring Matrix and assessment criteria considerations

**Please note:** Assessors assign a score and do not have to consider the weighting of a criterion as this is applied automatically within RMS. The tables below provide ready access to assessment criteria set out in the *Linkage Program Grant Guidelines (2024 edition): Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities* (available on [GrantConnect](#)) and the Scoring Matrixes outlined in this handbook. Assessors should use their judgement and experience to assess the appropriate score within the context of the relevant discipline.

### Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities (LE25)

#### Key Dates and Notes

Task	LE25 Dates	Detail
<b>Assessment Period</b>	8 May 2024 – 5 August 2024	<b>Carriages 1, 2, 3</b> Assess applications independently to determine preliminary and provisional scores and ranking.
<b>Rejoinder</b>	28 June 2024 – 11 July 2024	Applicants to read comments from Detailed Assessors and submit a rejoinder.
<b>Review and finalise assessments</b>	12 July 2024 – 5 August 2024	<b>Carriages 1, 2, 3</b> Review Detailed assessments and rejoinders. Revise and finalise scores and ranks in RMS. All carriages need to provide their feedback to each application.
<b>SAC Selection Meeting</b>	29 August 2024 – 30 August 2024	SAC members discuss shortlist and recommend applications

#### Grant Guidelines

The objectives and assessment criteria below are from the *Linkage Program Grant Guidelines (2024 edition): Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities* which are available on [GrantConnect](#).

#### Overview

The LIEF scheme is an integral part of the ARC's Linkage Program which promotes national and international collaboration and research partnerships between key stakeholders in research and innovation, including higher education providers, government, business, industry and end users. Through these partnerships, the ARC encourages the transfer of skills, knowledge and ideas as a basis for securing commercial and other benefits of research.

#### Objectives

The LIEF scheme objectives are to:

- support excellent pure basic, strategic basic and applied research and research training, across all disciplines excluding clinical and other medical research, through the acquisition (purchase, upgrade, construction, transportation, installation, and/or maintenance) of research equipment and infrastructure and access to national and international research facilities; and

- b) encourage Eligible Organisations to develop collaborative arrangements with other Eligible Organisations and/or Partner Organisations for the acquisition and use of research equipment and infrastructure or access to national and international facilities.
- c) enhance the scale and focus of research in areas of existing and/or emerging research strength; and
- d) expand the availability of research infrastructure for the broader research community.

### Scoring Matrix – LIEF

Assessment criterion	(A) <b>Outstanding</b> Of the highest quality and at the forefront of research in the field.  Approximately 10% of Applications should receive scores in this band.	(B) <b>Excellent</b> Of high quality and strongly competitive.  Approximately 15% of Applications should receive scores in this band.	(C) <b>Very Good</b> Interesting, sound and compelling.  Approximately 20% of Applications should receive scores in this band.	(D) <b>Good</b> Sound, but lacks a compelling element.  Approximately 35% of Applications are likely to fall into this band.	(E) <b>Uncompetitive</b> Has significant weaknesses.  Approximately 20% of Applications are likely to fall into this band.

## Assessment criteria - LIEF

Assessment criteria and weightings	Assessment criteria details
Project Quality and Innovation 30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– significance of the research that will be supported by the proposed research infrastructure;</li> <li>– capacity to enhance the scale and focus of research in areas of existing and/or emerging research strength;</li> <li>– effectiveness of collaborative arrangements for the management and sharing of the proposed research infrastructure or access to national or international facilities; and</li> <li>– extent to which the project represents value for money, including consideration of the relationship to similar research infrastructure at organisational, regional, national and/or international level.</li> </ul> <p><u>If the project involves Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander research infrastructure, additional criteria include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 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;</li> <li>– the project’s strategy and mechanisms for Indigenous research capacity building within the project; the project’s level of internal leadership of Indigenous research;</li> <li>– the project’s adherence to the <a href="#">Australian Indigenous Data Sovereignty Principles</a>; and</li> <li>– the project’s understanding of, and proposed strategies to adhere to, the <a href="#">AIATSIS Code of Ethics for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research</a> and NHMRC’s guidelines on <a href="#">Ethical conduct in research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples and communities</a>.</li> </ul>
Strategic Alignment 20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– relevance and necessity of the proposed research infrastructure to the research program and/or research projects of the named participants on the application;</li> <li>– relevance of the proposed research infrastructure to the strategic priorities of the participating organisations; and</li> <li>– extent to which the project aligns with Australian Government priority areas.</li> </ul>
Feasibility 25%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– demonstrated capability of Investigator(s) to manage the purchase, design, manufacture, installation, maintenance and coordination of access to the proposed research infrastructure.</li> <li>– viability of the plan to use the research infrastructure and arrangements for ongoing operational expenditure where applicable; and</li> <li>– evidence of commitment to collaboration by each participating organisation on the project.</li> </ul>
Benefit 25%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– level of demand and likely measurable impact of the proposed research infrastructure, including beyond the project activity period;</li> <li>– importance of equipment for the training of research students;</li> </ul>

Assessment criteria and weightings	Assessment criteria details
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– benefit of the proposed research infrastructure to the broader research community, including proposed arrangements for broader access; and</li><li>– potential to contribute to economic, commercial, environmental, social and/or cultural benefits for Australia.</li></ul>