

## EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND TRAINING

### SENATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE - QUESTIONS ON NOTICE 2006-2007 BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING

**Outcome:** CSIRO  
**Output Group:** CSIRO

#### DEST Question No. E468\_07

Senator Wong provided in writing.

#### Question:

31 May 2006, EWRE, p.13:

**Senator WONG**—*Without trying to put too fine a point on it, we have your office with annual costs of over \$1 million, with various components of that remuneration being housing, travel et cetera. Do you think the public and the organisation are getting value for money?*

**Dr Garrett**—*I think it must come back to what we are delivering. Looking at what this organisation is achieving, we have had 12 independent external reviews of our divisions in the last two years—independent international panels looking at the quality of our science and the impact of what we deliver—and we are shortly to release a flagship performance review, a copy of which we will obviously make sure you get at a very early stage. We want to be judged by the outputs of that programme.*

What were the terms of reference?

#### Answer:

*CSIRO has provided the following response.*

#### *Divisional Reviews*

The following are the generic Terms of Reference for the Science Assessment Reviews.

The Expert Review Committee will assess and make recommendations to improve:

- The quality of the Division's capabilities and their underpinning scientific skills and disciplines and the associated outputs (publications, patents, reports, technology transferred to users, etc.). Quality should be judged in terms of the scientific and/or technical excellence; and the distinction of the research leaders as indicated by measures of esteem conferred by the scientific community.
- The relevance of the capabilities to the Division's themes and to achieving the proposed outcomes, i.e. are the theme outcomes feasible given the science base?
- The extent to which the Division's capabilities are distinctive on the Australian scene and their relative standing with respect to leading international groups and whether the resulting scientific outputs are nationally or internationally important.
- The strength and effectiveness of the Division's collaborations and cooperation with other CSIRO Divisions and external research groups.
- The identification of future or emerging capabilities that are believed to be necessary to achieve the Division's aspirations and the feasibility of the strategies proposed to acquire or develop these capabilities. The Review Committee should specifically

comment upon the Division's Emerging Science Plan and particularly the "frontier science" identified as being relevant to the Division's activities.

- The effectiveness of the Division's policies and programs to develop researchers, including the extent of the Division's involvement in the supervision of postgraduate students, the training and skill development of postdoctoral researchers and the research training outcomes achieved, eg what are the destination of postgraduate students and post docs trained by the Division.
- The Division's internal project management processes in maintaining quality and relevance in the scientific outputs of the Division and the extent to which these processes meet the standards set by the ANAO best practice manual, *Management of Scientific Research and Development Projects in Commonwealth Agencies*.