## R eview of R esearch Support

The Grants Committee spent much of its time in the early part of this year considering the responses to its consultation on the scope of research support, and preparing a full report.

As a result of the changes that have taken place following the establishment of the AHRB, the A cademy's role can now be seen more distinctly as complementing the funding available nationally through the AHRB for the humanities, and the ESR C for the social sciences Given the new arrangements (which came into full effect in A pril 1999), it was decided that it would be timely to seek the views of the academic community on how the A cademy should organise its support so as to maximise the benefits to scholars.

Under the aegis of the Grants Committee, a detailed consultation paper was prepared, setting out the current scope and purposes of the small grants and conference schemes, and inviting comment on any modifications that should be made. A series of questions was devised, seeking views on what were the needs and wishes of the academic body.
During the autumn of 1999, 109 subject associations were consulted. Separately, a cohort of 240 previous aw ard holders were surveyed. By the deadline of 31 January 2000, 54 subject associations had submitted replies, and 165 award holders, representing an overall response rate of more than 60\%.

In M arch 2000, the A cademy's G rants C ommittee considered the results. Its principal conclusions were that there was ample evidence to show that the small grants scheme was perceived as meeting a real need, and its scope and purposes were generally on the right lines. A few modifications were required, principal amongst which was the clear preference that research funds should be reserved for primary research, with publicationrelated costs coming second by some distance. T he Academy has therefore decided to adjust its regulations so that publication costs can no longer be covered by research funds. There was little support for the suggestion that small grants might be used to finance short periods of teaching relief, given that other resources already existed to fund this element (AHRB, ESR C, and HEls all have
responsibility for funding research leave), and that there were already severe pressures on scarce funds available for the direct costs of research. The Academy has concluded that this option should not be pursued.

0 pinion had been sought through the consultation exercise on whether the level of small grants should be raised, and comments invited on whether there were particular types of activity that were not adequately accommodated under the present arrangements for research support nationally. The respondents were overwhelmingly in favour of maintaining the $£ 5,000$ ceiling for small grants, and emphatically endorsed the policy of distributing awards to as many individual scholars as possible. H owever, there was also a body of opinion that was strongly in favour of allowing support up to the $£ 20,000$ mark, particularly for pilot/field studies that were unlikely to attract funding elsewhere. Separately, representations from the archæeological community had been made directly to the A cademy's Council putting the case for the urgent need for additional support for fieldwork projects, the fundamental research base of the discipline.

Accepting the case that there was a gap in the current provision of funding nationally, which needed to be remedied, the Academy decided to introduce a new scheme for Larger Research Grants, to support pilot projects, field studies, and, to a limited degree, extensions to existing research activity. The upper limit will bef 20,000 and grants may be held for three years. The first competition will be held in 2000-01, and the Academy has allocated a budget of $£ 500,000$ for the first year. $N$ ew money has been forthcoming from the DfEE for the purpose. The Academy will review the scheme after its first year, and consider whether additional funds can be devoted to this programme.
It was evident from the responses received that the A cademy's support for individual research activity was seen as a vital contribution to the pattern of research activity nationwide. Typical comments that summarised the general opinion amongt those surveyed were that 'S mall grants are important out of all proportion to their size in fostering original research'; and 'The British A cademy's small grants scheme is vital, and complementary to the larger and more collaborative ESRC/AHRB schemes'.

Copies of the Report on the review of research support may be requested from the Academy (email e.ollard@britac.ac.uk), or it may be viewed on the Academy's web site at www.britac.ac.uk.

## Statistics on Aw ards, 1996-2000

The following statistics, taken from the R eport, relate to awards made by the British A cademy, for small research grants (up to $£ 5,000$ ) during the four year period 1996-2000. T he figures for each year relate to the financial year, which runs from 1 A pril to 31 M arch. W here success rates are quoted, they have been calculated as a percentage of awards made against applications received, within each category.

Aw ards by subject area


Profile of aw ard holders

|  | 1996-97 | 1997-98 | 1998-99 | 1999-2000 | 1996-2000 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Awards | Awards | Awards | Awards | Awards | \% of awards | \% success |
| Male | 174 | 164 | 217 | 320 | 875 | 67.8 | 65.6 |
| Female | 72 | 81 | 101 | 161 | 415 | 32.2 | 69.5 |
| Totals | 246 | 245 | 318 | 481 | 1290 |  | 66.8 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| under 30 | 13 | 15 | 13 | 24 | 65 | 5.0 | 64.4 |
| 30-40 | 74 | 72 | 105 | 157 | 408 | 31.6 | 67.5 |
| 41-50 | 56 | 71 | 78 | 104 | 309 | 24.0 | 64.0 |
| over 50 | 91 | 86 | 107 | 187 | 471 | 36.5 | 68.6 |
| unknown | 12 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 37 | 2.9 | 66.1 |
| Totals | 246 | 245 | 318 | 481 | 1290 |  | 66.8 |
| Institution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oxford | 12 | 13 | 13 | 37 | 75 | 5.8 | 81.5 |
| Cambridge | 10 | 17 | 3 | 24 | 54 | 4.2 | 80.6 |
| London | 33 | 26 | 47 | 63 | 169 | 13.1 | 71.9 |
| Sub-total triangle | 55 | 56 | 63 | 124 | 298 |  | 75.6 |
| Old universities (exc triangle) | ) 138 | 138 | 184 | 270 | 730 | 56.6 | 69.1 |
| New universities | 21 | 18 | 31 | 36 | 106 | 8.2 | 51.2 |
| Colleges of HE | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 0.7 | 50.0 |
| Museums/Galleries | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0.4 | 83.3 |
| Independent | 30 | 30 | 36 | 46 | 142 | 11.0 | 56.8 |
| Totals | 246 | 245 | 318 | 481 | 1290 |  | 66.8 |
| National base (universities) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 184 | 168 | 224 | 350 | 926 | 71.8 | 68.6 |
| Scotland | 22 | 24 | 38 | 51 | 135 | 10.5 | 69.6 |
| Wales | 9 | 15 | 10 | 25 | 59 | 4.6 | 64.1 |
| Northern Ireland | 1 | 6 | 11 | 8 | 26 | 2.0 | 60.5 |
| Unaffiliated | 30 | 32 | 35 | 47 | 114 | 11.2 | 56.9 |
| Totals | 246 | 245 | 318 | 481 | 1290 |  | 66.8 |

## Aw ards by discipline

|  | 1996-97 | 1997-98 | 1998-99 | 1999-2000 | 1996-2000 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Awards by number | Awards | Awards | Awards | Awards | Awards | \% of awards | \% success |
| Humanities | 192 | 191 | 259 | 362 | 1004 | 77.8 | 66.5 |
| Social Science | 54 | 54 | 59 | 119 | 286 | 22.2 | 67.8 |
| Totals | $\mathbf{2 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 9 0}$ |  | $\mathbf{6 6 . 8}$ |


|  | $1996-97$ | $1997-98$ | $1998-99$ | $1999-2000$ | $1996-2000$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Awards by value | Awards | Awards | Awards | Awards | Awards | \% of awards | \% success |
| Humanities | $£ 417,155$ | $£ 410,944$ | $£ 621,330$ | $£ 1,025,585$ | $£ 2,475,014$ | 73.8 | 63.0 |
| Social Science | $£ 136,210$ | $£ 138,972$ | $£ 172,299$ | $£ 431,412$ | $£ 878,893$ | 26.2 | 61.0 |
| Totals | $\mathbf{£ 5 5 3 , 3 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{£ 5 4 9 , 9 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{£ 7 9 3 , 6 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{£ 1 , 4 5 6 , 9 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{£ 3 , 3 5 3 , 9 0 7}$ |  | $\mathbf{6 2 . 4}$ |

