Scientific research grants

Reviewing the Grants
Each of the criteria below should be taken into consideration when reviewing applications and used to form your overall band. Upon completing the review, please add up your total score and assign an overall band for the application, where Very Good = 23-19; Good = 18-14; Average = 13-9; Poor = 8-4; Very Poor = 3-0.

1. The scientific quality and feasibility of the research proposal. (1-10):
10 - Very high quality proposal, well planned, with clear deliverable objectives and details of how the study is to be carried out. Has considered and, where appropriate, applied the principles of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion in the design of the application.
8 – High quality proposal, well planned, with clear objectives and timelines but more detail required to understand feasibility. Has considered and, where appropriate, applied the principles of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion in the design of the application.
6 – Good quality proposal, with more detail required on objectives, timelines and feasibility.
4 – Average quality proposal, with poor detail on objectives and feasibility.
2 – Poor quality proposal, with very poor detail on planning and feasibility.

Reviewer comments:

2. The calibre of the applicant. (1-5):*
5 – Very high quality applicant with an excellent track record of physiology research including an excellent publication record. Has provided good examples of their contributions to knowledge exchange and/or development of individuals and/or the wider research community and/or broader society.
4 - High quality applicant with a very good track record of physiology research including a very good publication record. Has provided good examples of their contributions to knowledge exchange and/or development of individuals and/or the wider research community and/or broader society.
3 - Good quality applicant with a good track record of physiology research including a good publication record.
2 – Average quality applicant with an average track record of physiology research at including an average publication record.
1 Poor quality applicant with a poor track record of physiology research at including a poor publication record.

*The quality of the applicant will be determined by their track record of original peer-reviewed research articles (in terms of the number and quality of articles) as related in their ‘research history’ and ‘publications’ within their application.

Reviewer comments:
3. **The possibility of the proposal securing future funding. (1-3):**
3 – Very likely to secure future funding. The proposal clearly demonstrates the potential for future research stemming from the project, which is very likely to attract funding from other bodies (e.g. funding councils).
2 – Likely to securing future funding. The proposal demonstrates the potential for future research stemming from the project, which may attract funding from other bodies (e.g. funding councils).
1 – Some likelihood of securing future funding. The proposal show little potential for future research or future research is unlikely to attract funding from other bodies (e.g. funding councils).

**Reviewer comments:**

4. **Commitment of the Host Institution and research environment. (1-3):**
3 – Institution/department has offered strong support for the candidate’s research in terms of start-up costs and/or research assistance and/or expertise. Excellent facilities for the project are available.
2 – Institution/department has offered some support for the candidate’s research in terms of start-up costs and/or research assistance and/or expertise. Additional facilities may be required.
1 – Institution/department has offered a letter of support, but little evidence for further support. Facilities for undertaking the project may not be available.

**Reviewer comments:**

5. **Potential for collaborations. (1-2):**
2 – High likelihood of a number of collaborations from both within the candidate’s department/unit and from academics at other institutions.
1 – Likelihood of some collaborations from either within the candidates department/unit and/or from academics at other institutions.

**Reviewer comments:**
Outreach/public understanding of physiology grants

What will we fund?
Outreach/public understanding of physiology grants of up to £40,000 (over 2 years) are available to Members of The Society as part of the Momentum Fellowships. In line with The Society’s 2018-2022 Strategy, the grants should be used to increase understanding and awareness of physiology with the aim of engaging study at higher education and beyond, and to promote The Society, its vision and its activities. We encourage collaborative applications, including those between expert science communicators, facilitators of public engagement, artists, musicians, thespians and our Members.

Projects should meet one of the following aims:

1. To increase understanding and awareness of physiology amongst the non-expert public.
2. To increase awareness of the opportunities available to those who pursue physiology in their education.
3. To increase engagement with physiology research.

- Where possible, applications should incorporate training into the project plan to ensure that the project also aims to develop the science communication skills of everyone involved, including early career physiologists; funds can be included in the budget for this purpose.
- In line with The Society’s 2018-2022 Strategy, priority will be given to applicants with projects aiming to reach 16-25 year olds as part of their target audience.
- Applicants should ensure that their project results in a publication and/or resource for the benefit of other members of The Society.
- The Society will consider Citizen Science project proposals. The aim of the project should be to use the data collected from or by members of the public to answer a physiological hypothesis based on Lifelong Health. Successful applicants will have demonstrated that they have thought about the balance between scientific and educational value so that both physiologists and participants benefit. Applicants are invited to apply for funding for a pilot year; if this is successful there is the potential that further funding may become available to extend the project.

Reviewing the Grants
Each of the criteria below should be taken into consideration when reviewing applications and used to form your overall band. Upon completing the review, please add up your total score and assign an overall band for the application, where Very Good = 27-22; Good = 21-16; Average = 15-10; Poor = 9-5; Very Poor = 4-0.

1. How suitable is the applicant for this project, based on the information provided in the application form and the Resume for Researchers document. (out of 2)

2 – Very suitable applicant, with many good examples of their contributions to knowledge exchange and/or development of individuals and/or the wider research community and/or broader society.
1 – Somewhat suitable applicant, with some good examples of their contributions to knowledge exchange and/or development of individuals and/or the wider research community and/or broader society.

Reviewer comments:
2. How well does the project fulfil the aim specified on the application (this should be one of the three aims of the outreach scheme as stated above)? Does the project have a clear and adequate evaluation plan? (Out of 5)

5 – Very good fulfilment of the specified aims and/or very good evaluation plan.
4 – Good fulfilment of the specified aims and/or good evaluation plan.
3 – Average fulfilment of the specified aims and/or average evaluation plan.
2 – Poor fulfilment of the specified aims and/or poor evaluation plan.
1 – Very poor fulfilment of the specified aims and/or very poor evaluation plan.

Reviewer comments:

3. How feasible is the project? This should take into consideration planning, timelines, budgets and execution. (Out of 5)

5 – Very likely that the project will achieve its planned objectives, taking into consideration planning, timelines, suitable expertise, realistic budgets and execution.
4 – Likely that the project will achieve its planned objectives, taking into consideration planning, timelines, suitable expertise, realistic budgets and execution.
3 – Somewhat likely that the project will achieve its planned objectives, taking into consideration planning, timelines, suitable expertise, realistic budgets and execution.
2 – Unlikely that the project will achieve its planned objectives, taking into consideration planning, timelines, suitable expertise, realistic budgets and execution.
1 – Very unlikely that the project will achieve its planned objectives, taking into consideration planning, timelines, suitable expertise, realistic budgets and execution.

Reviewer comments:

4. Does the applicant demonstrate any leadership or leadership of collaborations within the projects? (Out of 2)

2 – Stronger evidence of leadership within the project and/or leadership of the proposed collaborations for the project.
1 – Weaker evidence of leadership within the project and/or leadership of the proposed collaborations for the project.

Reviewer comments:

5. What is the impact of the project on physiologists? Will the outcomes of this work inform confidence in public engagement, research or physiology more generally? (Out of 5)

5 – Very likely potential impact onto physiologists in terms of training opportunities and/or encouragement of using public engagement in future career activities.
Scoring criteria for Momentum Fellowships

4 – Likely potential impact onto physiologists in terms of training opportunities and/or encouragement of using public engagement in future career activities.
3 – Somewhat likely potential impact onto physiologists in terms of training opportunities and/or encouragement of using public engagement in future career activities.
2 – Unlikely potential impact onto physiologists in terms of training opportunities and/or encouragement of using public engagement in future career activities.
1 – Very unlikely potential impact onto physiologists in terms of training opportunities and/or encouragement of using public engagement in future career activities.

Reviewer comments:

6. What is the impact of the project on the audience? (Out of 5)

5 – Very likely potential impact on to the target audience and their attitudes/opinions about physiology and physiologists. Has the applicant considered the principles of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion in the design of the proposal.
4 - Likely potential impact on to the target audience and their attitudes/opinions about physiology and physiologists. Has the applicant considered the principles of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion in the design of the proposal.
3 – Somewhat likely potential impact on to the target audience and their attitudes/opinions about physiology and physiologists.
2 - Unlikely potential impact on to the target audience and their attitudes/opinions about physiology and physiologists.
1 – Very unlikely potential impact on to the target audience and their attitudes/opinions about physiology and physiologists.

Reviewer comments:

7. Is a resource/publication being produced as a result of this project? Will the resource be useful to other Society members or can it be used by The Society to reach a wider audience? (Out of 3)

3 – Very valuable resource to other Society members/The Society, for wider reach.
2 – Somewhat valuable resource to other Society members/The Society, for wider reach.
1 – Less valuable resource to other Society members/The Society, for wider reach.

Reviewer comments:
Physiological education Grants

Reviewing the Grants
Each of the criteria below should be taken into consideration when reviewing applications and used to form your overall band. Upon marking a teaching grant, please add up your total score and assign an overall band for the application, where Very Good = 23-19; Good = 18-14; Average = 13-9; Poor = 8-4; Very Poor = 3-0.

1. The quality and feasibility of the proposal. (1-5):
5 – Very high quality proposal, well planned, with clear timelines and definite understanding of how it is to be carried out including definitive methods for evaluation of effectiveness. Has considered the principles of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion in the design of the application.
4 – High quality proposal, well planned, with timelines and moderate understanding of how it is to be carried out, includes robust methods for evaluation of effectiveness. Has considered the principles of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion in the design of the application.
3 – Good quality proposal, with more detail required on timelines, planning, feasibility and evaluation.
2 – Average quality proposal, with poor detail on timelines, planning, feasibility and evaluation.
1 – Poor quality proposal, with very poor detail on timelines, planning, feasibility and evaluation.

Reviewer comments:

2. The calibre of the applicant. (1-5) NOTE THIS SHOULD BE ASSESSED WITH REFERENCE TO EDUCATIONAL NOT PHYSIOLOGICAL RESEARCH TRACK RECORD:
5 – Very high quality applicant with excellent track record, evidenced by educational/teaching and learning publications, of teaching innovation and/or education research and excellent references. Has provided good examples of their contributions to knowledge exchange and/or development of individuals and/or the wider research community and/or broader society.
4 – High quality applicant with very good track record, evidenced by educational/teaching and learning publications, of teaching innovation and/or education research and very good references. Has many provided examples of their contributions to knowledge exchange and/or development of individuals and/or the wider research community and/or broader society.
3 – Good quality applicant with average track record, evidenced by educational/teaching and learning publications, of teaching innovation and/or education research and average references.
2 – Average quality applicant with little evidence of teaching innovation, and/or education research, few/no educational or teaching publications, and average/poor references.
1 – Poor quality applicant with no evidence of teaching innovation and/or education research and poor references.

Reviewer comments:

3. **The impact of the research/resource on physiology education, including the breadth of the dissemination of the work and the potential for widespread application. (1-5):**

5 – Very high impact work with very clear potential for widespread application to improve core physiology education within host Institution, nationally and internationally. Definitive plans for how the work is to be disseminated.

4 – High impact work with potential for widespread application to improve core physiology education within host Institution, nationally and internationally. Clear plans for how the work is to be disseminated.

3 – Work has reasonable impact, but potential for application to improve physiology education is limited to host Institution and nationally. Some plans for how the work is to be disseminated.

2 – Work has some impact, but potential application is limited to local institution or to students to whom physiology is not a core discipline. Poor plans for dissemination of work.

1 – Likely to have low impact and little potential for application outside local institution/ department.

Reviewer comments:

4. **Resources required. (1-3):**

3 – Intended use of funding requested clear, appropriate, fully justified, no ineligible costs, could not be delivered with less funding and achieve same outcomes, project feasible for costs requested.

2 – Could be greater clarity on intended use of funding, may not all be appropriate or fully justified, project may not be fully completed with costs requested and/or could be delivered with less funding yet achieve same outcomes. No ineligible costs.

1 – Limited description of use and justification of funds requested and/or funding requested is excessive for proposal and/or contains ineligible costs.

Reviewer comments:

5. **Commitment of the Host Institution and research environment. (1-3):**
3 – Institution/department has offered strong support for the candidate’s research in terms of start-up costs and/or research assistance and/or expertise. Excellent facilities for the project are available.
2 – Institution/department has offered some support for the candidate’s research in terms of start-up costs and/or research assistance and/or expertise. Additional facilities may be required.
1 – Institution/department has offered a letter of support, but little evidence for further support. Facilities for undertaking the project may not be available.

Reviewer comments:

6. Demonstration of leadership and/or a contribution towards strategy or policy. (1-2):

2 – Excellent/good demonstration of leadership in the proposed area and/or strong likelihood of the project contributing to strategy or policy that is recognised at an institutional, national or international level.

1 - Some demonstration of leadership in the proposed area and/or limited likelihood of the project contributing to strategy or policy that is recognised at an institutional, national or international level.

Reviewer comments: