Education and Teaching Award

Scoring criteria

The quality and feasibility of the 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.

8 - High quality proposal, well planned, with timelines and moderate understanding of how it is to be carried out, including robust methods for evaluation of effectiveness. Has considered the principles of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion in the design of the application.

6 - Good quality proposal, with more detail required on timelines, planning, feasibility and evaluation.

4 - Average quality proposal, with poor detail on timelines, planning, feasibility and evaluation.

2 - Poor quality proposal, with very poor detail on timelines, planning, feasibility and evaluation.

The calibre of the applicant. **(1-5)**

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.

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.

Resources required **(1-3)**

3 - Intended use of funding requested is clear, appropriate, and fully justified with no ineligible costs. Could not be delivered with less funding and achieve same outcomes.

2 - Could be greater clarity on intended use of funding and 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.

Commitment of the Host Institution and research environment. **(1-3):**

3 - Institution/department has offered strong support for the candidate's research/project 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/project 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.

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 depart ment/unit and/or from academics at other institutions.