

Research and Knowledge Exchange Award

Scoring criteria

The scientific quality and feasibility of the research proposal. (1 -10)

10 - 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.

8 - High quality proposal, well planned, with clear objectives and timelines but more detail required to understand feasibility.

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.

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.

4 - High quality applicant with a very good track record of physiology research at including very good publication record.

3 - Good quality applicant with a good track record of physiology research at including 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 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 secure 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).

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 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 startup 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 department/unit and/or from academics at other institutions.