**Research Grant Pre-assessment and Matrix**

**Pre-Assessment**

All items below must receive a check mark to progress to a full assessment

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Principal investigator and an ASMIRT voting member for at least 12 months |
|  | Application completed |
|  | Within word limit |
|  | Supporting documentation included: |
|  | CVs for all investigators |
|  | Ethics approvals (if applicable) |
|  | Detailed project plan |
|  | Detailed budget |
|  | Letter of support from department or organisation |
|  | Money not being used for excluded uses i.e. capital equipment (including university overheads), conference and travel expenses. |
|  | Dissemination plan (peer review journal/conference) |
|  | Signatures all present |
|  | Electronic copy sent by 5PM (AEST) on due date |
|  | All sections completed as required |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring Matrix** | | | | | |
| **Assessment criteria** | **0-6** | **7-12** | **13-16** | **17-20** | **Score** |
| Originality | Lacks originality. Limited evidence the project will provide new and relevant evidence for clinical practice. | Limited originality/replicating previous research for the purpose of validation. | Extending previous work to fulfil a gap in current research. | Innovative or distinctive design to extend current knowledge base. | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Reference to existing work | Limited range of literature used and limited critical appraisal. Literature not relevant to the topic and/or does not provide evidence to justify answering the research question. | Some literature and critical appraisal, which provides some evidence to justify answering the research question. | A reasonable range of literature used with some critical appraisal, which demonstrates the potential value in answering the research question. | A wide range of critically appraised relevant literature, which demonstrates a clear need to answer the research question. | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Methodology | * Insufficient detail provided to enable critical analysis by the reviewers. * Methodology and/or statistical tests are inappropriate. | * Methodology is explained, however there is insufficient detail to provide clear evidence the methodology is appropriate or whether ethical considerations have been fully evaluated. | * Methodology provides sufficient detail to demonstrate the type of research, methods for data acquisition, and ethical considerations * Statistical analysis is described | * Methodology clearly articulated. * Statistical analysis is clearly outlined with consideration of alternative tests depending on data distribution. * Sample size calculations provided (if applicable). | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Feasibility | * All investigators are novice. * Timeframe does not seem achievable. * Budget does not account for all requirements outlined in the methodology. | * Members of the research team have limited experience. * Timeframe does not consider contingencies. * The project relies on successful application/s for other significant grants. | * There is sufficient experience in the research team for successful completion of the project. * Timeframe is achievable if there is minimal disruption. * Budget is detailed and is not reliant on successful application for other significant grants. | * One or more investigators with extensive research and/or supervisory research experience. * Robust timeframe that allows for contingencies. * Detailed budget with excellent prospects for additional funding if required. | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Potential to enhance the research base of MRP | * Topic is not relevant to MRP sciences. * The purpose of the MRP members of the project team is limited to providing supervision/mentorship. | * Topic has some relevance to MRP sciences. * Project team includes novice or early career MRP researchers with limited roles in the project. * Project has very limited potential for extension. | * Topic is relevant to MRP sciences * Project team includes novice or early career MRP researchers with moderate roles in the project, as well as experienced mentors. * Project has some potential for extension. | * Topic is highly relevant to MRP sciences. * Project team includes novice or early career MRP researchers with significant roles in the project, as well as experienced mentors. * Project has potential for extension. | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Likelihood of publishable outcome and follow-up research grants | * Topic would not be desirable for a peer reviewed MRP sciences/allied health/medical journal. * Topic has low clinical relevance. * Research team has very limited track record of publications. | * Topic may be desirable for minor peer reviewed MRP sciences/allied health/medical journal. * Topic has limited clinical relevance. * Research team has a small number of previous publications. | * Topic would be desirable for a peer reviewed MRP sciences/allied health/medical journal. * Topic has moderate clinical relevance. * Research team has a track record of publications in MRP sciences journals/conferences. | * Topic would be desirable for a national or international peer reviewed MRP sciences/allied health/medical journal. * Topic has high clinical relevance. * Research team has a strong track record of publications in MRP sciences journals/conferences. | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Total score** |  | | | |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Other** | **Yes** | **Outcome (Yes or No)** |
| Interprofessional collaboration? | * The project encompasses multiple professional fields i.e. collaboration is not merely for research supervision * Co-investigators across different professions will have significant involvement in the project | Click or tap here to enter text. |