**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. |