

CfR Grant Scoring Matrix

Information within the boxes guide choice but don't all have to be present for that mark

1. Scientific Quality and feasibility (50% weight)

10 -9	8-6	5-4	3-1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research question is well articulated from the gaps in the literature. • Methodology is flawlessly designed and will answer the research question: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clear description of participants, tools, research methods. ○ Consideration of numbers required. ○ Well-designed analysis ○ Ethics well considered. • Highly feasible with required expertise, research tools and techniques established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research question is clear. • Aims directly address the research question. • Methodology is well designed to answer the research question and includes some but not all characteristics below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clear description of participants, tools, research methods. ○ Consideration of numbers required. ○ Well-designed analysis. ○ Ethics well considered. • Feasible project with explanation of how to address concerns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research question has some minor flaws. • Aims don't entirely cover the research question or minor misalignment. • Some questions about research design and methodology. • Some concerns about feasibility but still likely to be completed. • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear research question. • No or unclear aims. • Flawed or poorly developed research plan that is not appropriate to answer the research question. • Major methodology concerns. • Unlikely to be successful research with significant feasibility concerns.

2. Significance of the expected outcomes AND/OR Innovation of the concept (25% weight)

10 -9	8-6	5-4	3-1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes are informed by excellent analysis of the literature, will be highly relevant and have direct clinical impact or will result in growth in field of knowledge. • Outcomes likely to positively influence career progression. • Considers needs, priorities, and views of First Nations communities, consumers and carers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes are likely to have a regional or national clinical impact or increase knowledge. • Outcomes may positively influence career progression. • Some consideration of the needs, priorities, and views of First Nations communities, consumers and carers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes likely to have a local or community service clinical impact or increase knowledge. • Minimal consideration of the needs, priorities, and views of First Nations communities, consumers and carers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes unlikely to demonstrate meaningful improvement in knowledge or have clinical impact. • Does not consider the needs, priorities, and views of First Nations communities, consumers and carers.

3. Role of Applicant, applicant quality and experience, and research environment (25% weight)

10 -9	8-6	5-4	3-1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant leading this project. • Applicant has some research experience in this field or high level in another field. • Applicant involved in RHD. • Research supervisors and team have high level of expertise in this field. • The applicant environment is relevant and will clearly support their research objectives (mentorship and resources). • Clearly and comprehensively articulates the contribution of others. • Clear governance and oversight of the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant leading this project. • Applicant has some research experience that may not be within this field. • Applicant planning RHD. • Research supervisors and team have high level of expertise in this field. • Clear governance processes. • The environment the applicant is likely to support their research objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant has primary role in project but may be led by supervisor. • Supervisors/team has reasonable research experience. • Some concerns or lack of clarity with governance or processes within project. • It is unclear the environment will be conducive to support the research objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant does not have primary role in project or a large proportion of project will be completed by others. • Research supervisors/team has limited expertise in field. • Poor documentation or major concerns with roles of team members or governance.