



SEED FUNDING GRANTS 2022 – ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

Scoring System

Score	Description	Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses
10	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
9	Outstanding	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
8	Excellent	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
7	Very Good	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
6	Good	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
5	Satisfactory	Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
4	Fair	Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
3	Marginal	A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
2	Poor	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses
1	Very Poor	No strengths and numerous major weaknesses

Reviewers are asked to consider each application and give a separate score for each criterion (using 1 to 10 scoring range).

This scoring system uses a 10-point scale for each scoring criteria:

- A score of 10 indicates an exceptionally strong application with essentially no weaknesses
- A score of 1 indicates an application with serious and substantive weaknesses with very few strengths
- A score of 5 is considered an average application for the career stage and research area
- Ratings are in whole numbers only (no decimal ratings).

Four objectives of the Global CoE.

1. *To formulate a framework to develop, implement and evaluate models of care that lead to improved health outcomes and reduced burden for people living with T1D.*
2. *To promote effective transfer of research outcomes into health policy and/or practice.*
3. *To develop novel advanced economic frameworks that include the broad true costs of T1D to enhance access to novel therapies and shape policies.*
4. *To facilitate effective and cross disciplinary collaboration and partnerships with academia, industry, consumers, clinical organisations and key experts and stakeholders.*

The fifth objective of the Centre - *To develop talent and new investigators* – is addressed through evaluation criteria #4.

Please score the Project Funding Application out of 50, using the criteria below.

Evaluation Panel member:	
Project:	
<i>Eligibility</i>	
Does the project align with at least one of four Centre objectives?	Y/N
Is the applicant affiliated with the Rio Tinto Children's Diabetes Centre; working with or for Principal Investigators and/or Collaborators?	Y/N
<i>Proposal evaluation</i>	Score (1-10)
1. Scientific merit and feasibility	
<i>Comments eg: is the proposal sound? Is the project worth doing? Is it achievable in timelines and in the given budget? Is the burden placed on participants worth the outcome?</i>	
2. Innovation	
<i>Comments eg: what will the project bring to the field? Will the project likely contribute to attracting future funding and/or creating discovery, commercialisation, and other translation or impact opportunities?</i>	
3. Potential impact, contribution and alignment to the overall objectives of the centre?	
<i>Comments: Does it add value to work being undertaken by Centre Research Partners? Will the project contribute to improving the lives of all young people living with diabetes, their families and community?</i>	
4. Benefit to experience and professional development of the lead investigator.	
<i>Comments eg: record relative to career stage, PhD student, Early-Mid career;</i>	
5. Embedding community involvement into the proposed project	
<i>Comments eg: have consumers been consulted about this project? How will the T1D community be engaged in the study?</i>	
TOTAL	/ 50
<i>Other</i>	
Is the proposal for a discrete project or to generate pilot data for a future grant application?	Discrete project / Pilot data
General comments: eg: clarity, importance, consumer engagement, links to other projects etc.	

Please provide up to 3 points of feedback that will be provided to the applicant

- 1)
- 2)
- 3)