Bright Ideas Grant Program Round 2
Assessment Criteria

In your application you must address all relevant assessment criteria. We will only award funding to applications that score satisfactorily against all relevant criteria. Word limits apply to all responses.

This is a competitive process, and the Panel will address marking according to the Assessment Criteria and Scoring Matrix. In addition, please be aware of the following funding request criteria:

1) Publication costs: The CFR have a grant available dedicated to support publication costs and this is the preferred source to apply for funding. To access the Publication grant you must be or have an Early to Mid Career researcher as an author with preference to first or last author. Applicants who still want to apply for publication costs using Bright Ideas funds **MUST** contact Ondine.Gordon@health.wa.gov.au **before applying** or you will be **ineligible.**

2) Conference attendance: Applicants seeking funding to attend a conference must provide **evidence of a significant invitation**, such as being invited as a keynote speaker, symposium presenter, or panelist. **Please note: General attendance alone is not eligible for funding under this scheme.** This is a competitive process, and priority will be given to applicants who have been invited to present in a substantial capacity that reflects leadership, recognition, or impact in their field. Applications that do not meet this criterion will **not** be considered for funding.

3) CFR acknowledges the importance of **engaging consumers** in SCGOPHCG research applications. YOU must address this in your application. If your application is for engaging with consumers ensure you detail how this will take place including costings and timelines of engagement.

4) Please set realistic expectations about what is achievable in the timeframe given. Key reasons that we see projects delayed:

- Slow recruitment due to availability of participant population or limited interest from participant population in participating in the research.
- Staffing resources for the project, either investigator too busy and unable to prioritise project or key study staff leave and are not replaced (e.g. research nurse).
- Delays in obtaining approvals.

Assessment Criterion 1 – Project Quality, Approach and Methodology (30%)
(word limit 1200)

This section includes:
- (i) Background
- (ii) Research aims/objectives, hypotheses/research question
- (iii) Methodology / research plan (including project feasibility)
- (iv) Research project timelines

In responding to this criterion, you should demonstrate your proposed methodology, encompassing the strengths and weaknesses/risks of the study design and the scientific quality and feasibility of the proposal. You are required to provide information on appropriate milestones, performance indicators and timeframes.

Assessment Criterion 2 – Researcher Track Record, Development of Career and Team (15%) (word limit 450)

This criterion is used to assess how this project will develop and advance the career of the early career Chief Investigator. This begins with how does the application process contribute to the researchers' career development goals? How will the project outcomes enhance competitiveness in securing future external funding to support their research program? Provide evidence of how the CI is supported by a strong research team including appropriate mentoring, coaching and/or career development support arrangements with senior researchers. Show how the research team have the appropriate mix of research skills and experience to undertake the research project.

Assessment Criterion 3 – Research Impact (30%) (word limit 600)

Impact refers to the demonstrable contribution that research makes to knowledge, health outcomes, policy, practice, or society, beyond academic outputs alone. **Applicants do not need to demonstrate all types of research impact**.
You should demonstrate this by providing details of how your research proposal will be directly relevant to

1. Advancing Knowledge
2. Research Capacity Building
3. Informing Decision-Making
4. Social Impacts (Equity, Diversity, Inclusion)
5. Health Impacts
6. Economic Impacts

AAMRI Framework that guides on these 6 Impact criteria.
Research Impact Framework - AAMRI

Assessment Criterion 4 – Consumer Engagement (15%) (word limit 450)

Meaningful consumer and community engagement is critical to the relevance, quality, and impact of all medical research. **All applications need to demonstrate consumer engagement**. You will not be eligible if you do not have CCI engagement. A lack of authentic involvement is often apparent to assessors. Reflecting the principle of *"nothing about us without us,"* applications should demonstrate how consumers or end-users have shaped the research from the outset. Please contact Ondine.Gordon@health.wa.gov.au if you are unsure with this section.

Assessment Criterion 5 – Budget Preparation (10%)

A budget plan is often linked to the timeline of the research. Please provide quotes if available and costings for CCI, salary or other items.

Scoring Matrix

The scoring matrix (below) is used to assess the applications to ensure thorough, equitable and transparent assessment. While the scoring matrix provides assessors with benchmarks for appropriately scoring each application, it is not essential that all descriptors relating to a given score are met.

For support and **any questions** in specific areas we encourage you to please reach out to our Research Grants and Partnerships Coordinator: **Ondine.Gordon@health.wa.gov.au**

Assessment Criterion 1: Project Quality, Approach and Methodology (30%)

Component	Score 25-30 – Outstanding	Score 19-24 – Strong	Score 13-18 – Satisfactory	Score 7-12 – Limited	Score 0-6 Poor
Background	Background is compelling, evidence-based and sets out a clear case for the significance and urgency of the research. Demonstrates in-depth understanding of national and global context.	Well-articulated background with clear justification for the research. Some reference to wider context and existing evidence.	Background is adequate but lacks depth or broader context. Relevance is mostly clear but may not be fully compelling.	Limited background provided; lacks strong evidence or fails to make a convincing case for the research.	Background is vague, missing, or unsupported by relevant evidence. Relevance is unclear.
Research Aims, Objectives and Hypotheses	Aims and hypotheses are clearly defined, innovative, and logically derived from the background. Demonstrates a strong conceptual framework.	Research aims are clear and appropriate. Hypotheses are logical and well-aligned.	Aims and hypotheses are outlined but may lack clarity, originality, or alignment with the conceptual framework.	Objectives are weakly defined, lack coherence or are not clearly aligned with the research background.	Aims are missing, unclear or not meaningful. Hypotheses are not described or irrelevant.
Methodology and Research Plan	Robust, well-integrated methodology with detailed plan. Methods are appropriate and clearly justified. Risks and contingencies are thoughtfully addressed.	Sound methodology with reasonable justification. Research plan is structured and feasible with minor gaps.	Methodology is acceptable but lacks justification or detail in key areas. Some elements may be underdeveloped.	Weak or poorly described methodology. Significant feasibility concerns or methodological inconsistencies.	Methodological approach is missing, inappropriate, or fundamentally flawed.
Timelines and Feasibility	Timeline is detailed, realistic and well-aligned with project scope and resources. Roles and milestones are clearly defined and achievable.	Clear and achievable timeline with defined roles. Some minor gaps in milestones or feasibility.	Timeline is broadly adequate but lacks clarity or detail in deliverables or responsibilities.	Timeline is overly ambitious, vague or not aligned to project needs. Feasibility concerns evident.	No realistic or coherent timeline provided. Project not feasible within proposed duration.
Use of Landscape Analysis	Extensive and strategic use of national/international landscape to justify approach. Demonstrates awareness of current developments and gaps.	Good reference to external landscape; provides rationale for the proposed work.	Some engagement with the external landscape but lacks depth or strategic linkage.	Minimal use of landscape evidence; rationale for approach is weak.	No engagement with broader landscape; justification of approach is unsupported.
Milestones and Performance Indicators	Milestones and KPIs are specific, measurable, and aligned with project stages. Provides a clear monitoring framework.	Milestones and indicators are defined and mostly well-aligned to project goals.	Milestones are included but lack specificity or measurable indicators.	Milestones are vague, unrealistic or inconsistently aligned with objectives.	Milestones and KPIs are absent or not meaningful.

Assessment Criterion 2: Researcher Track Record, Development of Career and Team (15%)

Component	Score 13-15 – Outstanding	Score 10-12 – Strong	Score 7-9 – Satisfactory	Score 4-6 – Limited	Score 0-3 Poor
Chief Investigator (CI) Track Record	Demonstrates an exceptional track record relative to opportunity. Outputs, leadership, and impact are well above expectations for career stage.	Strong research record with quality outputs and clear evidence of leadership or impact, appropriate to career stage.	Acceptable track record with some indicators of research output or impact; broadly aligned with career stage.	Limited research output or achievements; weak evidence of leadership or relevance to field.	No meaningful track record or not aligned to expectations for career stage.
Career Development Plan	Clear, ambitious, and feasible plan for career development. Aligned with institutional strategy and addresses future goals with defined outcomes.	Well-structured plan with relevant and achievable career goals. Some alignment to long-term research vision.	Plan included with general career goals but lacks detail or long-term vision.	Career goals are vague or disconnected from research project. Little detail provided.	No career development plan or goals described.
Funding Competitiveness	Project strongly enhances future funding competitiveness with strategic alignment to external grant priorities and clear development of track record.	Likely to improve funding competitiveness through skills development, research outputs, or collaborations.	Some potential for enhanced funding competitiveness but not clearly articulated.	Limited alignment with future funding opportunities. Weak justification of long-term funding impact.	Unlikely to support future funding success; no link to grant strategy or competitiveness.
Research Environment and Mentoring	Outstanding support environment including mentoring, coaching, access to infrastructure and active research culture. Mentorship is structured and tailored.	Strong institutional support and access to resources. Mentor involvement is clear and appropriate.	Adequate support and general mentoring plan. Resources broadly available.	Minimal or passive support environment. Mentoring not clearly described or engaged.	No evidence of mentoring, infrastructure or team support.
Team Capability and Composition	Research team has exceptional and complementary expertise. Clearly defined roles aligned to project needs. Team structure enhances capacity and collaboration.	Team is well-composed with appropriate skills. Roles are defined and relevant to project aims.	Team has necessary skills but may lack diversity or role clarity.	Gaps in expertise or unclear role allocation. Team capability may limit success.	Team lacks essential skills or experience to deliver the project.

One team, **many** dreams.
Care / Respect / Innovation / Teamwork / Integrity

Assessment Criterion 3: Research Impact (30%)

Component	Score 25-30 – Outstanding	Score 19-24 – Strong	Score 13-18 – Satisfactory	Score 7-12 – Limited	Score 0-6 Poor
Advancing Knowledge	Clear and novel research question; likely to generate high-impact publications, influence future research, or establish new paradigms.	Builds on existing knowledge; outcomes likely to contribute significantly to the field or be widely cited.	Adds incremental knowledge; academic benefit plausible but not clearly transformative.	Contribution to knowledge is minimal or unclear; little novelty.	No research gap identified; unclear what new knowledge would be produced.
Research Capacity Building	Strong, specific plan to develop early/mid-career researchers, clinicians, or students; includes formal mentoring/training, especially in underrepresented groups.	Includes training or mentoring of staff or students; limited focus on structured capacity-building.	Mentions team growth or skills development, but vague or lacking concrete activities.	Limited or incidental mention of capacity-building.	No capacity-building described or evident.
Informing Decision-Making	Clear pathway to influence policy, guidelines, or service delivery; decision-makers engaged, and roles described.	Likely to inform practice or policy with some stakeholder engagement; pathways plausible.	May inform decisions but lacks engagement strategy or clarity on how impact will occur.	Unclear how results would be used; no engagement with potential end-users.	No relevance to decision-making demonstrated.
Social Impact (EDI)	Project explicitly benefits priority populations (e.g. rural/remote, ATSI, underserved); EDI is embedded throughout design, team composition, and outcomes.	Some focus on priority populations; EDI considerations in recruitment or dissemination.	EDI acknowledged but not meaningfully integrated into the research or impact.	EDI only briefly mentioned; lacks plan for inclusion or relevance.	No mention of EDI or social relevance.
Health Impact	Strong and specific potential to improve health outcomes, access to care, or clinical effectiveness; metrics of benefit are clearly stated.	Plausible health benefits described with moderate supporting evidence or rationale.	Health benefit assumed but not well defined or measured.	Minimal or speculative health relevance.	No connection to health outcomes.
Economic Impact	Economic benefit clearly quantified (e.g. cost-effectiveness, reduced hospitalisations, workforce gains); includes commercialisation or implementation plan.	Some economic value anticipated; pathways to uptake or commercialisation described.	Potential for indirect or long-term economic value but lacks clear plan.	Minimal or incidental mention of economic relevance.	No economic impact identified or feasible.

Assessment Criterion 4: Consumer and Community Engagement (15%)

Component	Score 13-15 – Outstanding	Score 10-12 – Strong	Score 7-9 – Satisfactory	Score 4-6 – Limited	Score 0-3 Poor
Early and Ongoing Involvement	Consumers are engaged from project inception (e.g. co-design), with plans for ongoing involvement.	Consumers engaged in early stages, with plans for some continued involvement.	Consumer involvement mentioned, but limited in scope or timing.	Minimal consumer involvement, no early-stage input.	No evidence of early or ongoing consumer involvement.
Clarity of Roles and Contributions	Roles are clearly defined and integrated into decision-making; consumers treated as partners.	Roles are described with moderate clarity; consumers contribute meaningfully.	Roles are mentioned but vaguely defined; limited evidence of contribution.	Consumer roles unclear or tokenistic.	No description of consumer roles.
Diversity and Inclusion	Project includes diverse consumer voices across geography, culture, age, etc.	Some diversity is addressed in engagement plans.	Diversity acknowledged but not well integrated.	Little consideration of diversity.	No mention of diversity or inclusion.
Support and Capacity Building	Consumers receive training, reimbursement, and accessible materials.	Some support provided; reimbursement or training planned.	Support mentioned but not well detailed.	Minimal support provided or planned.	No support or capacity-building described.
Impact on Research Design	Consumer input has clearly shaped research questions, methods, or outcomes.	Some consumer input has influenced aspects of research design.	Limited impact of consumers on design.	Impact on design is unclear or weak.	No evidence that consumers influenced research design.
Communication and Feedback	Two-way communication planned, with regular updates and feedback loops.	Some mechanisms to update or consult with consumers.	Feedback mentioned without clear plan.	Minimal feedback or communication plan.	No plan to communicate with consumers.

Assessment Criterion 5: Budget (10%)

Component	Score 9-10 – Outstanding	Score 7-8 – Strong	Score 5-6 – Satisfactory	Score 3-4 – Limited	Score 0-2 Poor
Budget Justification	Comprehensive and well-justified budget with clear alignment to project need. Resources appropriately allocated.	Budget is justified and appropriate overall. Minor areas may lack detail or alignment.	Budget is generally appropriate but lacks sufficient justification in some areas.	Budget is inconsistently justified or has major gaps in alignment with project plan.	Budget is unjustified, excessive, or missing key items.
Timelines	Timeline is well-aligned with budget request. Roles and milestones are clearly defined and achievable.	Timeline is aligned with budget. Clear and achievable timeline with defined roles. Some minor gaps in milestones or feasibility.	Timeline is partially aligned with budget and is broadly adequate but lacks clarity or detail in deliverables or responsibilities.	Timeline is overly ambitious, vague or not aligned to budget, and/or project needs. Feasibility concerns evident.	No realistic or coherent timeline provided. Project not feasible within proposed duration.