

Fellowship:

Applicant No.

Scoring Criteria – Scientific Advisory Group

Scoring Indicators	
10. Exceptional – top international research or of exceptional national strategic importance	✓
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highly original and innovative research - Novel methodology and research design - Excellent leadership (among the best in specialist area) • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very high likelihood of successful delivery with risks well managed • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research question or knowledge gap of crucial importance to UK research - Potential for significant health and/or socioeconomic impact - Internationally significant resource of value • CYP engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research actively engages children, young people or families in the design, set-up, delivery and dissemination of the research • Value for money <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sufficient and appropriate staff time allocation to deliver proposed research 	
9. Excellent – leading edge in most areas	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Original and innovative research - Novel methodology and sound research design - Excellent leadership (among the best in specialist area) • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very high likelihood of successful delivery with risks well managed • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research question or knowledge gap of crucial importance to UK research - Potential for significant health and/or socioeconomic impact - Internationally significant resource of value • CYP engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research actively engages children, young people or families in the design, set-up, delivery and dissemination of the research • Value for money <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sufficient and appropriate staff time allocation to deliver proposed research 	

8. Very high quality - nationally leading edge and internationally competitive	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Original and innovative research - Strong and robust methodology - Excellent leadership • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very high likelihood of successful delivery with risks well managed • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research question or knowledge gap of crucial importance to UK research - Potential for significant health and/or socioeconomic impact • CYP engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research actively engages children, young people or families in areas of the design, set-up, delivery and dissemination of the research • Value for money <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sufficient and appropriate staff time allocation to deliver proposed research (may be scope to strengthen management of project) 	
7. High quality - nationally leading edge and internationally competitive	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Innovative research idea - Methodologically robust study - Strong leadership • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potentially significant contribution to new knowledge/research - High likelihood of successful delivery • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Key research question/knowledge gap/area of importance to research in the UK - Potential for significant health and/or socioeconomic impact • CYP engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research engages children, young people or families in areas of the design, set-up, delivery or dissemination of the research • Value for money <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sufficient and appropriate staff time allocation to deliver proposed research (may be scope to strengthen management of project) 	
6. High quality - national impact, but not yet internationally competitive	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Methodologically robust study - Appropriate leadership • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate resources to deliver proposed research - High likelihood of successful delivery • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Worthwhile scientific question or knowledge gap - Potential for health and/or socioeconomic impact • CYP engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research engages children, young people or families in areas of the design, set-up, delivery or dissemination of the research (may be scope to maximise further) • Value for money <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sufficient and appropriate staff time allocation to deliver proposed research (may be scope to strengthen management of project) 	

5. Good quality	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good methodology, but significant revision required - Sub-optimal leadership/environment • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resources generally sufficient to deliver proposed research - Good likelihood of successful delivery • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Useful research question with potentially useful outcomes - Moderate likelihood of contributing to new knowledge/research • CYP engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research engages children, young people or families in areas of the design, set-up, delivery or dissemination of the research (may be scope to maximise further) • Value for money <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sufficient and appropriate staff time allocation to deliver proposed research (may be scope to strengthen management of project) 	
4. Potentially useful - with significant weaknesses	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Weak methodology (approach or study design requires significant review/revisions) - Sub-optimal leadership/environment • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inappropriate or insufficient resources to deliver the proposed research - Unlikely to significantly contribute to new knowledge/research • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potentially useful ideas discussed, but requires major review/revisions - Moderate likelihood of successful delivery • CYP engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research shows little engagement of children, young people or families in areas of the design, set-up, delivery or dissemination of the research • Value for money <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate staff time allocation to deliver proposed research (may be scope to strengthen management of project) 	
3. Potentially useful - with major weaknesses	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research question poorly defined - Weak/inappropriate methodology - Poor leadership/environment • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unlikely to contribute to new knowledge/research 	
2. Poor quality science, bordering on unacceptable	
1. Unacceptable quality or has serious ethical concerns	