

# Novice Researcher Scholarship 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
	Principal investigator is a novice researcher (has not been a PI on a previous research project)
	A suitable research supervisor/mentor has been identified in the application
	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



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.	
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.	
Methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient detail provided to enable critical analysis by the reviewers.</li> <li>Methodology and/or statistical tests are inappropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Methodology is explained, however there is insufficient detail to provide clear evidence the methodology is appropriate or whether ethical considerations have been fully evaluated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Methodology provides sufficient detail to demonstrate the type of research, methods for data acquisition, and ethical considerations.</li> <li>Statistical analysis is described</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Methodology clearly articulated.</li> <li>Statistical analysis is clearly outlined with consideration of alternative tests depending on data distribution.</li> <li>Sample size calculations provided (if applicable).</li> </ul>	
Feasibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All investigators are novice.</li> <li>Timeframe does not seem achievable.</li> <li>Budget does not account for all requirements outlined in the methodology.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research supervisor and senior members of the research team have limited experience in supervising novice researchers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research supervisor is experienced and there is sufficient experience in the research team for successful completion of the project.</li> <li>Timeframe is achievable if there is minimal disruption.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research supervisor has extensive research and supervisory experience.</li> <li>One or more co-investigators has extensive research experience.</li> <li>Robust timeframe that allows for contingencies.</li> </ul>	



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timeframe does not consider contingencies</li> <li>• The project relies on successful application/s for other significant grants.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget is detailed and is not reliant on successful application for other significant grants.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed budget with excellent prospects for additional funding if required.</li> </ul>	
Potential to enhance the research base of MRP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topic is not relevant to MRP sciences.</li> <li>• The purpose of the MRP members of the project team is limited to providing supervision/mentorship.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topic has some relevance to MRP sciences.</li> <li>• Project team includes other early career MRP researchers with limited roles in the project.</li> <li>• Project has very limited potential for extension.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topic is relevant to MRP sciences.</li> <li>• Project team includes other early career MRP researchers with moderate roles in the project, as well as experienced mentors.</li> <li>• Project has some potential for extension.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topic is highly relevant to MRP sciences.</li> <li>• Project team includes other early career MRP researchers with significant roles in the project, as well as experienced mentors.</li> <li>• Project has potential for extension.</li> </ul>	
Likelihood of publishable outcome and follow-up research grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topic would not be desirable for a peer reviewed MRP sciences/allied health/medical journal.</li> <li>• Topic has low clinical relevance.</li> <li>• Research team has very limited track record of publications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topic may be desirable for minor peer reviewed MRP sciences/allied health/medical journal.</li> <li>• Topic has limited clinical relevance.</li> <li>• Research team has a small number of previous publications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topic would be desirable for a peer reviewed MRP sciences/allied health/medical journal.</li> <li>• Topic has moderate clinical relevance.</li> <li>• Research team has a track record of publications in MRP sciences journals/conferences.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topic would be desirable for a national or international peer reviewed MRP sciences/allied health/medical journal.</li> <li>• Topic has high clinical relevance.</li> <li>• Research team has a strong track record of publications in MRP sciences journals/conferences.</li> </ul>	
<b>Total score</b>					





Other	Yes	Outcome (Yes or No)
Interprofessional collaboration?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The project encompasses multiple professional fields i.e. collaboration is not merely for research supervision</li><li>• Co-investigators across different professions will have significant involvement in the project</li></ul>	



info@asmirt.org  
www.asmirt.org  
PO Box 16234,  
Collins Street West,  
VIC 8007, Australia  
+61 3 9419 3336