



---

# INVESTIGATOR GRANTS 2019 GUIDE TO APPLICANTS ON PREPARING AN APPLICATION

---

## Contents

<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Profile Requirements .....</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1 Career Disruption (within the last 10 years).....	1
2.2 Relative to Opportunity (within the last 10 years).....	1
2.3 Publications.....	2
2.4 Minimum Data Requirements .....	2
<b>3. Addressing the assessment criteria .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3.1 Track Record, relative to opportunity (70%) .....</b>	<b>2</b>
3.1.1 Publications .....	2
3.1.2 Research Impact .....	3
3.1.2.1 Demonstrating Research Impact .....	4
3.1.3 Leadership.....	5
<b>3.2 Knowledge Gain (30%) .....</b>	<b>6</b>
3.2.1 Grant Proposal.....	6
<b>4. ATTACHMENTS .....</b>	<b>7</b>

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

---

The objective of the Investigator Grant scheme is to support the research program of outstanding investigators at all career stages.

The expected outcomes are:

- flexibility for investigators to pursue important new research directions as they arise and to form collaborations as needed
- innovative and creative research
- opportunities for researchers at all career stages to establish their own research programs
- reduced application and peer review burden on researchers.

This document provides guidance to Investigator Grant applicants on preparing an application and must be read in conjunction with the *Investigator Grants 2019 Guidelines*.

---

## 2. PROFILE REQUIREMENTS

---

Within an applicant's profile, there is mandatory information that will need to be completed and/or updated prior to submitting an application. This information includes, but not exclusively, personal details, academic/research interests and peer review information.

Applicants are also required to complete the sections outlined below. Should more information be entered than is required, only the required information will be imported into the application.

It is important that relevant profile information is up to date at the time of application submission as it is imported into the application and used by peer reviewers. Any changes made to the profile after Chief Investigator A (CIA) certification will not appear in the submitted application.

### 2.1 Career Disruption (within the last 10 years)

NHMRC is committed to ensuring that every applicant is treated fairly, and this means that it recognises some applicants will have had career disruptions that should be considered when evaluating their track record and eligibility. If applicable, applicants should use this opportunity to declare any career disruptions that may be relevant to their career history. This will ensure that applications are assessed objectively, and with all relevant factors taken into account.

#### Career Disruption

A career disruption is defined as a prolonged interruption to an applicant's capacity to work due to pregnancy, major illness/injury and/or carer responsibilities. For guidance on what constitutes a career disruption and how it is considered, refer to the *Investigator Grants 2019 Guidelines*.

#### Impact

Applicants are required to provide a brief explanation of the impact the career disruption(s) has had on their research, research achievements and associated productivity relative to their career stage. Applicants should not describe the nature of the career disruption in this field. Note that the information in this field will be provided to peer reviewers (maximum of 2000 characters including spaces and line breaks).

#### Dates

Applicants are required to nominate the periods when they have had a disruption (approximate dates).

### 2.2 Relative to Opportunity (within the last 10 years)

If applicable, the applicant should use this section to provide details on any relative to opportunity considerations and the effect they have had on their research and research achievements (see *Investigator Grants 2019 Guidelines* for further information).

#### Circumstance

Provide a brief explanation of the type of relative to opportunity circumstance (maximum of 200 characters including spaces and line breaks).

#### Impact

Applicants are required to provide a brief explanation of the impact this has had on their research, research

achievements and associated productivity relative to their career stage (maximum of 1500 characters including spaces and line breaks).

#### **Date**

Applicants are required to nominate the periods when they have had a disruption (approximate dates).

### **2.3 Publications**

Publication information can be uploaded by exporting an EndNote® Library as an .xml file.

NHMRC accepts nine types of publication: Journal Articles (Original Research), Journal Articles (Review), Books/Chapters, Research Report – commissioned by Government, industry or other, Technical Report, Text Book, Accepted for Publication, Editorials and Letters to the Editor.

Publications will be grouped together by the type of publication. They will also automatically be given an Identification Number (ID). DO NOT use the ID number to refer to specific publications in other sections of the application.

### **2.4 Minimum Data Requirements**

Minimum data must be entered in NHMRC's granting system by the specified due date to allow NHMRC to start identifying suitable peer reviewers. Applications that fail to satisfy this requirement will not be accepted. Applicants must complete the required fields with correct information. Using placeholder text such as "text", "synopsis" or "xx" etc. is not acceptable as minimum data.

Minimum data fields for Investigator Grants will be communicated when the Grant Opportunity is published on GrantConnect.

**Failure to meet this deadline will result in the application not proceeding.**

Research Administration Officers are not required to certify applications for the purpose of minimum data. Applications should only be certified once complete and ready for submission.

---

## **3. ADDRESSING THE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA**

---

Applications for Investigator Grants 2019 will be assessed by peer reviewers on the extent to which they address the assessment criteria<sup>1</sup> listed below.

- Track Record, relative to opportunity (70%)
- Knowledge Gain (30%)

The following advice should be considered when preparing applications.

### **3.1 Track Record, relative to opportunity (70%)**

Track record assessment comprises the consideration of:

- Publications (35%)
- Research Impact (20%)
- Leadership (15%)

#### **3.1.1 Publications**

Applicants will be assessed based on their publications from the past 10 years (taking into account career disruptions) as recorded in the applicant's profile within NHMRC's granting system. Applicants will be required to nominate their five best publications from those 10 years and provide explanations of why these publications have been selected, outlining the quality of the publications selected and their contribution to science (maximum of 2000 characters including spaces and line breaks).

The assessment of publications will be against the category descriptors at Table 1 of Attachment A.

---

<sup>1</sup> It is recognised that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander applicants make additional valuable contributions to policy development, clinical/public health leadership and/or service delivery, community activities and linkages, and are often representatives on key committees. If applicable, these contributions will be considered when assessing research output and track record.

### 3.1.2 Research Impact

Applicants will be assessed based on:

- The significance and reach of their claimed research impact
- The contribution of their research program to the research impact
- The contribution of the applicant to the research program.

NHMRC defines the impact of research as the verifiable outcomes that research makes to knowledge, health, the economy and/or society. Impact is the effect of the research after it has been adopted, adapted for use, or used to inform further research.

Research impact is the verifiable outcomes from research and *not the prospective or anticipated effects of the research*.

Research impact also includes research that leads to a decision not to use a particular diagnostic, treatment or health policy.

<p><b>Research Impact</b></p> <p>The verifiable outcomes that research makes to knowledge, health, the economy and/or society. Impact is the effect of the research after it has been adopted, adapted for use, or used to inform further research.</p>
<p><b>Research Program</b></p> <p>A cohesive body of research by the applicant, not limited to an individual case study (as used in a clinical context) or a single publication. It may be recent or in the past.</p>
<p><b>Research program's contribution to the research impact</b></p> <p>The degree to which the applicant's research program was necessary to achieve the impact(s) (knowledge, health, economic, and/or social impact).</p>
<p><b>Applicant's contribution to the research program</b></p> <p>The level of the applicant's contribution (e.g. leadership, intellectual and/or technical input) to the research program.</p>

**Figure 1:** Key definitions for the assessment of Research Impact

NHMRC identifies four specific types of impact (Table 1).

Examples of evidence are listed in Table 1. Evidence examples may be relevant to **more than one research impact type**.

**Table 1: Types of Research Impact and Examples of Evidence of Research Impact**

Type of impact	Description of research impact	Examples of evidence (not exhaustive)
<b>Knowledge impact</b>	New knowledge, demonstrating the benefits emerging from adoption, adaption or use of new knowledge to inform further research, and/or understanding of what is effective.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• recognition of research publications (e.g. citation metrics, particularly field weighted)</li> <li>• data sharing</li> <li>• contribution to registries or biobanks</li> <li>• prizes and conference presentations</li> <li>• uptake of research tools and techniques</li> <li>• evidence of uptake of the research by other disciplines</li> </ul>
<b>Health impact</b>	Improvements in health through new therapeutics, diagnostics, disease prevention or changes in behaviour; or improvements in disease prevention, diagnosis and treatment, management of health problems, health policy, health systems, and quality of life.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• policy or program adopted</li> <li>• a clinical guideline adopted</li> <li>• international or national practice standards adopted</li> <li>• improved service effectiveness</li> <li>• Phase I, Phase II and Phase III clinical trials underway or completed</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improved productivity due to research innovations (e.g. reduced illness, injury)</li> <li>• Quality-Adjusted Life Years, Disability-Adjusted Life Years, Potential Years of Life Lost, Patient Reported Outcome Measure and other relevant indicators</li> <li>• relative stay index for multi-day stay patients, hospital standardised mortality ratio, cost per weighted separation and total case weighted separation</li> <li>• reports (including community and government)</li> </ul>
<b>Economic impact</b>	Improvements in the nation's economic performance through creation of new industries, jobs or valuable products, or reducing health care costs, improving efficiency in resource use, or improving the welfare/well-being of the population within current health system resources. An economic impact may also contribute to social or health impacts, including human capital gains and the value of life and health.	<p><b>Health Care System Savings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• relative stay index for multi-day stay patients, hospital standardised mortality ratio, cost per weighted separation and total case weighted separation</li> <li>• reduction in Medicare Benefits Schedule/Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme costs</li> <li>• improved productivity due to research innovations (e.g. reduced illness, injury)</li> <li>• improved service effectiveness</li> </ul> <p><b>Product Development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a research contract with an industry partner and an active collaboration</li> <li>• granting of a patent</li> <li>• execution of a licensing agreement with an established company</li> <li>• income from intellectual property</li> <li>• raising funding from venture capital or other commercial sources or from government schemes that required industry co-participation</li> <li>• successful exit from start-up company (public market flotation, merger or acquisition)</li> <li>• development of pre-good manufacturing practice prototype</li> <li>• successful generation or submission of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ a regulatory standard data set</li> <li>○ applications for pre-market approval of a medical device</li> <li>○ a new drug or device for registration (e.g. by Food and Drug Administration, European Medicines Agency, Therapeutic Goods Administration)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• product sales</li> </ul>
<b>Social impact</b>	Improvements in the health of society, including the well-being of the end user and the community. This may include improved ability to access health care services, to participate socially (including empowerment and participation in decision making) and to quantify improvements in the health of society.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• uptake or demonstrated use of evidence by decision makers/policy makers</li> <li>• qualitative measures demonstrating changes in behaviours, attitudes, improved social equity, inclusion or cohesion</li> <li>• improved environmental determinants of health</li> <li>• improved social determinants of health</li> <li>• changes to health risk factors</li> </ul>

### 3.1.2.1 Demonstrating Research Impact

Applicants should only include **one** research program to demonstrate research impact(s) across one or more of the four types of impact. Applicants will be asked to indicate in the application which of the research impact types they would like considered in the assessment of their application. If the research program can be used to demonstrate multiple impacts, the overall research impact score is determined holistically and on balance across the four types (it is not additive). This means that an applicant with one type of impact can score as well as or better than an applicant with multiple types of impact.

Whilst it is expected that the research impact is recent, the research program that contributed to the research impact may be from any time in a researcher's career – there are no time limits on when a researcher made a contribution to the research program or when the research program contributed to the research impact.

Applicants should note that there is no requirement for their research impact to align with the research proposal/vision in their application – these are assessed independently against separate assessment criteria and category descriptors.

The assessment of research impact will be against the category descriptors at Tables 2, 3 and 4 of [Attachment A](#).

The following is provided to assist applicants to complete the application form in NHMRC's granting system. Applicants should provide robust, verifiable evidence (qualitative and/or quantitative, see Table 1) to support the claimed research impact that can be independently assessed by peer reviewers.

**FIELD 1 – Reach and significance of the research impact** (maximum of 2000 characters including spaces and line breaks)

Describe the research impact and outline with corroborating evidence its reach and significance.

*Reach* is the extent, spread, breadth, and/or diversity of the beneficiaries of the impact, relative to the type of research impact.

*Significance* is the degree to which the impact has enabled, enriched, influenced, informed or changed the performance of policies, practices, products, services, culture, understanding, awareness or well-being of the beneficiaries (not the prevalence or magnitude of the issue).

**FIELD 2 – Research program's contribution to the research impact** (maximum of 2000 characters including spaces and line breaks)

Outline with corroborating evidence how the research program contributed to the research impact.

A *research program* is a cohesive body of research by the applicant. It is not limited to an individual case study (as used in a clinical context) or a single publication. A research program may be recent or in the past. Applicants need to outline the research program with corroborating evidence that can be independently assessed by peer reviewers.

*Research program's contribution to the research impact* is the degree to which the applicant's research program was necessary to achieve the impact(s) (knowledge, health, economic, and/or social impact) based on robust and verifiable evidence. The relationship between the applicant's research program (including related activities) and the impact may be foreseen or unforeseen, and may be an end product or demonstrated during the research process. Research impact examples may include the adoption or adaptation of existing research.

**FIELD 3 – Applicant's contribution to the research program** (maximum of 2000 characters including spaces and line breaks)

Outline with corroborating evidence your contribution to the research program.

An *applicant's contribution to the research program* is, relative to opportunity and to the applicant's field of research, the level of the applicant's contribution (e.g. leadership, intellectual and/or technical input) to the research program based on robust and verifiable evidence.

### 3.1.3 Leadership

For the assessment of leadership, applicants are required to outline their outputs over the past 10 years (taking into account career disruptions) across each of the four leadership elements:

1. Research Mentoring
2. Research Policy and Professional Leadership
3. Institutional Leadership
4. Research Programs and Team Leadership.

Each element will be addressed by applicants in separate fields within NHMRC's granting system (maximum of 2000 characters including spaces and line breaks per field).

The assessment of leadership will be against the category descriptors at Table 5 of [Attachment A](#).

## 3.2 Knowledge Gain (30%)

NHMRC defines “Knowledge Gain” for the Investigator Grant scheme as the quality of the proposed research and significance of the knowledge gained. It incorporates theoretical concepts, hypothesis, research design, robustness and the extent to which the research findings will contribute to the research area and health outcomes (by advancing knowledge, practice or policy).

### 3.2.1 Grant Proposal

The grant proposal must be written in English and submitted in a Portable Document Format (PDF) file, using the NHMRC’s Grant Proposal template, which will be available within the Grant Opportunity on GrantConnect closer to the opening date. Applicants must use this template. The grant proposal must then be uploaded into NHMRC’s granting system.

Naming and formatting requirements for the grant proposal are listed in Table 2. Applications that fail to comply with these requirements may be excluded from consideration.

Details to be addressed in the grant proposal and associated page limits are set out in Table 3. Applicants should note that peer reviewers will, as part of their assessment, consider the reproducibility and applicability of the proposed research and research design. Within the experimental design of the proposal, applicants should include sufficient information to demonstrate that robust and unbiased results will be produced.

**Table 2: Formatting Requirements**

Component	Component Requirements
File format	The grant proposal must be saved and uploaded as a PDF file
File size	The PDF file MUST NOT exceed 2MB in size
File name	The PDF file must be named using the following: APP ID_Applicant’s Surname_Document Type/Name.pdf E.g.: APP1234567_Smith_Grant Proposal.pdf
Page size	A4
Header	Application ID and Applicant surname must be included in the header
Footer	Page number must be included in the footer
Font	NHMRC recommends a minimum of 12 point Times New Roman font. Applicants must ensure the font is readable
Line spacing	Single
Language	English

**Table 3: Grant Proposal Details**

Component	Page Limit
A. Response to Knowledge Gain criterion (Research Proposal)	5 pages
B. References	2 pages
C. Indigenous Research Excellence Criteria, if applicable	2 pages

#### A. Research Proposal – 5 pages

When drafting the response to the knowledge gain criterion, applicants should:

- describe their research vision for the next five years
- outline the proposed research objectives, basic methodologies and expected outcomes
- describe the importance of the problem to be researched, the planned outcome of the research plan, and the potential significance of the research
- describe the support for their proposed research (e.g. access to technical resources, infrastructure, equipment and facilities, and if required, access to additional expertise necessary to achieve proposed outcomes).

The significance of the study is not a measure of the prevalence/incidence of the health issue (e.g. cancer versus sudden infant death syndrome).

Applications are assessed relative to opportunity, taking into consideration any career disruptions, where applicable.

The assessment of knowledge gain will be against the category descriptors at Table 6 of [Attachment A](#).

## **B. References – 2 pages**

References for the Research Proposal must:

- not exceed 2 pages
- provide a list of all references cited in the application in an appropriate standard journal format, NHMRC prefers the Author-date (also known as the Harvard System), Documentary-note and the Vancouver Systems
- list authors in the order in which they appear in PubMed
- only include references to cited work
- must be written in English.

## **C. Indigenous Research Excellence Criteria, if applicable – 2 pages**

To qualify as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health research, at least 20% of the research effort and/or capacity building must relate to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health.

Applicants should complete this section if at least 20% of the research effort and/or capacity building relates to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health and they answered 'yes' to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research question within NHMRC's granting system.

Applicants should ensure that they address each Indigenous Research Excellence Criterion as set out in section 6.1 of the *Investigator Grants 2019 Guidelines* and demonstrate:

- what proportion of the research effort will be directed to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health
- that the Indigenous community were instrumental in identifying and inviting further research into the health issue and that the research outcomes will directly benefit the 'named' communities
- that there is a history of working together with the 'named' communities e.g., co-development of the grant, involvement in pilot studies or how the 'named' communities will have input/control over the research process and outcomes across the life of the project
- that there is opportunity for two-way capacity development for both non-Indigenous and Indigenous investigators
- that the above points are explicit throughout the application and not just addressed separately within the Indigenous Research Excellence Criteria section of the grant proposal.

## **4. ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A: Investigator Grants 2019 Category Descriptors

## **Attachment A – Investigator Grants 2019 Category Descriptors**

The following category descriptors are used as a guide to scoring an application against each of the assessment criteria.

While the category descriptors provide peer reviewers with some benchmarks for appropriately scoring each application, **it is not essential that all descriptors relating to a given score are met.**

The category descriptors are a guide to a “best fit” outcome. Peer reviewers will consistently refer to these category descriptors to ensure thorough, equitable and transparent assessment of applications.

### **Assessing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Contributions**

It is recognised that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander applicants make additional valuable contributions to policy development, clinical/public health leadership and/or service delivery, community activities and linkages, and are often representatives on key committees. If applicable, these contributions should be considered when assessing research output and track record.

## Track Record, relative to opportunity (70%)

### Publications (35%)

Table 1. Publications

Score	Performance Indicator	Category Descriptors
7	<b>Exceptional</b>	Relative to opportunity (including career stage) and to their field of research, the applicant demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• an <b>exceptional</b> record of publications in terms of quality and contribution to science</li></ul>
6	<b>Outstanding</b>	Relative to opportunity (including career stage) and to their field of research, the applicant demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• an <b>outstanding</b> record of publications in terms of quality and contribution to science</li></ul>
5	<b>Excellent</b>	Relative to opportunity (including career stage) and to their field of research, the applicant demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• an <b>excellent</b> record of publications in terms of quality and contribution to science</li></ul>
4	<b>Very Good</b>	Relative to opportunity (including career stage) and to their field of research, the applicant demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a <b>very good</b> record of publications in terms of quality and contribution to science</li></ul>
3	<b>Good</b>	Relative to opportunity (including career stage) and to their field of research, the applicant demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a <b>good</b> record of publications in terms of quality and contribution to science</li></ul>
2	<b>Satisfactory</b>	Relative to opportunity (including career stage) and to their field of research, the applicant demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a <b>satisfactory</b> record of publications in terms of quality and contribution to science</li></ul>
1	<b>Weak or limited</b>	Relative to opportunity (including career stage) and to their field of research, the applicant demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a <b>weak or limited</b> record of publications in terms of quality and contribution to science</li></ul>

## Research Impact (20%)

Table 2. Reach and significance of the research impact (Emerging Leadership and Leadership)<sup>1</sup>

Emerging Leadership Score	Category Descriptors			Leadership Score
	<i>There is robust, verifiable evidence of:</i>	<i>Note: Applicants do not need to demonstrate all types of research impact</i>	<i>There is robust, verifiable evidence of:</i>	
7	an <b>exceptional</b> knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact	<p><b>Knowledge:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a paradigm changing development that has led to (a) new knowledge within the field that is recognised across multiple countries, (b) significant influence beyond the specific field of research or (c) the development of a new field(s) of research that has been recognised across multiple countries/beneficiaries</li> </ul> <p><b>Health</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a paradigm changing development that has improved health or health systems, services, policy, programs or clinical practice that (a) had a significant impact on health with an extensive reach, (b) had a profound impact on health with a modest reach, (c) profoundly improved the health of Australia's Indigenous people or (d) led to a significant, scalable and sustainable change in health systems and services in a large number of communities</li> </ul> <p><b>Economic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>development of a service delivery or system change, prevention program, intervention, device, therapeutic or change in clinical practice that led to (a) the generation of significant commercial income or (b) a profound reduction in healthcare costs</li> </ul> <p><b>Social</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>changes in policy that have had (a) a significant impact on the social well-being, equality or social inclusion of very large numbers of people at a national level or across multiple countries or (b) a profound impact on the social well-being of the end-user, public and community of a smaller number of individuals at a national level or across multiple countries</li> </ul>	an <b>exceptional</b> knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact	7
			an <b>outstanding</b> knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact	6

<sup>1</sup> For the assessment of research impact, different seven point scales are used for Emerging Leadership and Leadership applicants. This is to recognise that early and mid-career researchers will have had less time to accumulate research impact.

Emerging Leadership Score	Category Descriptors			Leadership Score
	<i>There is robust, verifiable evidence of:</i>	<i>Note: Applicants do not need to demonstrate all types of research impact</i>	<i>There is robust, verifiable evidence of:</i>	
7	an <b>exceptional</b> knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact	<p><b>Knowledge:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a major development that has led to (a) new knowledge within the field that is recognised nationally or across multiple countries, (b) a major influence beyond the specific field of research or (c) a major influence on the development of a new field(s) of research that has been recognised nationally or across multiple countries/beneficiaries</li> </ul> <p><b>Health</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>an important development that has improved health or health systems, services, policy, programs or clinical practice that (a) had a major impact on health with an extensive reach, (b) had a significant impact on health with a modest reach, (c) led to a significant improvement in the health of Australia's Indigenous people or (d) led to major scalable and sustainable change in health systems and services in a number of communities</li> </ul>	an <b>excellent</b> knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact	5
6	an <b>outstanding</b> knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact	<p><b>Economic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>development of a service delivery or system change, prevention program, intervention, device, therapeutic or change in clinical practice that led to (a) the generation of considerable commercial income or (b) a major reduction in healthcare costs</li> </ul> <p><b>Social</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>changes in policy that have either had (a) a major impact on the social well-being, equality or social inclusion of very large numbers of people at a local, state/territory or national level or (b) a significant impact on the social well-being of the end-user, public and community of a smaller number of individuals at a local, state/territory or national level</li> </ul>	a <b>very good</b> knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact	4
5	an <b>excellent</b> knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact	<p><b>Knowledge:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a change that has led to (a) new knowledge within the field that is recognised nationally or across multiple countries, (b) had some influence beyond the specific field of research, or (c) some influence on the development of a new field(s) of research that has been recognised nationally or across multiple countries/beneficiaries</li> </ul>	a <b>good</b> knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact	3
4	a <b>very good</b> knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact	<p><b>Health</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a development that has improved health or health systems, services, policy, programs or clinical practice that (a) had some impact on health with an extensive reach, (b) had a major impact on health with a modest reach, (c) led to a major improvement in the health of Australia's Indigenous people, or (d) led to some scalable and sustainable change in health systems and services in a small number of communities</li> </ul>		

Emerging Leadership Score	Category Descriptors			Leadership Score
	<i>There is robust, verifiable evidence of:</i>	<i>Note: Applicants do not need to demonstrate all types of research impact</i>	<i>There is robust, verifiable evidence of:</i>	
3	a <b>good</b> knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact	<p><b>Economic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>development of a service delivery or system change, prevention program, intervention, device, therapeutic or change in clinical practice that led to (a) the generation of some commercial income or (b) some reduction in healthcare costs</li> </ul> <p><b>Social</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>changes in policy that have had (a) some impact on the social well-being, equality or social inclusion of very large numbers of people at a local, state/territory or national level or (b) an impact on the social well-being of the end-user, public and community of a smaller number of individuals at a local, state/territory or national level</li> </ul>	a <b>satisfactory</b> knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact	2
2	a <b>satisfactory</b> knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact			
1	a <b>weak or limited</b> knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact	<p><i>There is limited or weak evidence of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the development of new knowledge</li> <li>improved health systems and services</li> <li>reductions in health care costs or economic growth</li> <li>improvements in social well-being, equality or social inclusion.</li> </ul>	a <b>weak or limited</b> knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact	1

**Table 3. Research Program's contribution to the Research Impact**

Score	Performance Indicator	Category Descriptors
7	<b>Exceptional</b>	Relative to opportunity and to their field of research, there is robust verifiable evidence that the applicant's research program made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an <b>exceptional</b> contribution to the knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact</li> </ul>
6	<b>Outstanding</b>	Relative to opportunity and to their field of research, there is robust verifiable evidence that the applicant's research program made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an <b>outstanding</b> contribution to the knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact</li> </ul>
5	<b>Excellent</b>	Relative to opportunity and to their field of research, there is robust verifiable evidence that the applicant's research program made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an <b>excellent</b> contribution to the knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact</li> </ul>
4	<b>Very good</b>	Relative to opportunity and to their field of research, there is robust verifiable evidence that the applicant's research program made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a <b>very good</b> contribution to the knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact</li> </ul>
3	<b>Good</b>	Relative to opportunity and to their field of research, there is robust verifiable evidence that the applicant's research program made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a <b>good</b> contribution to the knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact</li> </ul>
2	<b>Satisfactory</b>	Relative to opportunity and to their field of research, there is robust verifiable evidence that the applicant's research program made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a <b>satisfactory</b> contribution to the knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact</li> </ul>
1	<b>Weak, Limited or No</b>	Relative to opportunity and to their field of research, there is robust verifiable evidence that the applicant's research program made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a <b>weak, limited or no</b> contribution to the knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact</li> </ul>

**Table 4. Applicant's contribution to Research Program**

Score	Performance Indicator	Category Descriptors	
7	<b>Exceptional</b>	Relative to opportunity and to their field, there is robust verifiable evidence that the applicant made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>an <b>exceptional</b> contribution to the research program that led to a knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact</li> </ul>	Leadership <b>AND/OR</b> instrumental role in a research program
6	<b>Outstanding</b>	Relative to opportunity and to their field, there is robust verifiable evidence that the applicant made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>an <b>outstanding</b> contribution to the research program that led to a knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact</li> </ul>	
5	<b>Excellent</b>	Relative to opportunity and to their field, there is robust verifiable evidence that the applicant made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>an <b>excellent</b> contribution to the research program that led to a knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact</li> </ul>	Leadership of a <b>component AND/OR collaborative role</b> (e.g. co-investigator) in a research program
4	<b>Very Good</b>	Relative to opportunity and to their field, there is robust verifiable evidence that the applicant made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a <b>very good</b> contribution to the research program that led to a knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact</li> </ul>	
3	<b>Good</b>	Relative to opportunity and to their field, there is robust verifiable evidence that the applicant made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a <b>good</b> contribution to the research program that led to a knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact</li> </ul>	Contribution to a research program
2	<b>Satisfactory</b>	Relative to opportunity and to their field, there is robust verifiable evidence that the applicant made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a <b>satisfactory</b> contribution to the research program that led to a knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact</li> </ul>	
1	<b>Weak, Limited or No</b>	Relative to opportunity and to their field, there is robust verifiable evidence that the applicant made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a <b>weak, limited or no</b> contribution to the research program that led to a knowledge, health, economic and/or social impact</li> </ul>	Limited or no contribution to a research program

## Leadership (15%)

**Table 5. Leadership**

Score	Performance Indicator	Category Descriptors
7	<b>Exceptional</b>	<p>Relative to opportunity (including career stage) and to their field of research, the applicant demonstrates <b>exceptional</b> performance in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• supervision, mentoring, training and/or career development of staff and/or students within and/or beyond their research group</li> <li>• experience and contribution to the peer review of publications and grant applications, nationally and/or internationally</li> <li>• contribution to community engagement, public advocacy, government advisory boards or committees, professional societies at a local, national and/or international level</li> <li>• non-research contribution(s) to department, centre, institute or organisation e.g. leadership or membership of committee</li> <li>• conception and direction of a research project or program</li> <li>• building and maintaining collaborative networks necessary to achieve research outcomes within and/or beyond institution.</li> </ul>
6	<b>Outstanding</b>	<p>Relative to opportunity (including career stage) and to their field of research, the applicant demonstrates <b>outstanding</b> performance in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• supervision, mentoring, training and/or career development of staff and/or students within and/or beyond their research group</li> <li>• experience and contribution to the peer review of publications and grant applications, nationally and/or internationally</li> <li>• contribution to community engagement, public advocacy, government advisory boards or committees, professional societies at a local, national and/or international level</li> <li>• non-research contribution(s) to department, centre, institute or organisation e.g. leadership or membership of committee</li> <li>• conception and direction of a research project or program</li> <li>• building and maintaining collaborative networks necessary to achieve research outcomes within and/or beyond their institution.</li> </ul>
5	<b>Excellent</b>	<p>Relative to opportunity (including career stage) and to their field of research, the applicant demonstrates <b>excellent</b> performance in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• supervision, mentoring, training and/or career development of staff and/or students within and/or beyond their research group</li> <li>• experience and contribution to the peer review of publications and grant applications, nationally and/or internationally</li> <li>• contribution to community engagement, public advocacy, government advisory boards or committees, professional societies at a local, national and/or international level</li> <li>• non-research contribution(s) to department, centre, institute or organisation e.g. leadership or membership of committee</li> <li>• conception and direction of a research project or program</li> <li>• building and maintaining collaborative networks necessary to achieve research outcomes within and/or beyond their institution.</li> </ul>

4	<b>Very Good</b>	<p>Relative to opportunity (including career stage) and to their field of research, the applicant demonstrates <b>very good</b> performance in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• supervision, mentoring, training and/or career development of staff and students within and/or beyond their research group</li> <li>• experience and contribution to the peer review of publications and grant applications, nationally and/or internationally</li> <li>• contribution to community engagement, public advocacy, government advisory boards or committees, professional societies at a local, national and/or international level</li> <li>• non-research contribution(s) to department, centre, institute or organisation e.g. leadership or membership of committee</li> <li>• conception and direction of a research project or program</li> <li>• building and maintaining collaborative networks necessary to achieve research outcomes within and/or beyond their institution.</li> </ul>
3	<b>Good</b>	<p>Relative to opportunity (including career stage) and to their field of research, the applicant demonstrates <b>good</b> performance in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• supervision, mentoring, training and/or career development of staff and/or students within and/or beyond their research group</li> <li>• experience and contribution to the peer review of publications and grant applications, nationally and/or internationally</li> <li>• contribution to community engagement, public advocacy, government advisory boards or committees, professional societies at a local, national and/or international level</li> <li>• non-research contribution(s) to department, centre, institute or organisation e.g. leadership or membership of committee</li> <li>• conception and direction of a research project or program</li> <li>• building and maintaining collaborative networks necessary to achieve research outcomes within and/or beyond their institution.</li> </ul>
2	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<p>Relative to opportunity (including career stage) and to their field of research, the applicant demonstrates <b>satisfactory</b> performance in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• supervision, mentoring, training and/or career development of staff and/or students within and/or beyond their research group</li> <li>• experience and contribution to the peer review of publications and grant applications, nationally and/or internationally</li> <li>• contribution to community engagement, public advocacy, government advisory boards or committees, professional societies at a local, national and/or international level</li> <li>• non-research contribution(s) to department, centre, institute or organisation e.g. leadership or membership of committee</li> <li>• conception and direction of a research project or program</li> <li>• building and maintaining collaborative networks necessary to achieve research outcomes within and/or beyond their institution.</li> </ul>

1	<b>Weak or limited</b>	<p>Relative to opportunity (including career stage) and to their field of research, the applicant demonstrates <b>weak or limited</b> performance in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• supervision, mentoring, training and/or career development of staff and/or students within and/or beyond their research group</li> <li>• experience and contribution to the peer review of publications and grant applications, nationally and/or internationally</li> <li>• contribution to community engagement, public advocacy, government advisory boards or committees, professional societies at a local, national and/or international level</li> <li>• non-research contribution(s) to department, centre, institute or organisation e.g. leadership or membership of committee</li> <li>• conception and direction of a research project or program</li> <li>• building and maintaining collaborative networks necessary to achieve research outcomes within and/or beyond their institution.</li> </ul>
---	------------------------	---

## Knowledge Gain (30%)

Table 6. Knowledge Gain

Score	Performance Indicator	Category Descriptors
7	<b>Exceptional</b>	<p>The proposed research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is supported by an <b>extremely well</b> justified and reasoned hypothesis/rationale</li> <li>• has a scientific framework, design, methods and analyses that are <b>flawless, highly</b> developed and <b>highly</b> appropriate</li> <li>• demonstrates to an <b>extremely high level</b> that it addresses an issue of <b>critical importance</b> to advance the research or health area (not prevalence or magnitude of the issue)</li> <li>• has or has access to <b>exceptional</b> technical resources, infrastructure, equipment and facilities, and if required, has access to additional expertise necessary to achieve proposed outcomes</li> <li>• <b>will</b> result in <b>extremely</b> significant and <b>transformative</b> changes/outcomes in the scientific knowledge, practice or policy underpinning human health issues</li> <li>• <b>will</b> lead to <b>extremely</b> significant research outputs (e.g. intellectual property, publications, policy advice, products, services, teaching aids, consulting, contract research, spin-offs, licensing)</li> <li>• would be <b>extremely</b> competitive with the best, similar research proposals internationally.</li> </ul>
6	<b>Outstanding</b>	<p>The proposed research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is supported by a <b>very well</b> justified and reasoned hypothesis/rationale</li> <li>• has a scientific framework, design, methods and analyses that <b>are well</b> developed and <b>highly</b> appropriate <b>with only a few minor weaknesses</b></li> <li>• demonstrates to a <b>very high level</b> that it addresses an issue that is <b>very important</b> to advance the research or health area (not prevalence or magnitude of the issue)</li> <li>• has or has access to <b>outstanding</b> technical resources, infrastructure, equipment and facilities, and if required, has access to additional expertise necessary to achieve proposed outcomes</li> <li>• <b>will</b> result in <b>very highly</b> significant and <b>substantial</b> changes/outcomes in the scientific knowledge, practice or policy underpinning human health issues</li> <li>• <b>will</b> lead to <b>very highly</b> significant research outputs (e.g. intellectual property, publications, policy advice, products, services, teaching aids, consulting, contract research, spin-offs, licensing)</li> <li>• would be <b>highly</b> competitive with the best, similar research proposals internationally.</li> </ul>

5	<b>Excellent</b>	<p>The proposed research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is supported by a <b>well</b> justified and reasoned hypothesis/rationale</li> <li>• has a scientific framework, design, methods and analyses that <b>are well</b> developed and <b>highly</b> appropriate <b>with several minor weaknesses</b></li> <li>• demonstrates to a <b>high</b> level that it addresses an issue that is of <b>considerable importance</b> to advance the research or health area (not prevalence or magnitude of the issue)</li> <li>• has or has access to <b>excellent</b> technical resources, infrastructure, equipment and facilities, and if required, has access to additional expertise necessary to achieve proposed outcomes</li> <li>• <b>will</b> result in <b>highly significant</b> and <b>substantial</b> changes/outcomes in the scientific knowledge, practice or policy underpinning human health issues</li> <li>• <b>will</b> lead to <b>highly</b> significant research outputs (e.g. intellectual property, publications, policy advice, products, services, teaching aids, consulting, contract research, spin-offs, licensing)</li> <li>• would be <b>competitive</b> with the best, similar research proposals internationally.</li> </ul>
4	<b>Very Good</b>	<p>The proposed research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is supported by a <b>well</b> justified and reasoned hypothesis/rationale</li> <li>• has a scientific framework, design, methods and analyses that <b>are well</b> developed and <b>highly</b> appropriate <b>with a few minor concerns</b></li> <li>• demonstrates that it addresses an issue that is of <b>importance</b> to advance the research or health area (not prevalence or magnitude of the issue)</li> <li>• has or has access to <b>very good</b> technical resources, infrastructure, equipment and facilities, and if required, has access to additional expertise necessary to achieve proposed outcomes</li> <li>• <b>is likely</b> to result in <b>significant and substantial</b> changes/outcomes in the scientific knowledge, practice or policy underpinning human health issue</li> <li>• <b>is likely</b> to lead to <b>significant</b> research outputs (e.g. intellectual property, publications, policy advice, products, services, teaching aids, consulting, contract research, spin-offs, licensing)</li> <li>• would <b>likely be competitive</b> with <b>high quality, similar research proposals</b> internationally.</li> </ul>

3	<b>Good</b>	<p>The proposed research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is supported by a justified and sound hypothesis/rationale</li> <li>• has a scientific framework, design, methods and analyses that are developed and appropriate with several minor concerns</li> <li>• demonstrates that it is addressing an issue that is of some importance to advance the research or health area (not prevalence or magnitude of the issue)</li> <li>• has or has access to good technical resources, infrastructure, equipment and facilities, and if required, has access to additional expertise necessary to achieve proposed outcomes</li> <li>• could result in significant and substantial changes/outcomes in the scientific knowledge, practice or policy underpinning human health issues</li> <li>• could lead to significant research outputs (e.g. intellectual property, publications, policy advice, products, services, teaching aids, consulting, contract research, spin-offs, licensing)</li> <li>• would be somewhat competitive with high quality, similar research proposals internationally.</li> </ul>
2	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<p>The proposed research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is supported by a reasoned hypothesis/rationale</li> <li>• has a scientific framework, design, methods and analyses that are generally sound but may lack clarity in some aspects and/or may contain notable weaknesses/concerns</li> <li>• demonstrates that it is addressing an issue that is of marginal importance to advance the research or health area (not prevalence or magnitude of the issue)</li> <li>• has or has access to some/most but not all of the technical resources, infrastructure, equipment and facilities, and if required, has access to additional expertise necessary to achieve proposed outcomes</li> <li>• could result in appreciable improvements/outcomes in the scientific knowledge, practice or policy underpinning human health issues</li> <li>• could lead to moderately significant research outputs (e.g. intellectual property, publications, policy advice, products, services, teaching aids, consulting, contract research, spin-offs, licensing)</li> <li>• would be marginally competitive with high quality, similar research proposals internationally.</li> </ul>

1	<b>Marginal to Poor</b>	<p>The proposed research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has a weak hypothesis/rationale</li> <li>• has a scientific framework, design, methods and analyses <b>that have significant flaws and may contain major weaknesses</b></li> <li>• demonstrates that it is addressing an issue of <b>some concern</b> to advance the research or health area (not prevalence or magnitude of the issue)</li> <li>• <b>does not</b> have access to the technical resources, infrastructure, equipment and facilities or access to additional expertise necessary to achieve proposed outcomes (if required)</li> <li>• is <b>unlikely</b> to result in <b>improvements/outcomes</b> in the scientific knowledge, practice or policy underpinning human health issues of <b>significance</b></li> <li>• is <b>unlikely</b> to lead to research outputs (e.g. intellectual property, publications, policy advice, products, services, teaching aids, consulting, contract research, spin-offs, licensing) of <b>significance</b></li> <li>• is unlikely to be <b>competitive</b> with <b>similar research proposals</b> internationally.</li> </ul>
---	-------------------------	---