|  |
| --- |
| **Collaborative Research Grants Application Scoring Template** |
|

|  |
| --- |
| **Scoring** |
| **Value** | **Meaning** |
| Does not meet criteria | * No response provided
* Significant misunderstanding of criteria
 |
| Partially meets criteria | * Some evidence of meeting the criteria
* Some evidence of ability to deliver, but some concerns raised
 |
| Mostly meets criteria | * Meets majority but not all parts of criteria
* Adequate evidence of ability to deliver
 |
| Fully meets criteria | * Meets all aspects of criteria
* Clear proposal showing comprehension
* Demonstrates ability to deliver
 |

 | **Panel Member Name:** |  |
| **Project title:** |  |
|  |  |
| **Area for consideration** | **Criteria** | **Comments**Please provide explanation of how the proposal meets the criteria and identify any strengths and gaps in the application | **Score** |
| Originality | Research questions are focused, feasible and specificProject aims and objectives are clear, focused and conciseRelevant background provided including a brief overview of the relevant literature and has identified the need or gap in knowledge for the projectProject is original and will contribute new knowledge, building on previous work |  | Choose an item. |
| Relevance | Project meets BACP’s overarching research priority of ‘client focussed’ researchProject addresses one or more of BACP’s strategic priorities or workstreamsProject will have substantive and sustainable impact on relevant practice, programmes and/or policies within the counselling, psychotherapy or coaching professions |  | Choose an item. |
| Methods | Well-designed, appropriate and feasible methods proposedProposed research design and methods are appropriate to answer the research questionsAppropriate sampling and participant recruitment strategy proposedDue consideration given to collection, analysis and management of data People with lived experience (PLE) are appropriately involved in the project’s design, delivery and dissemination, or a reasonable justification is provided for why PLE are not involved Project adequately addresses issues of equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI)Ethical considerations are clearly articulated and ethical approval processes outlined |  | Choose an item. |
| Feasibility/deliverability | Identified stakeholders are appropriate and will add value to the projectProposed outputs are realistic and add value to project deliveryProposed publication and dissemination plans are clear, ambitious and impactfulMedium- to long term outcomes and key indicators are appropriate and realistic Project risks identified and strong mitigations proposed to minimise risk Team and staffing arrangements are appropriate with team members who have relevant skills, experience and expertiseClear collaborative working arrangements outlined which add value to project deliveryAppropriate oversight, advisory and governance structures proposedViable and realistic project delivery timescales proposed Appropriate and achievable project activities outlinedIf project is under consideration for funding elsewhere, clear information is provided about the additional bid, including an indication of timelines. If a partnership funding model has been proposed, there is clarity around the co-funding relationship and the elements being funded by the different funders.If project has been rejected from funding previously, appropriate changes been made to the proposalDetailed budget provided is adequate, appropriate and offers value for money, with all budget lines justified |  | Choose an item. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Overall judgement** | Choose an item. |
| **Feedback** |
| **Overall review and feedback to applicants** |  |
| **How could this project or application be improved?** |  |