

	Category	Sub-Category	Criteria	1 = Not evident	2 = Fair	3 = Excellent	Weighting	Score out of 3	Weighted Score
Applicant	Applicant may be an individual or a practice	Esteem	Individual: Applicant has distinguished academic/career history - relevant to career stage	I: Poor academic/career history	I: Good academic/career history	I: Outstanding academic/career history	15%	3	0.45
			Practice: Practice is established and reputable	P: Not established / disreputable	P: Reasonably established/ reputable	P: Established and reputable			
Project	Project may be for education, equipment, career development or an initial research phase.	Rationale	Project has a clear rationale with the nature and significance of the problem clearly explained.	Unclear rationale	Moderately clear rationale	Clear rationale	20%	3	0.6
		Importance	The problem that the project is seeking to address is important	The problem that the project is seeking to address is not important	The problem that the project is seeking to address is somewhat important	The problem that the project is seeking to address is important	20%	3	0.6
		Outcomes	The proposed outcomes have been clearly articulated. <i>(Please note, the outcomes do not need to be achieved during the grant period, however the proposed outcomes and impact of the work must be clear)</i>	Poorly articulated impact	Moderately articulated impact	Clearly articulated impact	15%	3	0.45
		Reasonable budget	The budget is reasonable for what is proposed	Not reasonable	Somewhat reasonable	Very reasonable	15%	3	0.45
		Budget clarity	There is clarity in how the funding will be allocated (e.g. personnel, direct research, equipment)	Lack of clarity	Moderate clarity	Clarity	15%	3	0.45
<b>TOTAL</b>							<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>

Final weighted score