

CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING POTENTIAL OUTRUN CANCER RESEARCH AND ACTIVITY GRANTS

Project Name:

Project/research description and expected outcomes:

Provide an outline of the project/research that would be funded by Outrun Cancer, the objective and/or rationale and the expected outcomes or outputs that would be achieved.

Potential Impact of research/project:

Explain how the research or project will have an important positive impact on human lives, including any of the following aspects: better understanding of lifestyle factors and their contribution to cancer, increasing awareness of healthy lifestyle in cancer prevention, improving the community's health behaviours.

Community need or research gap being addressed

Explain how the project meets a need in the community; how does this address an unmet need and/or complement other projects rather than duplicating existing programs or services? Explain how the research builds on existing evidence to fill a gap in our knowledge about healthy lifestyle and cancer prevention.

Equity/Target group

Explain the selection of the study sample or target groups and why you have included and excluded particular groups who could potentially benefit from the outcomes of this research or project. If relevant, outline how the proposal addresses an under-studied or under-served population and/or a population with a high burden of disease or poorer outcomes.

Alignment to Outrun Cancer principles and desired outcomes:

Explain how the research or project is aligned with principles and desired outcomes outlined in the Outrun Cancer research and activities guidelines?

Alignment to Cancer Council strategic intent:

To what extent is this project aligned with Cancer Council NSW existing strategic intent with respect to prevention and research. If this is a Cancer Council project or research, does Cancer Council currently have capacity to effectively deliver and/or manage the research or project?

Pathway for realising the benefit:

Provide a clear description of the steps required to reach the stated end benefits of the research. Outline a timeline for the project or research including any key milestones or deliverables. How would the results of the research or outputs of the project be impact on cancer prevention activities? How would this research or project continue to deliver benefits after the funding has ceased? How would you ensure sustainability of programs beyond Outrun Cancer funding?

Branding and promotional opportunities

Outline opportunities to promote the collaboration between and Outrun Cancer and Cancer Council NSW to enhance the reputation of both organisations, demonstrate leadership in this area and raise awareness of the importance healthy lifestyle in cancer prevention.

Proposed budget:

Please provide a general outline of the required budget including staff costs, costs of resources and project material, other research costs. Please also list any in-kind contribution that would be provided.

Scoring criteria:

Reviewers independently score each of the xxx review criteria outline above on a range of 0-7. To derive the overall score for an application, average scores across all individual reviewers are calculated for each criterion, and then added together to produce the final score out of a maximum of xxx.

The scoring guide below is included to provide overall guidance for reviewers in scoring of each grant proposal against the above criteria.

7. Outstanding

Response is of the highest quality. It provides all the information required, is easily understood, and there is no possibility for improvement.

6. Excellent

An impressive response which provides all required information clearly and in detail.

5. Very good

The response provides most of the information required in a clear and detailed way. Little else could be included.

4. Good

The response is basically sound, but could be improved with a little more detail. The response contains minor gaps, or slight confusion in some parts.

3. Satisfactory

A barely acceptable response which response addresses the criterion but provides minimal detail, is confused and/or includes some irrelevant information.

2. Poor

The response suffers serious inadequacies such as little or no detail, irrelevant information and/or confusion.

1. Inadequate

The response does not address the question except in the most fleeting way or is inappropriate to the question. The information provided is very brief or generally irrelevant.

0. No response

There is no response, or a response that does not address the question. Nowhere else in the application is there any information relevant to the question.