



# EME Program Research Proposals Assessment Criteria

Proposal Details	
Project Title:	Text
Primary Investigator(s):	Text
Associate Investigator(s):	Text
Organisation(s):	Text
<b>Criteria:</b> (Using the Category descriptors please comment on the criteria below)	
Objectives and Methodology	Text <span style="float: right;">Score: /10</span>
Significance	Text <span style="float: right;">Score: /10</span>
Research Team Quality and Capability	Text <span style="float: right;">Score: /10</span>
Reporting of Results	Text <span style="float: right;">Score: /5</span>
Resources	Text <span style="float: right;">Score: /5</span>
Other issues/comments	Text Please use this space to make any other comments relating to this proposal, not made elsewhere
Assessed By:	Name: _____ Signature: _____ <span style="float: right;">Total Score: /40</span>

## EME Program Research Proposals Category Descriptors

Category	Objectives and Methodology	Significance	Research Team Quality and Capability
Excellent 9 - 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The methods described are robust and suitable to the aims and objectives</li> <li>- The methods described are clearly defined and feasible</li> <li>- The timescale and schedule of the proposed work is appropriate and achievable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposal addresses gaps in knowledge identified in the <a href="#">ARPANSA EME Research Agenda (2017)</a>, or recognised/peer-reviewed reports and reviews, and will result in a highly significant advance in knowledge</li> <li>- Addresses key areas of public concern that will benefit from further research</li> <li>- The project proposal will contribute to the greater scientific body of evidence that forms the basis for safety standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Demonstrated extensive expertise for proposed research project</li> <li>- Strong and recent (last 5 years) record of publications in EME research or other relevant field (relative to opportunity)</li> </ul>
Very Good 7 - 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The methods described are suitable to the aims and objectives</li> <li>- The methods described are defined and feasible</li> <li>- The timescale and schedule of the proposed project is achievable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposal addresses gaps in knowledge identified in the <a href="#">ARPANSA EME Research Agenda (2017)</a>, or recognised/peer-reviewed reports and reviews, and will result in an advance in knowledge</li> <li>- Addresses areas of public concern that will benefit from further evidence</li> <li>- The project proposal may contribute to the greater scientific body of evidence that forms the basis for safety standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expertise that is highly relevant to proposed research project</li> <li>- Multiple publications in recent years in EME research or other relative field (relative to opportunity)</li> </ul>
Acceptable 5 - 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The methods described are adequate to address the main aims and objectives of the proposed project</li> <li>- The methods described are feasible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposal addresses minor gaps in knowledge identified in the <a href="#">ARPANSA EME Research Agenda (2017)</a>, or recognised/peer-reviewed reports and reviews, which may incrementally advance knowledge</li> <li>- Addresses areas of public concern that may benefit from further research</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expertise relevant to proposed research project</li> <li>- Multiple publications in EME research or another relevant field (relative to opportunity)</li> </ul>

	- The timescale and schedule of the proposed work is manageable with only minor concerns	- The project proposal may contribute to the greater scientific body of evidence that forms the basis for safety standards	
Poor 3 - 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The methods described are unclear to the main aims and objectives of the proposed project</li> <li>- The methods described are not clearly defined and are not feasible</li> <li>- There are major concerns regarding the timescale and schedule of the proposed work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposal does not address gaps in knowledge identified in the <a href="#">ARPANSA EME Research Agenda (2017)</a>, or recognised/peer-reviewed reports and reviews and is unlikely to advance knowledge</li> <li>- Does not address areas of public concern that may benefit from further research</li> <li>- The project proposal is unlikely to contribute to the greater scientific body of evidence that forms the basis for safety standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are deficiencies in some areas for the level of expertise required to successfully complete project</li> <li>- Not many publications in EME research or another relative field (relative to opportunity)</li> </ul>
Not Satisfactory 1 - 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The methods described are not suitable to the aims and objectives</li> <li>- The methods described are not clearly defined and are not feasible</li> <li>- The timescale and schedule of the proposed work is not appropriate or achievable</li> <li>-The project is unlikely to be successfully completed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposal does not addresses gaps in knowledge identified in the <a href="#">ARPANSA EME Research Agenda (2017)</a>, or recognised/peer-reviewed reports and reviews and will not advance knowledge</li> <li>- Does not address areas of public concern that may benefit from further research</li> <li>- The project proposal will not contribute to the greater scientific body of evidence that forms the basis for safety standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No demonstrated expertise required to successfully complete project</li> <li>- Little to no history of EME research or other relative field</li> </ul>

## EME Program Research Proposals Category Descriptors

Category	Reporting of Results*	Resources
Excellent 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The results of the proposed project are likely to be submitted to a credible scientific journal</li> <li>- The results of the proposed project are likely to be presented at conferences and/ or events open to the public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The requested amount is well budgeted and expected to cover the completion of the project                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are no unnecessary costs</li> <li>- The benefits of the project justify the costs</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Very Good 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The results of the proposed study are likely to be submitted to a credible scientific journal</li> <li>- The plans to further disseminate the research findings are likely to be effective in informing the target audience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The requested amount is well budgeted and expected to cover the completion of the project                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inflated costs are kept to a minimum</li> <li>- The benefits of the project justify the cost</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Acceptable 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The results of the proposed study are likely to be submitted to a credible scientific journal</li> <li>- The plans to further disseminate the research findings are unlikely to be effective in informing the target audience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The requested amount is likely to be sufficient without being excessive to complete the proposed project.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inflated costs are kept to a minimum</li> <li>- The benefits of the project are likely to be worth the cost</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Poor 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The results of the proposed study are unlikely to be submitted to a credible scientific journal</li> <li>- The plans to further disseminate the research findings are unlikely to be effective in informing the target audience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The requested amount is slightly excessive or slightly inadequate to satisfactorily complete the proposed project                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are inflated costs</li> <li>- The benefits of the project are unlikely to be worth the cost</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Not Satisfactory 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The results of the proposed study are unlikely to be submitted to a scientific journal</li> <li>- There are no further plans to disseminate the research</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The requested amount is excessive or inadequate to satisfactorily complete the proposed project                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are unnecessary costs</li> <li>- The project is poor value for the money requested</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

- \* For small/seed research projects (<\$30,000) aspects of the reporting of results criteria may not apply
- *Note: Proposals that have an aggregate score below 21, or that score poor or not satisfactory for any criteria point will not be considered for funding.*