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1. About this document

The NHMRC Translating Research Into Practice (TRIP) Fellowship Peer Review Guidelines for funding commencing in 2015 (the Guidelines) describe the general process, procedures and timeline for peer reviewing TRIP Fellowship applications. They also contain important information about the conduct of peer review. The TRIP Fellowship Peer Review Panel (PRP) will be provided with separate detailed instructions for each phase of the peer review process.

These Guidelines complement the NHMRC Funding Rules incorporating the Translating Research Into Practice (TRIP) Fellowship Funding Rules for commencing in 2015 (the Funding Rules), which were made available to applicants to assist them in preparing and submitting their applications. It is important that the Guidelines be read in conjunction with the Funding Rules. The Funding Rules contain essential information about the aims of the TRIP Fellowship scheme, eligibility and the requirements of the scheme, the application process and other relevant matters. The Funding Rules can be found at:


2. Changes to the peer review process

- Assessment Criteria have been reduced from three to two;
- Assessment Criterion weightings have been modified, and
- Initial scoring process has been introduced at the shortlisting stage (see section 5.7.2 Preliminary Scoring of Applications).

3. Conduct during Peer Review

All participants in the peer review process must observe, or be aware of, relevant policies and standards. Please refer to A Guide to NHMRC Peer Review sections 1-4.


3.1 Career Disruptions

Peer Reviewers will need to take into account any career disruptions experienced by applicants. Please refer to the NHMRC Funding Rules subsection A3.7.1 Career Disruption for further details.

3.1.1 Sensitive Career Disruption

If the Career Disruption is of a highly sensitive nature, the applicant may not wish to share specific information with the Peer Review Panel and may have submitted details separately to NHMRC. For example, an applicant may consider their medical condition to be of a personal nature and therefore may wish to submit a Career Disruption claim separately.

Senior staff at NHMRC will review the sensitive career disruption claim. If the claim has been accepted, they will advise the panel on the period of time affected by the disruption.

Details may also be provided of how the disruption may have affected the applicant’s track record.

4. Peer Review Participants

Participants in the peer review process are identified in the Peer Review Participants table below, including a description of their roles and responsibilities. Following the peer review process, key participants in the peer review process will be publicly acknowledged on the NHMRC website without reference to the specific application(s) that they assessed.
### 4.1 Peer Review Participants Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.1 Research Committee Portfolio Representative</strong></td>
<td>The Research Committee Portfolio Representative is a member of NHMRC Research Committee. Their primary duties and responsibilities are to: • identify and advise the NHMRC of all real or potential CoIs they have with applications; • provide advice to the Chairs to ensure consistency in assessment approaches across Panels; • along with the NHMRC and Chairs, monitor progress and contribute to finding solutions for any problems that may arise; and • support NHMRC staff as they implement policy and follow established procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.2 Community Observer</strong></td>
<td>During Peer Review Panel discussions, independent Observers may be present to: • monitor procedural aspects of the PRP’s conduct; and • provide feedback to NHMRC on the consistency of procedures. Observers will be briefed on the peer review process. They will not participate in the discussion of any application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.3 Peer Review Panel Chair</strong></td>
<td>The primary duties and responsibilities of the Panel Chair are to ensure NHMRC’s procedures are adhered to and that a fair and equitable consideration is given to every application being reviewed by the PRP. Chairs are appointed to be independent of the review of research proposals, and must manage the process of peer review in accordance with these guidelines. The Chair will: • familiarise themselves with documentation relevant to the funding scheme; • identify and advise the NHMRC of all real or potential CoIs they have with applications assigned to the PRP; • confirm all CoI rulings and ensure appropriate action is taken in relation to declared CoIs; • familiarise themselves with ALL applications being considered by the PRP, excluding those for which they have declared CoI; • confirm the assignment of applications to PRPs and allocation of Spokespersons to applications; • ensure consistency when reviewing Indigenous health external assessments; • chair the PRP meetings; • keep discussion on time and focussed; • ensure procedures are followed; • assist panel members in fulfilling their duties and responsibilities; • promote good engagement by Spokesperson and panel members; • ensure that discussion leads to an outcome where the application is scored against the assessment criteria or deemed to be non-competitive; • ensure that discussion of applications under review include the consideration of additional awards where relevant; • ensure consistency across discussions and interviews; • in consultation with the NHMRC, confirm applications identified as being non-competitive; • endorse the review and scoring of applications; and • approve relevant Meeting Attendance Record sheets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.4 Peer Review Panel Member</strong></td>
<td>The primary duties and responsibilities of a panel member are to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | • familiarise themselves with documentation relevant to the funding scheme;  
|      | • identify and advise the NHMRC of all real or potential CoIs they have with applications assigned to their PRP;  
|      | • provide a fair and impartial assessment of applications against the assessment criteria in a timely manner;  
|      | • read and have a thorough understanding of all applications being assessed by the PRP (excluding those for which they have a declared CoI), paying particular attention to those for which they are spokesperson;  
|      | • ensure consistency when reviewing Indigenous health external assessments;  
|      | • act as a spokesperson for applications in their broad research area;  
|      | • prepare for and participate in panel discussion for each application to the best of their ability, consider applicant track record relative to opportunity;  
|      | • confirm the identification of non-competitive applications; and  
|      | • provide a score against the assessment criteria for each application reviewed by the PRP. |

4.1.5 **Primary Spokesperson (1SP)**

The primary duties and responsibilities of a 1SP are to:

- lead the PRP meeting discussion/interview on the competitiveness of the application against the aims of the scheme and the assessment criteria;  
- ensure productivity relative to opportunity and career are properly considered; and  
- formulate questions to be addressed by the applicants and ensure that they are addressed at interview.

4.1.6 **Secondary Spokesperson (2SP)**

The primary duties and responsibilities of a 2SP are to:

- support the application discussion at the PRP meeting on the competitiveness of the application against the aims of the scheme and the assessment criteria;  
- ensure productivity relative to opportunity and career disruptions are properly considered; and  
- formulate questions to be addressed by the applicants and ensure that they are addressed at interview.

4.1.7 **Additional Experts**

Additional Experts with research expertise and experience in the specific field(s) of an application may be appointed to provide advice at PRP meetings or interviews. Additional Experts do not participate in scoring of applications and must identify and advise the NHMRC of all real or potential CoIs they have with applications assigned to them.

Additional Experts may:

- provide advice to the PRP regarding the context of the applicant’s research field and their standing in that field; and  
- provide advice to the PRP on the applicant’s track record and the competitiveness of the application based on the applicant’s current stage in their career.

4.1.8 **Senior NHMRC Staff**

NHMRC staff with doctoral degrees or extensive research expertise will be involved in:

- establishing peer review panels;  
- reviewing allocations of applications to panels and Spokespersons;  
- assisting and advising on the peer review process; and  
- acting as an alternative independent chair when the Panel Chair and RC Portfolio Representative has a CoI with the application under
4.1.9 NHMRC Staff

Under direction from the CEO, NHMRC staff will be responsible for overall administration of the peer review process and may be responsible for the conduct of the following specific activities.

- approach potential panel members;
- assign applications to the appropriate panels;
- assign spokespersons to applications;
- provide the following administrative support and advice to the Chair and panel members:
  - facilitate use of RGMS;
  - maintain accurate records of CoIs;
  - ensure that the Chair has approved all CoIs declared by members;
  - provide advice on the treatment of declared CoI;
- provide policy advice to the Panel Chair and panel members;
- ensure that all panel members/assessors are provided with the necessary information to review each application;
- prepare a list of non-competitive applications for consideration by the Chair and panel members;
- prepare the order in which applications will be assessed during PRP meetings;
- maintain scoring records for each application;
- record outcome of PRP recommendations;
- act as the first point of contact for panel members and community observers;
- consider recommendations from observers to improve peer review procedures/processes; and
- record and notify NHMRC Senior Staff of any requests for clarification or advice.

4.2 Peer Review Panels

Peer Review Panels are established to review all TRIP Fellowship applications.

The Panel is composed of an independent Chair and members (the number depending on the number of applications received). Where required, Expert and/or Additional Members in specified fields will be called upon. An NHMRC Staff member will be assigned to assist with the panel administration.

Panel members are chosen for their expertise and experience. Geographical spread, gender balance and institutional representation are also considered when determining each panel’s membership. Members should currently hold, or have held, a health or medical research grant obtained through a nationally or internationally competitive peer review process. Members are appointed for one year, and are generally not reappointed for more than three consecutive years.

Current TRIP Fellowship applicants are not permitted to participate in the assessment process as panel members.

In the event of a panel member withdrawing from the peer review process, the NHMRC will, if time permits, replace them with another member possessing appropriate expertise relevant to the PRP. If a replacement member cannot be found, the NHMRC will reallocate the application(s) within the relevant PRP, ensuring that the expertise required for each application is appropriately represented. If the panel member is contactable after withdrawing from the process, the NHMRC may contact the member with queries relating to the applications originally allocated to them.

4.2.1 Quorum

A quorum must be present for an application to be reviewed and scored. For the purposes of PRP meetings a quorum is one member more than half the total number of panel members. NHMRC will endeavour to identify, prior to PRP meetings, those applications that do not have a quorum and obtain a suitably qualified additional
5 Peer Review Process

The NHMRC peer review is expected to provide a rigorous, fair, transparent and consistent assessment of the merits of each application in keeping with NHMRC’s Principles of Peer Review (the Principles) [www.nhmrc.gov.au/grants/peer-review/nhmrc-principles-peer-review](http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/grants/peer-review/nhmrc-principles-peer-review) and the Code.

Peer review of TRIP Fellowships is a two stage process with an initial review and shortlisting of applications, followed by shortlisted applicants proceeding to interview.

5.1 Receipt and Initial Processing of Applications

NHMRC staff will verify that TRIP Fellowship applications meet eligibility criteria.

5.2 Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander Research Assessment

Applications relating specifically to Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander Peoples’ health will be identified by information provided by the applicant in their application.

Those applications identified will be subject to NHMRC’s Criteria for Health and Medical Research of Indigenous Australians (Attachment A). The extent to which the application fulfils these criteria in relation to research into the health of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples will be considered by a suitable external assessor with appropriate expertise, and also take into consideration the applicant’s track record relative to opportunity.

5.3 Assignment of Applications to PRPs

Applicants will indicate which specific field of research or particular stream best fits their application. In the case where two or more panels have been appointed, Senior NHMRC Staff will allocate applications to the most appropriate panel based on the information provided by applicants. These allocations are confirmed by the panel chairs.

5.4 Identification of CoI

Panel members will be provided access, via NHMRC’s Research Grants Management System (RGMS) to the Snapshot Summary Report of each application assigned to the PRP, and will declare their CoI in accordance with the guidance on the management of CoI. Refer to A guide to NHMRC Peer Review section 4.3 [www.nhmrc.gov.au/book/guide-nhmrc-peer-review/4-conduct-during-peer-review](http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/book/guide-nhmrc-peer-review/4-conduct-during-peer-review).

Panel members will be given access to the full application only if they have no or a low CoI. Where panel members declare they have a high CoI, they will not be granted access to the full details of the application.

Some members may have a CoI for which they require a ruling. For these, NHMRC will assess the information declared and specify in RGMS the level of participation applicable. All CoI rulings will be confirmed and endorsed by the Panel Chair during the interview week. Panel members are requested to ensure they include sufficient detail in their declaration to ensure an accurate CoI assessment can be made.

CoIs must be declared at the beginning of the peer review process. However CoIs may be declared at any stage of the peer review process if new conflicts become apparent.

CoI guidelines also apply to Observers and they must be aware of their obligations under NHMRC’s guidance for management of CoI. Observers must advise NHMRC of any real or potential CoIs they have with an application.

5.5 Allocation of Spokespersons

Panel members will indicate their ability to act as a spokesperson on applications based on their expertise. NHMRC staff will allocate spokespersons to each application based on the indicated suitability and declared conflicts of interest of each panel member. Panel members will be notified of their allocations accordingly.

As far as possible, each panel member will be allocated an equal proportion of applications as Primary and Secondary Spokesperson.
Panel members should read ALL applications for their panel carefully, but pay particular attention to those for which they are 1SP and 2SP.

5.6 PRP Members Access to Applications

Panel members will be provided with full access to applications allocated to their panel, within RGMS, excluding those where a high CoI has been declared. When accessing the full application, panel members should again check whether they have a CoI not previously evident, and notify NHMRC if additional conflicts are identified.

The ‘Download All’ function, in RGMS, streamlines panel members’ access to all relevant application documentation. Panel members can download all relevant documents using this functionality rather than reading applications individually through RGMS. In order to assess an application, the panel members should review the following ‘Snapshot Reports’ and uploaded PDF documents:

‘Assessor’ snapshot (relevant sections of the application and Profile/CV required to assess the application);
- Uploaded document - ‘Grant Proposal’ PDF;
- Uploaded document – ‘Employing Institute Statement of Support’ PDF; and
- Uploaded document – ‘Project Mentor Statement of Support’ PDF.

5.7 Part One – Initial Review of Applications

All applications are subject to the same peer review process and assessment criteria. The initial review and final rankings are established on merit, regardless of the applicant’s previous fellowship status.

Panel members must use the Statement of Expectations at Attachment B as a guide when assessing the level of applications.

5.7.1 General Guidelines for Shortlisting

For the TRIP Fellowships scheme less than 40% of applications will be shortlisted.

Funding data for previous rounds are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of applications received</th>
<th>Number of applications that proceeded to interview</th>
<th>Number funded</th>
<th>Percentage of the total number of applicants who applied who were successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Scheme Under Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel members must critically examine all applications for competitiveness against the aims of the scheme, the Statement of Expectations (Attachment B) and the Assessment Criteria (Attachment C). Applications considered marginal should not be shortlisted.

5.7.2 Preliminary Scoring of Applications

The 1SP and 2SP for each application will provide a score, using a seven point scale, against each assessment criterion in RGMS. In order to obtain accurate scores against each criterion, Spokespersons must refer to the Statement of Expectations (Attachment B) and the Scoring Descriptors (Attachment D).

The PRP will be provided with detailed instructions on how to complete the preliminary shortlisting scores in RGMS.

5.7.3 Prior to the Shortlisting Teleconference

Following the preliminary scoring of applications, the Office of NHMRC will provide the panel with a list (catering for CoI) of application scores identifying:
- applications with a score of six or greater. These applications will automatically proceed to interview;
• applications which score within the five range. These applications will be discussed and ranked by consensus to determine which applications will proceed to interview;
• applications with a score within the four range. These applications may be discussed and ranked by consensus to determine which applications may proceed to interview; and
• applications with a score of less than four. These applications will be identified as Not For Further Consideration (NFFC).

If a panel member feels strongly that an application warrants rescuing from the NFFC (and should proceed to interview), the panel member will have an opportunity to nominate one application only for consideration by the panel.

The Panel Chair will review all applications appearing on the NFFC list to confirm no application has scores from the Spokespersons which are two or more points away from each other. If an application receives scores from the Spokesperson with this amount of variation, the application must be discussed at the teleconference.

As a guide, historically less than 40% of the total number of applications have proceeded to interview.

5.7.4 Process for the Shortlisting Teleconference
The PRP will meet via teleconference to:
• discuss and rank applications scored within the five range (average of the SP1 and SP2 scores) to determine which applications will proceed to interview.
• if applicable, discuss and rank applications scored within the four range (average of the SP1 and SP2 scores) to determine which applications may proceed to interview.
• discuss applications nominated for rescue from the NFFC (i.e. applications with a score of three or less). These ‘rescue’ applications must be nominated before the shortlisting teleconference. Panel members who have nominated an application for rescue will have to speak to the application and provide justification for the application to proceed. The SP1 and SP2 will also speak to the application and recommend if the application should proceed or not. For an application to be rescued from the NFFC, the entire panel must be in agreement.
• discuss applications with a variation between Spokespersons scores of two or more. The Chair will lead the discussion of these applications.

Panel members with a high CoI must disconnect from the teleconference before discussion of that applicant commences.

5.8 Part Two – Applications proceeding to further Peer Review

5.8.1 Interviews
Interviews for TRIP Fellowships will take place by teleconference from 17-18 July 2014. The PRP will convene face to face for the interviews and will be briefed by NHMRC staff before the interviews. The briefing provides an opportunity for NHMRC and panel members to clarify any matters relating to the interview process. Interviewees have the opportunity to provide a one-page A4 single sided CV update. Any additional pages submitted by the applicant will not be provided to the panel. NHMRC will forward all CV updates received to the panel prior to interviews.

A total of 40 minutes has been allocated for the discussion and interview of each application; 10 minutes for a pre interview panel discussion, 20 minute interview with the applicant, and finally 10 minutes post-interview for panel discussion and scoring. Panel Chairs must manage the time allocation for all applicants to ensure each is given an equal opportunity to state their case and to ensure that the interview schedule is maintained.

A Community Observer may be present during individual interviews to monitor the procedural aspects of the PRP and to provide feedback to NHMRC on the consistency of procedures.

5.8.2 Conduct during Interviews
The purpose of the interview is for both the applicant and panel members to identify optimum evidence to warrant funding for an application. Panel members will be assessing how well an application meets the assessment criteria and are expected to encourage and assist applicants to present their case in the best light. They should not be confrontational, negative or accusatory, or put applicants in a position where they feel they have to defend what they have done or are proposing to do.
Panels are expected to be direct and obvious in what they ask, so applicants should be able to respond equally clearly and not be looking for traps or hidden aspects to questions.

There may be aspects of an application about which the panel members are perfectly satisfied, based on the information already provided. Because there is limited time available for interviews, it is unnecessary for the panel to explore these details further.

Panels will need to explore aspects of an application where they require clarification or confirmation. However, applicants should view such enquiries as opportunities and invitations to throw light on or emphasise the worth of the case they are making, and not as criticisms.

A guide for applicants and panel members, “What to Expect at a TRIP Fellowship Interview” is provided at (Attachment E).

All interviews will follow the TRIP Fellowships Interview Run Sheet (Attachment F) to ensure procedural consistency is maintained.

5.8.3 Procedure for Ranking Applicants

After each interview, the application will be discussed by the panel and scored with the assistance of the TRIP Fellowships Scoring Descriptors (Attachment D) and the Statement of Expectations (Attachment B) as required. It is important that the PRP consider the merits of the application in relation to the scoring descriptors rather than whether the applicant is considered fundable.

Panel members will score each applicant on a seven point scale against each assessment criterion. Scores will be provided via secret ballot after the 1SP has declared their scores to the panel. All secret ballot sheets will be destroyed once scores are accurately transcribed to the scoresheet.

An average panel score is determined for each criterion and the relevant weighting applied. Each weighted panel score is combined to provide an overall score for the applicant.

5.8.4 Daily Panel Review

At the end of each day of interviews, the PRP should briefly review the day’s interviews, but not for the purpose of re-scoring and re-ranking. This is to ensure that equity is maintained between applicants in relation to time spent discussing each application. The PRP may wish to flag an application which will require further discussion at the conclusion of all interviews.

5.8.5 Final Ranking

On the last day of interviews, a preliminary ranked list is created for the panel based on the overall score of each applicant interviewed. Each panel member must agree on the ranking of applicants on the preliminary ranked list, and typically, adjustments should only be made for applicants with the same overall score.

Any changes to rank order must be with the consensus of the panel. If the panel decides to alter the ranking of an application, the panel must agree on a revised score against the relevant assessment criterion and adjust accordingly. This process is essential to ensure the transparency and integrity of peer review. The final ranked list will be confirmed and endorsed by the Panel Chair.

In the case where more than two panels are established, once all panels have agreed on a ranked list for the applicants they interviewed, applicant’s scores are normalised across all panels. These normalised final scores are used as the basis for producing a final ranked list for all TRIP Fellowship applicants interviewed. This final ranked list will be used in preparing the funding recommendations for Research Committee.

NHMRC will seek advice from its Research Committee and Council on the allocation of expenditure for the Fellowships. Research Committee and Council do not challenge the scores or relative ranking of applications as determined by the PRP. In accordance with Subsection 7(1) (c) of the NHMRC Act, the CEO accepts Council’s recommendation (as advised by Research Committee) and then formally seeks the Minister with portfolio responsibility for NHMRC’s approval to expend public money from the Medical Research Endowment Account (MREA).

5.9 Notification of Outcomes

5.9.1 Outcome Letters

Outcomes of the application round will be formally announced by the Minister or his/her representative. Applicants and RAOs will be notified via electronic letter of the outcome of the peer review process. Funding
schedules will be provided for all successful applicants.

5.9.2 Feedback Reports

Feedback will be provided to applicants in the form of an Application Assessment Summary. Applicants who were not shortlisted will receive a report of their outcome after the list of applications proceeding to final review has been finalised. All other applicants will receive their report attached to their outcome letter.
Criteria for Health and Medical Research of Indigenous Australians

Applicants are required to address the extent to which their application fulfils these criteria in relation to research into the health of Indigenous Australians including documentation and other relevant written evidence where appropriate.

The criteria are:

- Community engagement
- Benefit
- Sustainability and transferability
- Building capability
- Priority
- Significance

Community engagement

The proposal demonstrates how the project has had and will have relevant community engagement by individuals, communities and/or organisations in conceptualisation, development and approval, data collection and management, analysis, report writing and dissemination of results.

Benefit

The proposal demonstrates the potential health benefit of the project for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. Benefit need not necessarily be direct or immediate.

Sustainability and transferability

The proposal demonstrates how the results of the project have the potential to lead to achievable and effective contributions to health gain for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, beyond the life of the project. This may be through sustainability in the project setting and/or transferability to other settings. In considering this issue the proposal should address the relationship between costs and benefits.

Building capability

The proposal demonstrates how Aboriginal communities, researchers and others will develop relevant capabilities through participation in the project.

Priority

The research and potential outcomes are a priority for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities either at community, regional or national levels.

Significance

The research addresses an important public health issue for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
Statement of Expectations

The Statement of Expectations outlines anticipated standards which will characterise TRIP Fellows’ project activities, professional attributes and existing achievements. Assessment of TRIP Fellowship applicants will be guided by these standards and include attributes such as a demonstrated commitment to the health care area, a track record in quality improvement or other initiatives to improve health care, public health, demonstration of leadership potential, and involvement in professional activities. While experience in health policy and health system/delivery improvements will be considered, experience in this area is not essential.

Applicants should note the Scoring Descriptors (Attachment D) which identify professional attributes of importance to this program. The list of scoring descriptors is meant to be indicative rather than exhaustive.

Applicants for an NHMRC TRIP Fellowship will be expected to articulate an evidence-practice gap of significant importance in their area of interest and a convincing proposal for a two year part-time research translation improvement initiative. TRIP Fellows are expected to lead a project that will develop their knowledge of research translation, and create expertise in practical aspects of getting research evidence into practice in clinical settings, in the broader health care environment, in health policy or public health initiatives. They may work with support from more senior colleagues or independently in a leadership role within a team.

TRIP Fellows are expected to strategically acquire training and skills to establish themselves as leaders in research translation throughout the Fellowship. In the development of the Fellow as a leader, it is expected that Fellows will be involved in:

- professional activities including attendance at conferences and seminars;
- training others and being trained in the Fellow's field of expertise;
- make contributions to policy development for professional bodies;
- have involvement in health policy and/or health system/delivery improvements at local, state and/or national levels.
TRIP Fellowships Assessment Criteria

Section 5 of the NHMRC TRIP Fellowship Funding Rules, provides the criteria against which TRIP Fellowship applications will be reviewed. A brief summary of the criteria for this scheme is provided below.

Aims of the Scheme

The TRIP Fellowships scheme aims to:

1. Build capacity in research translation by supporting future leaders to undertake projects focussed on translating robust or best-available evidence into practice that will either have localised health benefits to patients or broader and deeper impact in health care, the health system, public health, national policy, and/or service delivery.

2. Create a critical mass of experts in the area of research translation to support and sustain change in the long term.

Assessment Criteria

All applicants will be assessed and ranked against the Assessment Criteria listed below and on how well their application meets the aims of the scheme. All criteria are assessed relative to opportunity and take into account any career disruptions.

1. Translation project – (The quality, feasibility and significance of the research translation project).

2. Research output and leadership – (Potential of the applicant to develop as a future leader in research translation (with emphasis on the past 5 years)).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score*</th>
<th>Criterion 1 – TRANSLATION PROJECT</th>
<th>Criterion 2 – RESEARCH OUTPUT AND LEADERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>The quality, feasibility and significance of the research translation project. (Weight 50%)</td>
<td>Potential of the applicant to develop as a future leader in research translation (with emphasis on the past 5 years) (Weight 50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following descriptors are to be used as a guide to score an application against each of the assessment criteria. The descriptors are indicative rather than exhaustive. Evaluation of performance will take into account opportunity, career disruption, discipline, and be an overall summation of track record and potential of the Fellow to be a leader in research translation.

### Score 7.0
An outstanding application which clearly supports the aims of the scheme and meets all the assessment criteria, with essentially no weaknesses.

- Presents an exceptionally strong case for the evidence practice gap.
- Presents a highly innovative proposal that is achievable within the term of the Fellowship.
- Presents a proposal that addresses an issue of utmost importance to health and will have a significant impact.
- Demonstrates a clear vision which is highly likely to transform health care, health delivery, health policy, health systems and/or public health in Australia.

It is expected that only the top 2-3% of applications would be ranked in this category.

### Relative to opportunity the applicant:
- Has a leadership role in their area of specialty which may be clinical, policy, health system, health services development and/or public health.
- Have leadership roles in college, society and health care facility committees.
- Successful advocate and change agent for public or private health sector.
- Is recognised nationally and/or has a growing international reputation in their area of specialty.
- Has published peer review journal articles and written reports that are highly influential.
- Has a demonstrated clear, and continuing upward trajectory in their area of specialty.
- Has demonstrated a multidisciplinary and strong collaborative approach in quality improvement in their area of specialty.
- Have extensive evidence of primary supervision and/or mentoring of staff and/or students with successful outcomes in their area of specialty.
- Has extensive experience in the review of publications, policy documents, and reports pertaining to health.
- Has been an invited speaker at conferences.

### Score 6.0
An excellent application which supports the

- Presents a strong case for the evidence

### Relative to opportunity the applicant:
- Has a major role in their area of specialty which may be clinical,
| 4.5 | aims of the scheme and meets the assessment criteria, with very few weaknesses. | **Practice gap.**  
- Presents an innovative proposal that is likely to be achieved within the term of the Fellowship.  
- Presents a proposal that addresses an issue of major importance to health and will have an impact.  
- Demonstrates a vision which is likely to transform health care, health delivery, health policy, health systems and/or public health in Australia. | **Policy, health system, health services development and/or public health.**  
- Shows some success as advocate and change agent for public or private health sector.  
- Has a growing national and/or international reputation for their contribution to their area of specialty.  
- Has published peer reviewed journal articles and written reports that are influential in their area of specialty.  
- Has demonstrated a multidisciplinary approach to quality improvement with good collaborations.  
- Has strong participation in college, society or health care facility committees.  
- Has strong evidence of primary supervision and mentoring of staff and/or students with successful outcomes.  
- Has very good experience in the review of publications, policy documents, and reports pertaining to health.  
- Has been an invited speaker at conferences. |
| 5.0 | A very good application that meets the aims of the scheme or assessment criteria but has some weaknesses requiring additional consideration by the panel. | Relative to opportunity the applicant:  
- Prevents a very good case for the evidence practice gap.  
- Presents a proposal that has at least one innovative idea but may not be achieved within the term of the Fellowship.  
- Presents a proposal that addresses an issue of considerable importance to health and may have some impact.  
- Demonstrates a vision which may advance health care, health delivery, health policy, health systems and/or public health in Australia. | Relative to opportunity the applicant:  
- Has a significant role in their area of specialty which may be clinical, policy, health system, health services development and/or public health.  
- Shows some success as advocate and change agent for public or private health sector in smaller projects.  
- Has an emerging national reputation for their contribution role in their area of specialty.  
- Has published articles and written reports that are in their area of specialty.  
- Has the beginning of an upward trajectory for the career of the Fellow.  
- Has demonstrated a collaborative approach in their area of specialty.  
- Has membership in college, society or health care facility committees.  
- Has evidence of primary supervision and mentoring of staff and/or students with successful outcomes.  
- Has some experience in the review of publications, policy documents, and reports pertaining to health.  
- Has presented orally at national conferences but not as an invited speaker. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Relative to opportunity the applicant:</th>
<th>Relative to opportunity the applicant:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.0   | • Presents a good case for the evidence practice gap.  
• Presents a proposal that will extend existing knowledge and practice.  
• Presents a proposal that addresses an issue of some importance to health and may have some impact.  
• Has a developing vision which may contribute to the advancement of health care, health delivery, health policy, health systems and/or public health in Australia. | • Has a role in their area of specialty which may be clinical, policy, health system, health services development and/or public health at national and state levels.  
• Shows early development as advocate and change agent for public or private health sector  
• Has a growing national reputation for their contribution in their area of specialty.  
• Has published research and written reports that make specialised contributions in their area of specialty.  
• Has the potential to have an upward trajectory for the career of the Fellow.  
• Has demonstrated emerging collaborative activities in their area of specialty.  
• Makes some contribution to college, society or health care facility committees.  
• Has evidence of supervision and joint supervision of staff and/or students with successful outcomes  
• Has limited experience in the review of publications, policy documents, and reports pertaining to health systems  
• Makes contributions to leadership roles within their area of specialty.  
• Has presented orally at national conferences but not as an invited speaker. |
| 3.0   | • Presents a limited case for the evidence practice gap.  
• Presents a proposal that may extend existing knowledge and practice.  
• Presents a proposal that addresses an issue of some concern to health and may have some impact.  
• Has a developing vision which may contribute to some elements of health care, health delivery, health policy, health systems and/or public health in Australia. | • Has had a minor role in their area of specialty which may be clinical, policy, health system, health services development and/or public health at a state or local level.  
• Shows promise as advocate and change agent for public or private health sector.  
• Is developing a national reputation for their contribution in their area of specialty.  
• Has published research and written reports that sustain the knowledge base of the discipline.  
• Makes some contribution to health-related committees.  
• Has some evidence of involvement in joint supervision of staff and/or students with successful outcomes.  
• Has limited experience in the review of at least one publication, policy documents, or report pertaining to health systems.  
• Has a leadership role within a team. |

**TRIP Fellowship Peer Review Guidelines for funding commencing in 2015**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>The application does not meet the aims of the scheme or assessment criteria. Should not proceed to further peer review.</th>
<th>Relative to opportunity the applicant:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presents a weak case for the evidence practice gap.</td>
<td>• Has had a minor contributing role in their area of specialty which may be clinical, policy, health system, health services development and/or public health at a local level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presents a proposal that may extend existing knowledge and practice.</td>
<td>• Shows limited skill as advocate and change agent for public or private health sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presents a proposal that addresses an issue of some concern to health and is unlikely to yield much impact.</td>
<td>• Has demonstrated little evidence of contribution in their area of specialty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Has a developing vision which will have minor contributions to elements of health care, health delivery, health policy, health systems and/or public health in Australia.</td>
<td>• Makes no contribution to health-related committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Has published few research and written reports that had some contribution to the knowledge base of the discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Has some evidence of minor involvement in joint supervision of staff and/or students with successful outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Has no experience in the review of publications, policy documents, or reports pertaining to health systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Has a leadership role within a small team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Has not demonstrated an upward trajectory for the career of the Fellow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Has little or no evidence for oral presentations at conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not recommended for Interview.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>The application does not meet the aims of the scheme or assessment criteria. Should not proceed to further peer review.</th>
<th>Relative to opportunity the applicant:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Applicant provides no evidence of the practice gap.</td>
<td>• Has had a very junior contributing role in their area of specialty which may be clinical, policy, health system, health services development and/or public health at a local level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presents a proposal that will not extend existing knowledge and practice.</td>
<td>• Shows no evidence as advocate and change agent for public or private health sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presents a proposal that does not directly address an issue of concern to health.</td>
<td>• Makes no contribution to health-related committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Has a developing vision which will not contribute to elements of health care, health delivery, health policy, health systems and/or public health in Australia.</td>
<td>• Does not have a reputation for their contribution to their area of specialty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Has published research and written reports that have had little contribution to the knowledge base of the discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Has no evidence of involvement in the review of publications,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not recommended for Interview.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy documents, or reports pertaining to health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Has no evidence of involvement in joint supervision of staff and/or students with successful outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Has no evidence of leadership roles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Has little evidence of career advancement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Has no evidence of presentations at conferences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: To be given a score at a particular level, the applicant should meet the majority of points listed within each assessment criterion*
Attachment E

What to expect at a TRIP Fellowships interview

Assessment of Applications
Applications will be assessed against the specified aims of the scheme and the assessment criteria. The Scoring Descriptors and Statements of Expectations provide guidance for the panel while assessing and scoring an application. Applicants are advised to familiarise themselves with these documents in preparation for their interview.

Applicants have been given the opportunity to provide a one page single sided update of their CV for the Panel. This document should highlight only those updates which are relevant since the time of submitting their application. Only one page is to be provided – any additional pages will not be considered.

Interview Time Allocation
Forty minutes has been allocated for each interview, of which 20 minutes will be dedicated to a discussion with the applicant. During this discussion, the panel will explore aspects of an application which may need clarification. Panel members are expected to encourage and assist the applicant to present their case in the best light.

The panel will hold a 10 minute pre-interview discussion (prior to the applicant coming on line for the teleconference), where the primary spokesperson will summarise the application, identifying any concerns to be addressed with the applicant and will highlight any relative to opportunity and career disruption/s to be considered during the assessment of the application. The secondary spokesperson, followed by the rest of the panel, will be provided with the opportunity to raise issues they feel should also be considered.

The last 10 minutes allocation will be for the panel post-interview discussion and scoring (once the applicant has left the teleconference).

Management of Conflicts of Interest
Panel members with a high level conflict of interest will not participate in discussions relevant to the identified application and will not be present for the interview.

Interview Process
The interviews will proceed as follows:

• applicant is welcomed to the interview by the Panel Chair;
• Panel Members are introduced and spokespersons identified;
• Panel Chair asks the applicant to give a brief summary, approximately three minutes, of their application and how the application conforms to the aims of the scheme.

Note: if an applicant goes over time it may restrict opportunities for the panel to explore other issues important to the assessment of the application. The Panel Chair will warn applicants when the time limit is approaching.

• primary spokesperson leads the questioning of the applicant, with the support of the secondary spokesperson, followed by the rest of the panel. All questions will address the assessment criteria;
• at the end of the interview, the Panel Chair asks the applicant to provide a brief summary statement which may include any important issues the applicant considers have not been addressed during the interview;
• applicant disconnects from the interview;
• the panel evaluates the application and interview, and provides a score against the assessment criteria via secret ballot.

Please note: Additional information pertaining to the application will not be accepted nor provided to the panel after the interview has concluded.
NHMRC TRIP Fellowships Interview Run Sheet

Pre-Interview Discussion (10 minutes)

- Chair to announce declared conflicts of interest
- Highly conflicted panel members to leave the room
- Chair to introduce the applicant with all relevant details –
  - App ID, Name, Institution, Name of 1SP and Name of 2SP
- Chair to ask for any newly identified conflicts of interest
- Chair to remind the panel if applicant has Indigenous focus
- Chair to remind the spokespersons to identify any relative to opportunity considerations or career disruptions
- 1SP to present a summary/analysis of the application strengths and weaknesses
- 2SP to raise any additional concerns
- All panel members given opportunity for open discussion
- 1SP to clarify who will raise specific issues during the interview

Applicant Interview (20 minutes)

- Chair to dial the contact number provided by the applicant
- Chair to welcome the applicant and determine if applicant is ready for interview
- Chair to ask panel members to identify themselves
- Chair to confirm sound clarity with applicant and identify spokespersons
- Chair to ask applicant to provide a three minute summary of their application and how their application conforms to the aims of the scheme
- Spokespersons to ask questions relevant to assessment criteria and in line with pre interview discussion
- All panel members given opportunity to ask questions relevant to assessment criteria and/or aims of the scheme
- Chair to ask applicant to provide a summary statement including any issues considered important by the applicant which were not addressed by the panel

Post interview discussion and Scoring (10 minutes)

- Spokespersons to provide final comments on interview and application in relation to the two (2) assessment criteria
- Chair to invite other panel members to comment if required
- 1SP to declare their score for each assessment criterion

*Note:* Panel members to assign a separate score for each criterion in a seven point scale

- Chair to invite panel to address any concerns with the 1SP score (especially if scoring two or more away from 1SP score)
- Panel members to clearly record their scores for each criterion in-confidence on ballot slip provided
- Secretariat to collect ballot slips from panel members and enter scores into score sheet

Conclusion of interviews on 18 July

- Final ranking
- Panel evaluation and discussion