Scoring Matrix for Board and Panel Meetings

### Score Indicators

#### 10. Exceptional – Top international programme or of exceptional national strategic importance

- **Quality**
  - Highly original and innovative
  - Novel methodology and design
  - Excellent leadership (team, environment, and collaborators are amongst the best in a broad field)

- **Impact**
  - Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap
  - Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact
  - Internationally unique resource of value to many disciplines

- **Productivity**
  - Potential for high return on investment
  - Very high likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed)

#### 9. Excellent – Internationally competitive and leading edge in most areas

- **Quality**
  - Original and innovative
  - Novel methodology and design
  - Excellent leadership (team, environment, and collaborators e.g. among the best in a specialist area)

- **Impact**
  - Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap
  - Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact
  - Internationally significant resource of value to many disciplines.

- **Productivity**
  - Potential for high return on investment
  - Very high likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed)

#### 8. Very High Quality – Internationally competitive and leading edge nationally

- **Quality**
  - Original and innovative
  - Robust methodology and design (innovative in parts)
  - Excellent leadership (team, environment, and collaborators)

- **Impact**
  - Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap or area of strategic importance to the UK
  - Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact
  - Resource of value to many disciplines.

- **Productivity**
  - Potential for significant return on investment
  - Very high likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed)
## Score Indicators

### 7. High Quality – Leading edge nationally and internationally competitive in parts

- **Quality**
  - Innovative
  - Robust methodology and design (innovative in parts)
  - Strong leadership (team, environment, and collaborators)
- **Impact**
  - Key scientific question or knowledge gap or area of strategic importance to the UK
  - Potential for significant health and/or socioeconomic impact
  - Valuable scientific resource
- **Productivity**
  - Potential for significant return on investment
  - High likelihood of successful delivery

### 6. High Quality – Leading edge nationally, but not yet internationally competitive

- **Quality**
  - Methodologically robust study
  - Appropriate leadership (team; environment; collaborators)
- **Impact**
  - Worthwhile scientific question or knowledge gap
  - Justifiable scientific resource
  - Potential for reasonable health and/or socioeconomic impact
- **Productivity**
  - Resources appropriate to deliver the proposal
  - High likelihood of successful delivery

### 5. Good Quality – Nationally competitive

- **Quality**
  - Methodologically sound study but areas require significant revision
  - Leadership not optimal (scope to strengthen team; environment; collaborators)
- **Impact**
  - Worthwhile scientific question with potentially useful outcomes
  - Moderate likelihood of contributing to new knowledge generation
- **Productivity**
  - Resources broadly appropriate to deliver the proposal
  - Good likelihood of successful delivery

### 4. Potentially Useful – With significant weaknesses

- **Quality**
  - Methodologically weak study (approach or study design requires significant revision)
  - Leadership/environment not optimal
- **Impact**
  - Contains potentially useful ideas but requires major revision
  - Moderate likelihood of successful delivery
- **Productivity**
  - Resources inappropriate to deliver the proposal
  - Unlikely to significantly contribute to new knowledge generation
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### 3. Potentially Useful – With major weaknesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Fundability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Question poorly defined</td>
<td>• Unlikely to contribute to new knowledge generation</td>
<td>Not fundable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Methodologically weak study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor leadership/environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Poor quality science, bordering on unacceptable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not fundable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Unacceptable quality or has serious ethical concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not fundable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>