**VAMHN SMALL GRANTS RATING CRITERIA**

**1. Creativity, originality and potential contribution to knowledge of prevention/interventions for violence/abuse**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer Score** | **Score description** |
| 6 (Outstanding) | The project is extremely timely, answers an urgent and important research question, and will substantially advance knowledge about prevention/interventions for violence/abuse. Extremely high level of synergy between scientific and artistic approaches. |
| 5 (Excellent) | The project is very timely and answers an important research question, and will majorly advance knowledge about prevention/interventions for violence/abuse. High level of synergy between scientific and artistic approaches. |
| 4 (Good) | The project is timely and answers an important research question and will advance knowledge about prevention/interventions for violence/abuse. Synergy between scientific and artistic approaches. |
| 3 (Satisfactory) | The research question is important but may not be urgent/timely. It will only result in a limited advance in knowledge about prevention/ interventions for violence/abuse. Clear alignment between scientific and artistic approaches. |
| 2 (Fair/Some weaknesses) | The research question is relevant but not important or timely and is unlikely to advance in knowledge about prevention/interventions for violence/abuse in a meaningful way. Limited alignment between scientific and artistic approaches. |
| 1 (Poor) | The proposal simply repeats previous work, or is attempting to answer a question that is not worth pursuing. No clear alignment between scientific and artistic approaches. |
| 0 (Not able to assess) | The proposal is outside of the remit of the call or the relevant information was not provided to make a rating.  |

**2. Scientific and artistic quality**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer Score** | **Score description** |
| 6 (Outstanding) | The proposal employs extremely high quality and appropriate scientific and artistic methods. The project is clearly feasible to conduct within the proposed timeframe. Ethics and data management have been fully considered and approaches to mitigate potential risks/challenges have been carefully outlined. |
| 5 (Excellent) | The proposal employs high quality and appropriate scientific and artistic methods. The project seems feasible to conduct within the proposed timeframe. Research ethics and data management have been fully considered and some approaches to mitigate potential risks/challenges are outlined.  |
| 4 (Good) | The proposal employs good quality scientific and artistic methodology and seems feasible to conduct within the proposed timeframe. Research ethics, data management and risk mitigation have been adequately considered. |
| 3 (Satisfactory) | The proposal is not of a consistently high quality. There may be some concerns about the appropriateness of the scientific and/or artistic methods employed or uncertainty about the feasibility of conducting the project within the proposed timeframe. |
| 2 (Fair/Some weaknesses) | The proposal is of lesser quality than more highly rated proposals. There are likely to be concerns about the scientific and/or artistic methods employed and its feasibility. |
| 1 (Poor) | The proposal is flawed in its scientific or artistic approach, or is repetitious of other work; or even though it possibly has sound objectives, it appears seriously defective in its methodology. The project is not feasible within the timeframe. |
| 0 (Not able to assess) | The proposal is outside of the remit of the call or the relevant information was not provided to make a rating.  |

**3. Value for money**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer Score** | **Score description** |
| 6 (Outstanding) | The proposal provides exceptional value for money. This may be achieved by capitalising upon existing substantial investments. The funds requested are essential for the project and are comprehensively justified. Payment for lived experience involvement is included at a higher rate than the rates laid out in the INVOLVE guidelines. Payments for artistic involvement is included at a higher rate than specified. The collaborators are viewed as essential and equal partners within the application and have an equal voice in how they are compensated.  |
| 5 (Excellent) | The proposal provides excellent value for money. This may be achieved by capitalising upon existing investments. The funds requested are essential for the project, include appropriate payment for lived experience and are fully justified. |
| 4 (Good) | The proposal provides reasonable value for money. The funds requested are essential for the project and most are justified. Appropriate payment for lived experience involvement is included. Consideration has been given to equity of payment across different roles. |
| 3 (Satisfactory) | There may be uncertainty about whether the proposal provides value for money. Appropriate payment for lived experience involvement is included. |
| 2 (Fair/Some weaknesses) | There are likely to be major concerns about whether the proposal provides value for money, there is insufficient justification of the funds requested and/or lived experience involvement is not appropriately costed. |
| 1 (Poor) | The proposal does not provide value for money and the funds requested are not appropriately justified. |
| 0 (Not able to assess) | The proposal is outside of the remit of the call or the relevant information was not provided to make a rating.  |

**4. Level of involvement of users/survivors in the development of the application.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer Score** | **Score description. Note applications must score at least 4 (good) to be taken forward to the panel.** |
| 6 (Outstanding) | Service users/survivors have been involved in multiple ways and at multiple levels throughout development and co-design of the proposal. More than one co-applicants has lived experience and is taking a leading role within the application \* |
| 5 (Excellent) | Service users/survivors have been involved throughout the co-design of the proposal. One of the co-applicants has lived experience \*  |
| 4 (Good) | Service users/survivors have been consulted in a meaningful way during development of the application. Ideally one of the co-applicants has lived experience \* |
| 3 (Satisfactory) | There has been limited involvement of users/survivors in development of the application or reliance solely on one of the applicants having lived experience (without explicitly stating their involvement in co-design). |
| 2 (Fair/Some weaknesses) | Minimal consultation after development of the application or solely relying on consultation that took place several years ago. |
| 1 (Poor) | No consultation took place with service users/survivors. |
| 0 (Not able to assess) | The relevant information was not provided to make a rating.  |

\*Note. In these criteria we recommend having at least one co-applicant with lived experience. We appreciate that co-applicants may not be comfortable disclosing that they have lived experience of violence, abuse, or mental health problems and that we would therefore accept a statement in the application form to indicate that one (or more) of the applicants has relevant lived experience but they do not have to specify which applicants have/do not have this experience.

**5. Effectiveness of plans for consistently involving users/survivors in conducting/leading the project.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer Score** | **Score description. Note applications must score at least 4 (good) to be taken forward to the panel.** |
| 6 (Outstanding) | Service users/survivors will be involved in multiple ways and at multiple levels throughout the process of conducting and leading the project. Provides opportunities for career development of one or more people with lived experience (e.g., training in research skills, training in artistic skills, and/or leadership).  |
| 5 (Excellent) | Service users/survivors will be involved in multiple ways throughout the process of conducting and leading the project.  |
| 4 (Good) | Service users/survivors will be involved in conducting the project. |
| 3 (Satisfactory) | There will be limited involvement of users/survivors in conducting the project (e.g., just a steering group with an advisory role). |
| 2 (Fair/Some weaknesses) | Lived experience involvement limited to one or small number of users/survivors and only in advisory role. |
| 1 (Poor) | No involvement of service users/survivors or they are just participants in the research. |
| 0 (Not able to assess) | The relevant information was not provided to make a rating.  |

**6. Effectiveness of plans for engaging users/survivors in the public engagement and dissemination of finding**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer Score** | **Score description. Note applications must score at least 4 (good) to be taken forward to the panel.** |
| 6 (Outstanding) | Service users/survivors will be involved in multiple ways and at multiple levels throughout the public engagement and dissemination of the findings. Those with lived experience will design and lead the project outputs. Specific dissemination activities are included and led by and for people with lived experience.  |
| 5 (Excellent) | Service users/survivors will be involved in multiple ways throughout the public engagement and dissemination of the findings. Those with lived experience are involved in co-design of the project outputs. Specific dissemination activities are included for people with lived experience. |
| 4 (Good) | Service users/survivors will be involved throughout the public engagement and dissemination of the findings.  |
| 3 (Satisfactory) | Service users/survivors will be consulted about the public engagement and dissemination of the findings. |
| 2 (Fair/Some weaknesses) | There will be minimal consultation with service users/survivors about public engagement and dissemination of the findings. |
| 1 (Poor) | No involvement of, or consultation with, service users/survivors in public engagement and dissemination of the findings. |
| 0 (Not able to assess) | The relevant information was not provided to make a rating.  |

**7. Outputs, dissemination and impact**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer Score** | **Score description** |
| 6 (Outstanding) | Outputs or dissemination activities are planned to actively engage a broad range of relevant stakeholders. The project is very likely to have a significant and long-lasting impact on policy, practice, public perception and knowledge, or individuals engaged in the project activities. The project has a clear evaluation plan to assess impact, led and delivered by people with lived experience. |
| 5 (Excellent) | Outputs or dissemination activities are planned to engage a range of relevant stakeholders. The project has the potential to have a long-lasting impact on policy, practice, public perception and knowledge, or individuals engaged in the project activities. The project has a clear evaluation plan to assess impact, co-delivered by people with lived experience. |
| 4 (Good) | Output or dissemination activities are planned to engage relevant stakeholders. The project has the potential to have an impact on policy, practice, public perception and knowledge, or individuals engaged in the project activities. The project has a clear evaluation plan to assess impact.  |
| 3 (Satisfactory) | At least one output or dissemination activity is planned to engage relevant stakeholders. The likelihood of having an impact on policy, practice and/or public perception may be limited. |
| 2 (Fair/Some weaknesses) | At least one output or dissemination activity is planned to share the findings. The project is unlikely to have any impact on policy, practice, or public perception. |
| 1 (Poor) | No output or dissemination activity is planned. The project will have no impact on policy, practice or pubic perception. |
| 0 (Not able to assess) | The proposal is outside of the remit of the call or the relevant information was not provided to make a rating.  |

**8. Collaborative development through partnership**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer Score** | **Score description** |
| 6 (Outstanding) | There is an extremely strong project team and they have clearly and reflectively articulated how their partnership will help develop all members involved in the project. The co-applications have significantly expanded their areas of research or artistic practice through collaborations. The project has clearly articulated learnings for the partnership, which are measurable and appropriate to the level of funding available.  |
| 5 (Excellent) | There is a strong project team who have clearly articulated how their partnership will help develop all members involved in the project. The co-applications have expanded their areas of research or artistic practice through collaborations. The project has articulated learnings for the partnership, which are measurable.  |
| 4 (Good) | There is a strong project team who have clearly articulated how their partnership adheres to the principles outlined. Two or more of the co-applications has discussed how they have expanded their areas of research or artistic practice through collaboration. The project has articulated learnings for the partnership. |
| 3 (Satisfactory) | The project team have articulated how their partnership adheres to the principles outlined. At least one of the co-applications has discussed how they have expanded their areas of research or artistic practice through collaboration.  |
| 2 (Fair/Some weaknesses) | The project team have articulated how their partnership adheres to some of the principles outlined. |
| 1 (Poor) | The project team have not clearly articulated how their partnership adheres the principles outlined, nor have they shown how they will expand their areas of artistic practice or research. |
| 0 (Not able to assess) | The proposal is outside of the remit of the call or the relevant information was not provided to make a rating.  |

**Overall Score:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer / Panel Score** | **Score description based on scientific quality. All assessment criteria should be considered before arriving at an overall score.** |
| 6 (Outstanding) | The proposal is outstanding in terms of its potential scientific and artistic merit, with an extremely high level synergy between the scientific and artistic approaches. The project is extremely timely and answers an urgent and important question, and is very likely to have a significant and long-lasting impact. It employs high quality methodology, is clearly feasible to conduct within the proposed timeframe, and provides exceptional value for money. There is an extremely strong project team including those with lived experience who are involved in multiple ways throughout the project and have leadership roles. There is a clearly articulated sense of how all team members will develop substantively and expand their practice through the project. |
| 5 (Excellent) | The proposal is excellent in terms of its potential scientific and artistic merit, with a high level of synergy between the scientific and artistic approaches. The project is very timely and answers an important question, and has the potential to have a long-lasting impact. It employs high quality methodology, seems feasible to conduct within the proposed timeframe, and provides excellent value for money. There is a strong project team including those with lived experience who are involved in multiple ways throughout the project. There is a clearly articulated sense of how all team members will develop through the project. |
| 4 (Good) | The proposal is important as it has considerable potential merit with synergy between the scientific and artistic approaches. The project is timely and answers an important question, and has the potential to have an impact on policy, practice and/or public perception. It employs good quality methodology, seems feasible to conduct within the proposed timeframe, and provides reasonable value for money. There is an appropriate project team including those with lived experience who are involved in throughout the project. The collaboration has been though through and there are clearly expressed learnings for the team through the collaboration.  |
| 3 (Satisfactory) | The proposal has significant potential merit but is not of a consistently high quality. The question being addressed is important but may not be urgent and there may be some concerns about the appropriateness of the methods employed, or a lack of synergy between the scientific and artistic approaches. There may be uncertainty about the feasibility of conducting the project within the proposed timeframe and/or its value for money. The project is timely and answers an important question, but may have limited potential to impact on policy, practice and/or public perception Those with lived experience may play more of a consultation role rather than being involved directly in the project. There is a limited sense of how the partners will develop and grow through the partnership. |
| 2 (Fair/Some weaknesses) | The proposal will add to understanding but is of lesser quality or urgency than more highly rated proposals. There are likely to be concerns about the methods employed, feasibility and value for money. Such proposals are unlikely to have a major influence on the development of the research area or any impact on policy, practice and/or public perception. The project team may lack relevant cross-disciplinary/cross-sector expertise and there is only minimal consultation with service users/survivors. There is a very limited sense of how the partners will develop and grow through the partnership. |
| 1 (Poor) | The proposal is flawed in its scientific and artistic approach, or is repetitious of other work, or otherwise judged not worth pursuing; or even though it possibly has sound objectives, it appears seriously defective in its methodology. There is no or limited alignment between artistic and research approaches or objectives. The project is not feasible within the timeframe and does not provide value for money. There is no involvement of, or consultation with, service users/survivors. There is limited evidence of how the partners will work in mutually beneficial or respectful ways with one another and how members of the team would develop through the partnership.  |
| 0 (Not able to assess) | The proposal is outside of the remit of the call or the relevant information was not provided to make a rating.  |