

MRC Board and Panel Scoring Matrix

| Score Indicators | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| <p>10. Exceptional –Top international programme or of exceptional national strategic importance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Highly original and innovative ○ Novel methodology and design ○ Excellent leadership (<i>team, environment, and collaborators are amongst the best in a broad field</i>) • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap ○ Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact ○ Internationally unique resource of value to many disciplines • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential for high return on investment, excellent value for money ○ Very high likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed) | <p>Highest priority for funding</p> |
| <p>9. Excellent - Internationally competitive and leading edge in most areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Original and innovative ○ Novel methodology and design ○ Excellent leadership (<i>team, environment, and collaborators e.g. among the best in a specialist area</i>) • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap ○ Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact ○ Internationally significant resource of value to many disciplines. • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential for high return on investment, excellent value for money ○ Very high likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed) | <p>Very high priority for funding</p> |
| <p>8. Very High Quality- Internationally competitive and leading edge nationally</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Original and innovative ○ Robust methodology and design (<i>innovative in parts</i>) ○ Excellent leadership (<i>team, environment, and collaborators</i>) • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential for significant return on investment, very good value for money ○ Very high likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed) | <p>High priority for funding</p> |
| <p>7. High Quality- Leading edge nationally and internationally competitive in parts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Innovative ○ Robust methodology and design (<i>innovative in parts</i>) ○ Strong leadership (<i>team, environment, and collaborators</i>) • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential for significant return on investment, very good value for money ○ High likelihood of successful delivery | <p>Fundable</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>6. High Quality –Leading edge nationally, but not yet internationally competitive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality Fundable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Methodologically robust study ○ Appropriate leadership (<i>team; environment; collaborators</i>) • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Worthwhile scientific question or knowledge gap ○ Justifiable scientific resource ○ Potential for reasonable health and/or socioeconomic impact • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Resources appropriate to deliver the proposal, good value for money ○ High likelihood of successful delivery |
| <p>5. Good Quality- Nationally competitive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality Unfundable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Methodologically sound study but areas require significant revision ○ Leadership not optimal (<i>scope to strengthen team; environment; collaborators</i>) • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Worthwhile scientific question with potentially useful outcomes ○ Moderate likelihood of contributing to new knowledge generation • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Resources broadly appropriate to deliver the proposal, adequate value for money ○ Good likelihood of successful delivery |
| <p>4. Potentially Useful - With significant weaknesses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality Unfundable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Methodologically weak study (<i>approach or study design requires significant revision</i>) ○ Leadership/environment not optimal • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Contains potentially useful ideas but requires major revision ○ Moderate likelihood of successful delivery • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Resources inappropriate to deliver the proposal, poor value for money ○ Unlikely to significantly contribute to new knowledge generation |
| <p>3. Potentially Useful - With major weaknesses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality Unfundable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Question poorly defined ○ Methodologically weak study ○ Poor leadership/environment • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to contribute to new knowledge generation |
| <p>2. Poor quality science, bordering on unacceptable.</p> |
| <p>1. Unacceptable quality or has serious ethical concerns.</p> |
| <p>0. Ineligible for funding.</p> |