

# APCP Research Bursary Scoring System

## Section 1 – Course Information

Course Title		
Applicant <b>Unique Number</b> <i>(The admin team process will anonymise and keep a master copy of the applicant's name, designation, address and their unique code until the scoring has been completed).</i>		
Funding requested (exact amount)	Group A: Up to £500 (.....)	Group B: UP to £2000 (....)
Breakdown of funding requested	<i>Costings should be a cut and paste with comment on appropriateness for example realistic costs or gaps in costs which may limit the success of the project.</i>	

## Section 2 – Eligibility

	Yes	No	N/A
Is the applicant an APCP member			
If yes – are approval details submitted			
Funding requested is fully accounted for and meets the APCP criteria			
If no, please comment			

## Section 3 – Scoring

Criteria	Score 3	Score 2	Score 1	Score 0	Score
<b>1. Background and rationale for the research</b>	The background to the research is clearly explained and provides a good rationale.	The background to the research is adequately explained and provides an adequate rationale.	The background to the research is poorly explained and provides a limited rationale.	The background to the research is inappropriate or missing and does	

				not provide a rationale.	
<b>2. Research question/aims and objectives</b>	Research question/aims and objective are clear.	Research question/aims and objective are adequate.	Research question/aims and objective are poorly expressed.	Research question/aims and objective are missing.	
<b>3. Research design and the methods are appropriate to the aims and objectives. Ethics considered / time lines included.</b>	Research design and the methods are clearly expressed and are appropriate to the aims and objectives. Ethics considered / time lines included.	Research design and the methods are adequately expressed and are appropriate to the aims and objectives. Ethics adequately considered/ time lines included.	Research design and the methods are poorly expressed and are not well aligned to the aims and objectives. Ethics partly considered / time lines included.	Research design and methods are missing. Ethics not considered/ time lines not mentioned.	
<b>4. Funding proportionate the research</b>	Funding request is proportionate and justifiable.	Funding request slightly excessive to needs of project.	Funding request moderately excessive to needs of project.	Funding request is inappropriate or missing.	
<b>5. Dissemination plans – includes plans specific for paediatrics / APCP.</b>	Dissemination has been carefully considered and is appropriate includes plans specific for paediatrics / APCP.	Dissemination has been considered and is adequate - includes adequate plans specific for paediatrics / APCP.	Dissemination is poorly considered -includes some plans specific for paediatrics / APCP.	Dissemination is not appropriate or has not been addressed. No links to paediatrics/ APCP.	
				<b>Total Score/15</b>	

### Reviewers Comments

.....

.....

# APCP Education Bursary Scoring System

## Section 1 – Course Information

Course Title		
Applicant <b>Unique Number</b> <i>(The admin team process will anonymise and keep a master copy of the applicant's name, designation, address and their unique code until the scoring has been completed).</i>		
Funding requested (exact amount)	Group A: Up to £500 (.....)	Group B: Up to £2000 (....)
Breakdown of funding requested	<i>Costings should be a cut and paste with comment on appropriateness for example realistic costs or gaps in costs which may limit the success of the project.</i>	

## Section 2 – Eligibility

	Yes	No	N/A
Is the applicant an APCP member			
If yes – are approval details submitted			
Funding requested is fully accounted for and meets the APCP criteria			
If no, please comment			

## Section 3 – Scoring

Criteria	Score 3	Score 2	Score 1	Score 0	Score
1. <b>Do the learning aims and objectives make the purpose of the course clear</b>	Clear aims and objectives that are appropriate to the applicants learning	Aims and objectives adequately explained	Aims and objectives are poorly explained	Aims and objectives cannot be understood or are missing	

<b>2. Do the objectives fit with the aims of the APCP</b>	The objectives clearly relate to the APCP aims	The objectives adequately relate to the APCP aims	The objectives slightly relate to the APCP aims	The objectives do not relate to the APCP aims	
<b>3. Does the educational training enable the stated learning outcomes to be met</b>	The educational training is clearly explained, rigorous and appropriate to the topic and enables the stated learning outcomes to be met.	The educational training are adequately explained and justifiable. They are likely to enable most of the stated learning outcomes to be met.	There is poor justification for the educational training used. They are unlikely to enable the stated learning outcomes to be met.	Little or no justification for the educational training proposed is provided. None of the stated learning outcomes to be met.	
<b>4. Is the funding proportionate to the course</b>	Funding request is proportionate and justifiable	Funding request slightly excessive to needs of project	Funding request moderately excessive to needs of project	Funding request is wholly excessive	
<b>5. Dissemination of learning</b>	Dissemination has been carefully considered and is fully appropriate	Dissemination has been considered and is adequate.	Dissemination is poorly considered	Dissemination is not appropriate or has not been addressed	
				<b>Total Score/15</b>	

**Reviewers Comments**

.....

.....