



AUSTRALIAN
PHYSIOTHERAPY
ASSOCIATION

2023 Pat Cosh Trust Strategic Grant

Expression of Interest (EOI) Guidelines and General Information for Applicants

Pat Cosh Trust (PCT) is pleased to announce that research funding of up to \$150,000 (excluding GST) will be available for lead researchers in Victoria. The research aim is to improve physiotherapy students' access and experience to clinical placements in private practice settings with a focus on musculoskeletal physiotherapy.

SUBMISSION OF EOI APPLICATIONS

**Applicants are required to submit an expression of interest (EOI)
Using the provided form.**

Submissions and any relevant documents are to be sent via email to:
Joanna.Chen@australian.physio

All submissions must be received by **Sunday 22 October 2023, 11:30 pm AEDT**.
Receipt of your application will be acknowledged by return e-mail.

ABOUT PAT COSH TRUST

The Pat Cosh Trust was established on 16 June 2010 with Settlor funds contributed by the Victorian Physiotherapists Registration Board under the auspices of the Victorian Government.

The Trust was named for Miss Pat Cosh in recognition of her outstanding leadership and vital contribution to the Physiotherapy Profession in Victoria. She was the first physiotherapist appointed as Chairman of the (then) Masseurs' Registration Board in 1975, and she was instrumental in driving the change in name to the Physiotherapists Registration Board. She was appointed as the first head of the physiotherapy course in 1960 and, subsequently, Head of the School of Physiotherapy in Victoria at the Lincoln Institute in 1973, a position she held until she retired in 1986.

The purpose of the Trust is for the public charitable purpose of the advancement of education of physiotherapists and students of physiotherapy located, working or residing in Victoria by:

- a) Initiating and supporting programs that improve the practitioners and students of physiotherapy's ability to practice, and
- b) Funding research to improve the education standard of practitioners and physiotherapy students.

Since the Trust came into being, 21 research and project grants totalling approximately \$400,000 have been awarded. This is the Trust's first strategic-led project designed to address key issues facing the profession and align with the Trust's Purpose.

ABOUT THE RESEARCH PROJECT

Research background

Clinical placement is an essential and fundamental experience for physiotherapy students and prepares them for further work practice. Traditionally, most physiotherapy students would undertake clinical placements in the hospital setting (Peiris et al., 2022), and it is estimated that only 5–10% of physiotherapy student placements in Australia were in private practice in 2012 (Health Workforce Australia, 2014). However, approximately 43–60% of physiotherapists are employed in private practice settings (National Health Workforce, 2017), and there is an increasing number of new graduates working in the private sector (Health Workforce Australia, 2014).

It is also a concern that new graduate physiotherapists in Australia may be underprepared for private practice employment (Health Workforce Australia, 2014; Peiris et al., 2022). Therefore, there is a real need to address these issues and improve clinical education for physiotherapy students in private practice.

Research Scope

- Clinical placement in private practice with a focus on Musculoskeletal (MSK) physiotherapy.
- Victorian focus as part of the requirements of the Pat Cosh Trust, but the project or research can include national collaboration.

Research question

- How to improve students' access to private practice placements with a focus on MSK physiotherapy?
- How to improve students' experience in private practice placements with a focus on MSK physiotherapy?

Research Purpose

- To understand and identify the barriers and enablers of student placements in private practice settings with a focus on MSK physiotherapy.
- To evaluate the current models of student placements in private practice settings focusing on MSK physiotherapy.
- To make recommendations on how to overcome the barriers and what are the feasible models in the future.

Research Methods

- The research methodology is not restricted, but it must be appropriate and reasonable for the study design and budget.

Project duration

- The research must be completed within 18-24 months of the grant being awarded.

ELIGIBILITY

The applicant must:

- be the Chief Investigator of the project;
- hold current unconditional registration as a physiotherapist with Ahpra;
- currently work or reside in Victoria;
- be an Australian citizen or have permanent resident status;
- be an experienced researcher with previous and current research support and publications arising from that support.
- The applicant may submit up to two separate Strategic Grant EOIs, but only one will proceed to the full application stage (if applicable).

Research team:

- A number of associate Investigators can be included as part of the research team;
- The organisation or the administration team must be Victorian-based.
- Ideally, at least one of the Associate Investigator have experience with student placements, for example, supervising students, coordinating student placements, designing student education programs, etc.
- Where appropriate, please consider including students/ new graduates working in MSK private practice being investigated on the research team.

APPLICATION PROCEDURE

Application Process

- Applicants are required to submit an expression of interest (EOI) using the provided form, followed by a full application for those who are shortlisted.
- **Deadline for EOI:** All submissions must be received by **Sunday 22 October 2023, 11:30 pm AEDT**. No late applications will be accepted.
- Submissions and any relevant documents are to be sent via email to Joanna.Chen@australian.physio
- Full applications are anticipated to open in mid-December 2023 and close in early March 2024.

Application Documents

- [2023 PCT Strategic Grant EOI form](#)

ASSESSMENT

Assessment Process

- Grants will be evaluated by a Grants Review Committee, and the Trust will allocate grants according to the assessors' recommendations and within the limitations of the allocated budget.
- The outcome of grant applications will be communicated in writing to applicants in mid-December 2023.
- Please be advised that all decisions are final, and there is no mechanism for appeal.

Assessment Criteria

Grants will be evaluated by a Grants Review Committee, whose decisions shall be considered final, on the recommendation of the Grants Review Committee in relation to:

- Scientific quality (40%) – This includes the clarity of the hypotheses or research objectives, the appropriateness of the study design or methodology, evidence of high-quality research practices (such as statements on protocol registration, analysis plan registration and adherence to reporting guidelines for relevant study design) to ensure that the experimental results will be unbiased, reproducible and transparent, and the feasibility of the project.
- Significance of expected outcomes and/or innovation of the concept (25%) - This includes the potential of the project to increase knowledge in the field and have a significant impact on improved physiotherapy students' access and experience to private practice placements with a focus on musculoskeletal physiotherapy.
- Knowledge translation (10%) – This includes study design features that facilitate translation, planned processes for translating findings to the physiotherapy (and broader) community, and the likelihood that these strategies will lead to influences on practice and policy. This can also include future plans, which do not necessarily need to be achieved during the project scope or timeline.
- Team quality and capability (25%) – The applicants' research record demonstrates the appropriate research skills, experience, and concern for research rigour, relative to opportunity, required to complete the proposed project. The applicant clearly justifies their eligibility and demonstrates how their expertise is relevant to the proposed project. The research record of the team demonstrates appropriate skills, experience and research rigour to support the applicant and ensure timely completion of the proposed project.
- Budget – This includes its appropriateness and level of detail provided, which should include personnel, equipment, project materials, consumables, travel and incentives. Projects will only be funded if the budget is fully justified.

A sample of the scoring template used by the Grants Review Committee to assess applications is attached at the end of this document. Please ensure that you consult this carefully when preparing your application.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

- For research involving humans and animals, ethical approval from an appropriate body must be gained.
- Please note that approval can be obtained once you have been notified of the outcome of your application.
- However, confirmation of this approval must be supplied to the Pat Cosh Trust prior to the payment of grant monies.

TIMELINE

- Please ensure that the timeline is feasible.
- Please note that there is the expectation that the project will be completed within 18 - 24 months of the grant being awarded.
- It is envisaged that the outcome of full applications will be known in May 2024.

BUDGET

- The maximum funding available for a Pat Cosh Trust strategic grant is \$150,000, excluding GST.
- The entire funding will not be issued at the commencement of the project or research. The budget must be aligned with the key milestones, with a request for funding at each stage.
- A report on progress against key milestones must be submitted on the Milestone Report Template with each invoice. The final invoice will not be paid until the final key milestone report is received and accepted as satisfactory by the Trustees.
- Provide details for each item of expenditure, justify their need and the basis on which they have been calculated. Use the following headings:
 - Personnel: People employed in order to carry out the project, e.g. research officers or assistants. Funding to backfill the clinical workload of the Chief Investigator will be considered. However, this must be justified. Include appropriate salary scale and costs.
 - Equipment: the cost associated with purchasing equipment necessary to undertake the project or research.
 - Consumables: material items to be used, such as paper, phone, and postage.
 - Travel: Funds may be allocated to support the costs of participating in the project or research.
 - Administrative fees: A maximum amount of 10% of the funding will be considered to be provided to cover organisational, administrative or overhead recoveries, and this must be justified.
 - Infrastructure fees: All grant funds must go to research, none towards institutional infrastructure.
 - Publication fees: Only publication fees for publishing papers related to the project or research will be paid by the fund.

CERTIFICATIONS

- The Chief Investigator (applicant) must verify the contents of the application and his or her eligibility for a PCT strategic grant.
- The signed application form is to be returned via email to Joanna.Chen@australian.physio

CONDITIONS OF FUNDING

Legal Agreement

Successful applicants are required to sign a formal agreement (referred to as the Agreement) and provide evidence that ethical approval, if required, has been gained.

Communication / Acknowledgement

The Trust attaches importance to the publication of the results of a project or research undertaken with the assistance of a grant. Any publicity or publications resulting from a funded project or research will be in accordance with the Agreement and will acknowledge the support of the Pat Cosh Trust. A copy of publications must be forwarded to the Trust, and the Trust must be notified of conference presentations, workshops and other forms of communication regarding the funded project or research.

Official wording to be used for all publications/promotions

This research/project received funding from the Pat Cosh Trust. The Pat Cosh Trust was established in 2010 with funds bequeathed by the former Physiotherapy Board of Victoria for the purpose of advancing the education of all Victorian physiotherapists.

Reporting

The successful applicants will be required to provide the following documentation:

- a progress report submitted on the Milestone Report Template at each milestone, together with the invoice for the next payment
- a project certification at completion that the funds allocated have been used for the purpose they were provided and
- a final report at the conclusion of the project or research detailing the outcomes.

Release of Information

All information provided on a Pat Cosh Trust grant application form is private and confidential and will be used in accordance with the [APA Privacy Policy](#). In the event that your grant application is successful, information including the names of investigators, grant amount, project title and project summary will be published on the APA website.

If you have any questions about this policy, please contact the please contact the privacy officer at privacy@australian.physio

EOI DEADLINE: Sunday 22 October 2023, 11:30 pm AEDT

The Trust must receive EOI submissions by the above-specified deadline.

Late applications will not be accepted, and no extension of the deadline will be considered.

Email queries and applications to:
Joanna.Chen@australian.physio

2023 Pat Cosh Trust Strategic Grant – EOI Evaluation

SAMPLE ONLY

1. Project Identification

Chief Investigator	
Title	
Application No.	

2. Project Overview (minimum of three key points)

3. Scientific Quality (40%) score out of 12

This includes the clarity of the hypotheses or research objectives, the appropriateness of the study design or methodology, evidence of high-quality research practices (such as statements on protocol registration, analysis plan registration and adherence to reporting guidelines for relevant study design) to ensure that the experimental results will be unbiased, reproducible and transparent, and the feasibility of the project.

- 12. Outstanding:** Well-defined, near-flawless study design. Strong evidence of high-quality, reproducible research practices. Highly feasible with expertise, tools and techniques established.
- 10. Excellent:** Clearly defined, strong, well-developed study design. Very good evidence of high-quality, reproducible research practices. Feasible with expertise, tools and techniques established.
- 8. Very Good:** Generally clear in scientific plan with only very few minor concerns with study design. Good evidence of high-quality, reproducible research practices, required techniques and tools established or nearly established.
- 6. Good:** The plan is generally solid but may lack clarity of intent and focus. Some evidence of high-quality, reproducible research practices. Several minor concerns in design or feasibility.
- 4. Marginal:** The research plan is somewhat unclear in scientific approach and goals, with some major design flaws and major concerns about feasibility and likelihood of successful completion. Little evidence of high-quality, reproducible research practices.
- 2. Poor:** The research plan is unclear in scientific approach and goals, with several major design flaws and several major concerns about feasibility and likelihood of successful completion. No evidence of high-quality, reproducible research practices, and strong potential for bias.
- 0. Unsatisfactory:** Major flaws in the study and unlikely to be feasible or successfully completed. No evidence of high-quality, reproducible research practices, and strong potential for bias.

Score:

Out of 12

Comments:

**4. Significance of Expected Outcomes and/or Innovation of the Concept - (25%)
score out of 8**

This includes the potential of the project to increase knowledge in the field and have a significant impact on improved physiotherapy students' access and experience to clinical placements in private practice settings with a focus on musculoskeletal physiotherapy.

- 8. Excellent:** Will result in a significant advance in knowledge in this field. It is likely to have a significant impact on physiotherapy student's access and experience to clinical placements in private practice and translate into transformative outcomes downstream. Will most likely result in highly influential publications and invited presentations. The work is highly innovative in concept.
- 6. Very Good:** Will advance knowledge in this field. It may have a significant impact on physiotherapy student's access and experience to clinical placements in private practice. It may translate into transformative outcomes downstream. Will likely result in very strong publications and could be the subject of invited presentations. The work is innovative in concept.
- 4. Good:** May incrementally advance knowledge in this field but it is unlikely to have a significant impact on physiotherapy student's access and experience to clinical placements in private practice and unlikely to translate into transformative outcomes downstream. May result in some good but not excellent publications but is unlikely to be the subject of invited presentations. The work is solid in concept.
- 2. Marginal:** May result in some publications. The work may have some innovative or novel aspects.
- 0. Unsatisfactory:** Unlikely to result in publications and/or influence practice. The work is not innovative or novel.

Score: **Out of 8**

Comments:

5. Knowledge Translation (10%) score out of 3

This includes study design features that facilitate translation, planned processes for translating findings to the physiotherapy (and broader) community, and the likelihood that these strategies will lead to influences on practice and policy. This can also include future plans, which do not necessarily need to be achieved during the project scope or timeline.

- 3. Excellent:** Clearly defined translation strategy. Strong evidence of end-user engagement in the design, conduct analysis and/or dissemination of results. Process is clearly outlined. Strategy indicates that current or downstream findings are likely to influence practice and policy. Feasible with expertise of the team.
- 2. Good:** Translation strategy is generally solid but may lack focus. Some evidence of end-user engagement in the design, conduct analysis and/or dissemination of results. Several minor concerns regarding the likelihood that using this strategy will result in current or downstream findings influencing practice, and policy. Several minor concerns regarding feasibility.
- 1. Poor:** Translation strategy is unclear. Unlikely to be feasible. Very little evidence of end-user engagement in the design, conduct analysis and/or dissemination of results.
- 0. Unsatisfactory:** No translation strategy provided.

Score:

Out of 3

Comments:

6. Team Quality and Capability (25%) score out of 7

The applicants' research record demonstrates the appropriate research skills, experience, and concern for research rigour, relative to the opportunity that they are required to complete the proposed project. The applicant clearly justifies their eligibility and demonstrates how their expertise is relevant to the proposed project. The research record of the team demonstrates appropriate skills, experience and research rigour to support the applicant and ensure timely completion of the proposed project.

- 7. Outstanding:** Over the last 5 years, the applicant has a combined record of outstanding research achievement in their research field relative to opportunity. The applicant (and/or team) has expertise that specifically targets all elements of the project. Strong evidence supports that the applicant clearly justifies their eligibility

and demonstrates how their expertise is relevant to the proposed project.

6. Excellent: Over the last 5 years, the applicant has a combined record of excellent research achievement in their research field relative to opportunity. The applicant (and/or team) has expertise that is highly relevant to all elements of the project. Very good evidence supports that the applicant clearly justifies their eligibility and demonstrates how their expertise is relevant to the proposed project.

5. Very Good: Over the last 5 years, the applicant has a combined record of research achievement that is above average in their research field relative to opportunity. There are only minor concerns about the expertise of the applicant (and/or team) relevant to the project. Good evidence supports that the applicant clearly justifies their eligibility and demonstrates how their expertise is relevant to the proposed project.

4. Good: Over the last 5 years, the applicant has a combined record of research achievement that is average in their research field relative to opportunity. There are some concerns about the expertise of the applicant (and/or team) relevant to the project. Some evidence supports that the applicant clearly justifies their eligibility and demonstrates how their expertise is relevant to the proposed project.

3. Marginal: Over the last 5 years, the applicant has a combined record of research achievement that is average by peer standards in their research field relative to opportunity. There are major concerns about the expertise of the applicant (and/or team) relevant to the project. Little evidence supports that applicant clearly justifies their eligibility and demonstrates how their expertise is relevant to the proposed project.

2. Poor: Over the last 5 years, the applicant has a combined record of research achievement that is below average by peer standards in their research field, relative to opportunity. There are major concerns about the expertise of the applicant (and/or team) relevant to the project. No evidence supports that the applicant clearly justifies their eligibility and demonstrates how their expertise is relevant to the proposed project.

1. Unsatisfactory Insufficient details provided

Score:

Out of 7

Comments:

7. Budget

How appropriate is the budget? This should be itemised under the following headings: personnel (indicate salary level, on-costs, time involved), equipment/project materials/consumables, travel and incentives.

Excellent: The budget is well-considered and applicable for both the project and the use of PCT funds. Itemised headings were used. All detail/calculations are provided as appropriate.

Good: The budget is adequately considered and applicable for both the project and the use of PCT funds. Itemised headings are generally used. Some detail/calculations were provided as appropriate.

Marginal: There are minor concerns about the budget and use of PCT funds. Limited use of headings. Minimal detail/calculations provided.

Unsatisfactory: Unrealistic budget provided. Inappropriate use of PCT funds. Insufficient details provided.

Comments: Please outline what adjustments should be made to the budget and if there are components that the PCT should not fund. Please note this feedback will be provided to shortlisted applicants to assist them in preparing their full application.

Total score = out of 30

8. Feasibility

8.1 Based on the information provided, is this project feasible?
Please consider timelines, the budget and already collected data.

Yes

No

Comments:

8.2 Are there any reasons why this application should not progress to the full application stage outside of the criteria?

Yes

No

Comments:

9. Applicant feedback (will be anonymous)

9.1 Key strengths of the project

9.2 Key areas for improvement

Reviewer's name: _____