

2021 SEEDING GRANTS

EOI GUIDELINES AND GENERAL INFORMATION FOR APPLICANTS

The Physiotherapy Research Foundation (PRF) Seeding Grants are for new researchers working on new or established research projects. The purpose of PRF Seeding Grants is to help new researchers begin a research career.

Applications are considered predominantly on the basis of scientific merit and significance, rather than the applicant's research record. However, please note that projects will only be funded if the budget is fully justified. Inexperienced researchers are advised that collaboration with an associate investigator who has current experience in the relevant research area will enhance the likelihood of a project receiving PRF funding.

Applicants are required to submit an expression of interest (EOI), followed by a full application for those who are shortlisted. It is anticipated that full applications will open in late May and close late June.

In 2021, there are up to six Seeding Grants available, each with a maximum amount of \$10,000.

Submission of EOI Applications

Submissions and any relevant documents are to be sent via email to:

Jenine.Fleming@australian.physio

All submissions must be received by **Monday 8 March, 11:30 pm AEDT**. Late applications will not be accepted and no extension of the submission deadline will be considered. Receipt of your application will be acknowledged by return e-mail.

Evaluation Criteria

Grants will be evaluated by the PRF Committee, whose decisions shall be considered final, on the recommendation of the PRF 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 adhering 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 the practice of physiotherapy.
- Knowledge translation (10%) - This includes study design features that facilitates translation, planned processes for translating findings to the physiotherapy (and broader) community, and the likelihood that these strategies will lead to influences on practice, policy and / or behaviour change. 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 rigor, relative to opportunity, required to complete the proposed project. The research record of the team demonstrates appropriate skills, experience and research rigour to support the development of the applicant as a researcher 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 see page 5). Please ensure that you consult this carefully when preparing your application.

Research Area

Choose one or two areas of research from the following list:

- Basic Science Behavioural or Biological
- Cardiothoracic (Jill Nosworthy Seeding Grant)
- Continence
- Education
- Electrotherapy
- Ergonomics & Occupational Health
- Exercise Therapy
- Gerontology
- Musculoskeletal
- Movement Sciences
- Neurology
- Orthopaedics
- Paediatrics
- Posture
- Rehabilitation
- Return to work
- Sports Physiotherapy
- Women's Health
- Other (specify)

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 PRF prior to the payment of grant monies.

Research Team

Investigators will be categorised as either the Chief Investigator (Applicant) or Associate Investigators. The applicant must:

- be the Chief Investigator of the project
- hold registration with AHPRA
- be an Australian citizen, or have permanent resident status
- currently reside in Australia
- be a financial member of the Australian Physiotherapy Association (APA) and maintain APA membership for the duration of the grant.

The applicant must not have received:

- a PRF Seeding, Project or Tagged grant previously
- any research grant of more than \$20,000 as a named chief investigator (including at the time of awarding this grant)
- more than \$20,000 in maintenance or support funding accompanying a post-doctoral fellowship (total amount over the duration of the fellowship). This amount is exclusive of salary, but includes additional funds for items such as travel and research consumables.

The applicant may have received a post-graduate scholarship.

The applicant may submit up to two separate Seeding Grant EOIs but will only be eligible for a maximum of one grant.

The applicant cannot be a named Associate Investigator on another 2021 PRF Seeding Grant application.

At least one of any Associate Investigators should be an experienced researcher with previous and current research support and publications arising from that support. At least one of the Associate Investigators must be the Lead Supervising Investigator who agrees to support and commit time to developing the applicant as a researcher.

As distinct from the project investigators, personnel are defined as people who are specifically employed in order to carry out the project, e.g. research assistants.

As Seeding Grants are only available to new researchers, the expectation is that the proposal will be predominantly the work of the applicant, albeit with input and support from the lead supervising investigator who does have research experience. Where the applicant's project is part of a larger study, the proposal should state how the proposed project relates to, but is discrete from, the larger study.

Budget

The maximum funding available for a PRF seeding grant is \$10,000.

As a grant made by the Physiotherapy Research Foundation is considered by the Australian Taxation Office as a 'gift' rather than a grant of financial assistance, no GST is payable. There is therefore no need to include GST in your project budget.

Itemise your budget under the following headings: personnel (indicate salary level, on-costs, time involved), equipment / project materials / consumables, travel and incentives.

For budget purposes, the following interpretations will apply:

Personnel – people employed in order to carry out the project, e.g. research assistant. Please note that funding to backfill the clinical workload of the Chief Investigator is typically not appropriate (although may be considered in cases where specific skill sets are required to complete data collection).

Equipment, project materials and consumables – items used during the course of the project, e.g. paper or film.

Travel – normally only travel related to data acquisition will be funded, not conference travel.

In general, the PRF will not fund items which are usually funded or provided by an administering organisation such as a university or a hospital.

The PRF will not fund administering organisation's infrastructure costs, as this would substantially impact on the amount of funds remaining for research.

If funding is requested for subject payment or reimbursement, please include with your application a copy of the consent form or plain language statement referring to payment/reimbursement arrangements. Compensation for healthy student volunteers from within the Administering Organisation will not normally be approved.

Timeline

Please ensure that the timeline is feasible. Please note that the project does not need to be completed within one year. While there is no specific limit to when the project needs to be completed and funds expended, the proposed timeline will be evaluated relative to each individual project. Please note that it is envisaged that the outcome of full applications will be known in mid-October. Following ethics approval, full payment will be made in early 2022 (or earlier by arrangement).

Certifications

The Chief Investigator (applicant) must verify the contents of the application and his or her eligibility for a PRF Seeding Grant.

The Lead Supervising Investigator (Associate Investigator 1) must verify their commitment to supporting and developing the Chief Investigator throughout the project.

Legal Agreement

Applicants are required to sign a formal agreement prior to receiving any grant monies.

Release of Information

All information provided on a PRF grant application form is private and confidential and will be used in accordance with the APA's 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 PRF webpage of the APA website.

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

EOI DEADLINE: Monday 8 March 2021, 11:30pm AEDT

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

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

Queries:

For queries please contact Jenine Fleming, PRF Administration Officer on (03) 9092 0852 or via email Jenine.Fleming@australian.physio

PHYSIOTHERAPY RESEARCH FOUNDATION

Level 1, 1175 Toorak Road, Camberwell VIC 3124

Postal Address: PO Box 437, Hawthorn BC VIC 3122



2021 Seeding Grant – EOI Evaluation SAMPLE ONLY

1. Project Identification

Chief Investigator (Applicant):	
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 adhering 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:** 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:** 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:** 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.

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 the practice of physiotherapy.

8. **Excellent:** Will result in a significant advance in knowledge in this field. It is likely to have a significant impact on physiotherapy 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 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 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.

Comments:

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

This includes study design features that facilitates translation, planned processes for translating findings to the physiotherapy (and broader) community, and the likelihood that these strategies will lead to influences on practice, policy and / or behaviour change. 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, policy and / or behaviour change. 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, policy and / or behaviour change. 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.

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 rigor, relative to opportunity, required to complete the proposed project. The research record of the team demonstrates appropriate skills, experience and research rigour to support the development of the applicant as a researcher 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 of a framework to support the applicant as an early career researcher.

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 of a framework to support the applicant as an early career researcher.

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 of a framework to support the applicant as an early career researcher.

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 of a framework to support the applicant as an early career researcher.

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 of a framework to support the applicant as an early career researcher.

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 of a framework to support the applicant as an early career researcher.

1. Unsatisfactory Insufficient details provided

Comments:

Total score = x out of 30

Form continued overleaf ...



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 use of PRF funds. Itemised headings used. All detail/calculations provided as appropriate.

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

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

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

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

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?

Comments

9. Applicant feedback (will be anonymous)

9.1 Key strengths of project

9.2 Key weaknesses of project / areas for improvement

Reviewer's name: _____

Date: