

Skills and Knowledge Transfer Grants: Scoring criteria

This document is intended as a guide for Panel members to score applications. It is essential that Panel members consider a range of factors when deciding on the overall score for a proposal.

1. Science/skills transfer and 3Rs potential

Panel members should consider:

- Reproducibility of the science for which the model/tool/technology is being used and the translatability and quality of the proposed skills transfer plan
- Potential 3Rs impact:
 - at the local level, should the model/tool/technology be successfully adopted by the host laboratory
 - at the national/international levels, should the model/tool/technology be more widely adopted

In order to help Panel members determine a combined score for the scientific/skills transfer and 3Rs impact of an application, the NC3Rs uses the scoring system shown in the table below.

2. Overall score

Panel members are asked to score the application from a range of 1 – 10, where one is the lowest score and ten is the highest. Scores should be whole numbers (0.5 integers are not accepted). Proposals with an average score of between seven and ten are considered fundable.

The scoring system should be used to determine the overall science/skills transfer and potential 3Rs impact score to give an application. Panel members should refer to Annex 1 for guidance when determining descriptors. The science/skills transfer and 3Rs descriptors should be used to form the basis of the overall score but Panel members should also judge whether the additional considerations listed below increase or lower the score.

SCIENCE/SKILLS TRANSFER	POTENTIAL 3Rs IMPACT				
	Exceptional	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Not competitive
Exceptional	10	9	8	7	5
Excellent	9	8	7	6	4
Very Good	8	7	6	5	3
Good	7	6	5	4	2
Not competitive	5	4	3	2	1

Additional considerations

When assessing Skills and Knowledge Transfer grant applications, Panel members should also take into consideration the following points regarding the proposed investigatory team;

- Expertise and ability to carry out the proposed work
- Track record of communication and dissemination (talks, workshops, collaborative networks, etc.)
- Standing of the investigatory team and collaborators in their field and their potential to facilitate the wider adoption of the model
- Suitability of collaborators listed, and the value they will add to the project

The following table should be used as guidance when determining the science/skills transfer and 3Rs score. It is not necessary to meet all of the individual criteria as this is not intended to be prescriptive but rather to provide a general framework.

SCIENCE/SKILLS TRANSFER	3Rs
<p>Exceptional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Exceptional experimental plan including excellent risk management strategy ▪ Exceptional plan for demonstrating utility and reproducibility of model/ tool/ technology including performance characteristics/ markers of success ▪ Excellent translatability/ skills transfer plan including realistic solutions to identified barriers to uptake ▪ Answers important scientific question in end-user(s) laboratory ▪ Excellent track record of investigatory team ▪ Very high likelihood of successful delivery ▪ Strategically important area as identified by the NC3Rs 	<p>Exceptional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3Rs benefit of tool/ model/ technology expertly described ▪ Potential to have a very high impact on the 3Rs e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replacing/ reducing a large number of animals - Refining a severe procedure (even if numbers affected are low) - Will have a local impact on animal use with a very high likelihood of increasing adoption by other groups nationally/internationally*
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Excellent experimental plan including strong risk management strategy ▪ Excellent plan for demonstrating utility and reproducibility of model/ tool/ technology including performance characteristics/ markers of success ▪ Excellent translatability/ skills transfer plan including realistic solutions to identified barriers to uptake ▪ Excellent track record of investigatory team ▪ High likelihood of successful delivery ▪ Strategically important area as identified by the NC3Rs 	<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3Rs benefit of tool/ model/ technology excellently described ▪ Potential to have a high impact on the 3Rs e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replacing/ reducing a significant number of animals - Refining a severe/moderate procedure (even if numbers affected are low) - Will have a local impact on animal use with a high likelihood of adoption by other groups nationally/internationally*
<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Robust experimental plan including strong risk management strategy ▪ Strong plan for demonstrating utility and reproducibility of model/ tool/ technology including performance characteristics/ markers of success ▪ Strong translatability/ skills transfer plan including realistic solutions to identified barriers to uptake ▪ Very good track record of investigatory team ▪ High likelihood of successful delivery ▪ Addresses an important area as identified by the NC3Rs 	<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3Rs benefit of tool/ model/ technology well described ▪ Potential to have a strong impact on the 3Rs e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replacing/ reducing a significant number of animals - Refining a moderate procedure (even if numbers affected are low) OR refining a mild procedure where numbers are high - Will have a local impact on animal use with the likelihood of adoption by other groups nationally/internationally
<p>Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Robust experimental plan including realistic risk management strategy ▪ Solid plan for demonstrating utility and reproducibility of model/ tool/ technology including performance characteristics/ markers of success ▪ Adequate translatability/ skills transfer plan including realistic solutions to identified barriers to uptake ▪ Good track record of investigatory team ▪ Good likelihood of successful delivery 	<p>Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3Rs benefit of tool/ model/ technology adequately described ▪ Potential to have an impact on the 3Rs e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replacing/ reducing a modest number of animals - Refining a mild/unclassified procedure - Will have a local impact on animal use but unlikely to be adopted more widely
<p>Not competitive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poor experimental plan with poor risk management strategy ▪ Weak plans for demonstrating utility and reproducibility of model/ tool/ technology ▪ Poor translatability/ skills transfer plan ▪ Investigatory team lacks essential expertise ▪ Low likelihood of successful delivery 	<p>Not competitive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3Rs benefit of tool/ model/ technology poorly described ▪ Will have no (or a very low) impact on the 3Rs e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will not replace/ reduce any animal use - Does not refine a classified procedure - Will not have a local impact on animal use or be adopted by more widely

*Local impact refers to: within an applicant's own laboratory and/or institution