**Strategic Research Initiatives: Research Project Funding Proposal**

**Notes for Referees**

Assessment Criteria

**Cost Effectiveness.** For all public funding, we must ensure that resources are allocated on a basis that ensures optimal value for money. The cost effectiveness assessment and grading should be based on an assessment of the financial resources requested against the outputs proposed. The assessment should implicitly consider factors such as the applicant’s relevant track record, leverage of investment already made in existing infrastructure/facilities, and benefits arising from co-funding e.g. jointly funded programmes, in-kind contributions and attraction of third-party funding.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Grade | Research |
| V | Excellent value for money |
| IV | Very good value for money |
| III | Good value for money |
| II | Satisfactory value for money |
| I | Poor value for money |

**Excellence.** This criterion is used to judge the excellence of the proposal in accordance with the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **Research** |
| α5 | Outstanding: exceptional scholarly merit and originality; expected to have major scholarly impact; top 5% |
| α4 | Excellent: at the forefront of the field; will advance understanding; top 25% |
| α3 | Very good: generally competitive scholarship; top 60% |
| α2 | Good: quality scholarship, but not leading edge |
| α1 | Of merit: modest advance in the field |
| β | Will probably not advance the field or produce new, useful knowledge |
| Reject | Will not advance the field |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategic Research Initiatives:**  **New Research Project Funding Proposal**  **Reference Form** | | | | | | | CONFIDENTIAL |
| **Referee**: Please complete in typescript and return the form electronically to [biaa@thebritishacademy.ac.uk](mailto:biaa@britac.ac.uk). | | | | | | | |
| **1. Applicant** | | | | |  | | **2. Referee** |
|  | | | | |  | |  |
| **3. Title of research proposal** | | | | |  | | **4. Capacity in which the project and applicant are known to the referee** |
|  | | | | |  | |  |
| The British Institute at Ankara (BIAA) is registered under the Data Protection Act 1998 (Registration Number: Z499325X) and adheres to the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) which came into force on 25th May 2018. To pursue its legitimate interests the BIAA makes extensive use of peer review. The BIAA is not exempt from disclosing the content of a reference to an applicant invoking the Data Protection Act, unless by doing so the identity of the author of the reference is revealed. The policy of the BIAA is to maintain strict confidentiality, unless the referee **explicitly** consents to the disclosure of their identity. Please indicate below if you are willing for your reference to be disclosed. Otherwise, confidentiality will be preserved and, where necessary to protect your identity, the content of your reference will not be revealed to the applicant. The BIAA’s Privacy Notice can be found on the BIAA website. | | | | | | | |
| I am willing for my reference to be disclosed to the applicant | Yes |  | No |  | |  | |

1. What level of expertise do you have in the subject area of this application?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | High - High level of expertise |
|  | Medium - Sufficiently knowledgeable to provide an informed opinion |
|  | Low - Providing a generalist opinion only |

2. Which aspects of the application are you commenting on?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | (a) Whole application |
|  | (b) Particular aspects (please specify): |

3. Based upon your assessment of excellence, risk-reward and cost effectiveness (see below), would you recommend this proposal for funding?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | (a) Yes |
|  | (b) No |

(a) Cost effectiveness

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1  Poor | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  Excellent |
| Mark chosen grade with an ‘X’  *Only a single grade should be chosen* |  |  |  |  |  |

(b) Excellence

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Reject | β | α 1 | α 2 | α 3 | α 4 | α 5 |
| Mark chosen grade with an ‘X’  *Only a single grade should be chosen* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

What are the proposal's particular strengths? (e.g. are theories or approaches novel and timely, are questions and hypotheses well formulated, is the proposed methodology sound, can the stated objectives be met, are applicants suitable to carry out the project, does the project have potential to make major scholarly advances in knowledge, does it have wider applications and/or major scholarly impact etc.).

|  |
| --- |
|  |

What are the proposal's particular weaknesses? (e.g. ill-defined questions and hypotheses, methodological flaws, resources not justified, duplicates existing research etc.).

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Please assess the application with reference to the following: its originality, its relationship to and the volume of research already in the field, the scholarly importance of the research proposed, the feasibility of the research programme, the specificity of the scheme of research, the cost-effectiveness and intended outcomes.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

*End of reference form*