

## Equipment Grant marking guidelines

### Scientific quality (marks out of 30)

Proposals should have clear objectives and milestones, and well thought through experiments. Scientific excellence of the project and the applicant's potential will be paramount.

Consider the following:

- Clarity of hypotheses, aims, and objectives
- Strengths and weaknesses of the experimental design
- Feasibility of the work programme, given the preliminary data and/or track-record of the applicant

	<b>Exceptional Fundable</b>	Work that is or is likely to be at the leading edge internationally.
	<b>Excellent Fundable</b>	Work that is of a good international standard and nationally leading.
	<b>Very Good Fundable</b>	Work that may be internationally competitive and certainly nationally.
	<b>Good Fundable</b>	Work that has merit.
	<b>Not Competitive or unfundable</b> Not Fundable	Work that is potentially of some merit, but which is not internationally or nationally competitive. OR Work that is of no significant scientific merit, flawed, or duplicative of other research

### Benefit to applicant (marks out of 30)

The proposal should be of clear benefit to the future career of the researcher and should significantly advance them in establishing their laboratory research.

Consider the following:

- Is the equipment critical for the future research of the applicant?
- Is the funding for the equipment likely to be available to the applicant from elsewhere (eg a substantial fellowship, such as from the Wellcome Trust or RCUK) – ie will it really make a difference if successful?
- Who will benefit most from the equipment? Will it be the applicant or the wider Department?

	<b>Exceptional Fundable</b>	Equipment that will clearly be of benefit to the applicant in establishing an independent research group. The impact on the applicant's research capability is likely to be substantial.
	<b>Excellent Fundable</b>	
	<b>Very Good Fundable</b>	Equipment that will be of an advantage to the applicant but will not make a substantial difference to their research capacity, or for which funding ought to be available elsewhere (eg if they hold a substantial personal fellowship).
	<b>Good Fundable</b>	
	<b>Not Competitive or Unfundable</b> Not Fundable	Equipment that may benefit the Department but which may be of little obvious or immediate benefit to the applicant.

**Benefit to endocrine science/medicine** (marks out of 10)

The applicant's research should address a problem of endocrine significance, which may be of clinical, basic or translational importance. It should be of a quality that will make an international impact or have the potential to make an international impact.

Consider the following:

- Will the equipment help the applicant address a clinical endocrine need?
- Will the equipment be used to address a fundamental question in endocrinology?
- Will the equipment facilitate the translation of findings from animals to human research?

	<b>Exceptional Fundable</b>	Work that addresses a major clinical need or an important basic question in endocrinology and where the impact is likely to be substantial
	<b>Excellent Fundable</b>	
	<b>Very Good Fundable</b>	Work that is relevant to endocrinology, but where impact on the field is unlikely to be great.
	<b>Good Fundable</b>	
	<b>Not Competitive or Unfundable Not Fundable</b>	Work that is of borderline significance to endocrinology and should be funded by an alternate body or not funded.