

NATIONAL ASTHMA RESEARCH PROGRAM

PHD FUNDING: APPLICANT GUIDE (GROUP)

Contents

General information for applicants	2
Assessment Process	3
Application Guide.....	4
Research environment and supervision team (40%)	4
The Project (quality and feasibility) (30%)	4
Impact (30%)	4
Consumer Review Form	5
Peer Review Guide	7
Research environment and supervisor (40%)	7
Quality and feasibility of the research proposal (30%)	7
Impact (30%)	8
Consumer Review Guide	10

General information for applicants

Over the past ten years the Asthma Australia National Asthma Research Program has made significant contributions to important discovery science, clinical, and population health research projects, as well as PhD Scholarships and research fellowships to promote emerging researchers in the field.

Asthma Australia invites research groups whose research relates to people with asthma, to apply for funding for a PhD scholarship.

Applicants for Asthma Australia's PhD scholarship (group) must:

- Lead an established research team in an established NHMRC registered research institution
- Ensure the appointment of an appropriately qualified PhD candidate in the research project to conduct the research.
- Be conducting research in Australia

Please refer to the advertisement for specific eligibility requirements.

Submission process

- Applications should be submitted to research@asthma.org.au. Late or incomplete applications will not be accepted.
- Applications must include
 - Completed application form
 - Completed consumer review form
- Applications must be lodged electronically in Microsoft Windows Word or PDF format, using the application form. Applications not received in this format will not be accepted.
- Left margin should be at least 2.5cm with content aligned text left
- Font (body) should be Calibri 11 point
- Applications should be in one document and named as follows: SURNAME OF APPLICANT_GROUP_PHD_YEAR

Reporting expectations

If successful, applicants (and appointed PhD candidate) will provide 6 monthly progress reports to Asthma Australia. Progress reports will include:

- Any changes to the research,
- Any issues or delays which might impact the completion of the project,
- Progress against key milestones,
- Outcomes, and
- Publications, presentations, collaborations and additional funding which have arisen as a result of the research.

These should be provided in language appropriate for a lay audience.

Affiliation and acknowledgment

Successful applicants must ensure (wherever possible) Asthma Australia's contribution and support of the Project is acknowledged in publications or presentations related to the research.

Assessment Process

Eligibility

Applications are assessed for their eligibility by Asthma Australia staff. Eligible applications will undergo assessment by peer and consumer reviewers from Asthma Australia's Research Advisory Committee or delegate/s.

All applications are assessed against standardised assessment criteria which are described in this document. Applicants will receive a score out of 100 for both peer review and consumer reviews.

Peer Review

Peer reviewers assess applications on the extent to which they address the criteria below.

Applications will be assessed against the domains described on the following pages.

Peer Review Categories	Weight
Research environment and supervision team	40%
Quality and feasibility of the research proposal	30%
Impact	30%

Consumer review

Consumer reviewers assess applications on the extent to which they address the domains described below. Applicants are asked to complete a Consumer Review Form which the consumers will use in reviewing applications.

Consumer Review Categories	Weight
Impact	25%
Equity	25%
Translation	25%
Consumer Centred	25%

Application Guide

Research environment and supervision team (40%)

This section should demonstrate the quality and suitability of the supervisor (applicant), including resources and infrastructure available to the applicant and necessary for the completion of the research and the suitability of the wider research team.

It should also detail how the project team will effectively appoint an appropriate PhD candidate.

The Project (quality and feasibility) (30%)

This section should clearly demonstrate the need and rationale behind the PhD research project, aims and objectives, scientific quality of the methodology, expected outcomes, timeframes and feasibility of the research. In the outline of the research proposal, applicants should address the following:

1. Background of the research including the need for the proposed research proposal.
2. Aims, objectives and hypothesis
3. Methods, techniques and analyses that will be used for the research
4. Identification of potential risks or anticipated challenges, as well as how these will be addressed
5. Expected outcomes of the research
6. Timelines of the research project
7. A description on how the proposed research will be feasible

Impact (30%)

This section relates to the potential knowledge gain about asthma and the proposed impact on people with asthma of the PhD project. Applicants can also detail the potential impacts of the research carried out by the wider team, to which the PhD project will contribute.

Applicants should indicate how the research will address any of Asthma Australia's [research priority area/s](#).

Applicants should consider and address the following in each section:

Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential impact of this project for people with asthma • The potential knowledge gains or fundamental outcomes of the research • How the PhD project contributes to the wider impacts of the research team's research and how this relates to asthma
Research priority area	<p>Outline how the project meets the Asthma Australia National Research Program Priority/ies. If a specific priority area has been outlined in the application information, this criteria must be addressed adequately for the application to be eligible.</p> <p>The priority areas are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention • Vulnerable groups • Models and system • Environment • Influencing policy <p>It is not required that all priority areas are addressed in the application.</p>

Consumer Review Form

Asthma Australia is committed to being a consumer-centred organisation, which meets the diverse needs of people with asthma and carers. We seek to champion the expressed needs of people with asthma and ensure their inclusion in our research program. We believe research should be informed by consumers, involve consumers and be meaningful for consumer lived experience.

Please submit the completed Consumer Review Form as part of your application. Your responses to these criteria will be scored by an Asthma Australia consumer representative.

The Consumer Review Form must be completed in plain English and be able to be considered by the consumer reviewer as a stand-alone document and without reference to information provided in the full application. Please provide a simple concise definition of key technical concepts used. We suggest you ask someone without detailed research knowledge to read the completed form, prior to submission, to check for understanding.

This should include why the research is being conducted, aims and objectives, how you will do the research and what the benefits of the research will be as well as explanations of any technical terms used.

The Consumer Review Form must then describe how the proposed research addresses the following criteria:

Impact	<p>Applicants should address which Asthma Australia research priority area/s this addresses, the need for the research, proposed outcomes and how these will lead to a benefit for people with asthma.</p> <p>Explain the potential for the proposed research to have a direct, beneficial impact on the lives of people with asthma, in the short, medium and/or long term. Applicants should include what the benefit/s are expected to be, how likely it is they will occur, and when the benefits might be realised. This shouldn't be confused with the benefits for research participants.</p>
Translation	<p>This section should explain how the current study will be applied to the real world over the short, medium and long term to achieve the proposed impacts.</p> <p>Consumers recognise that further steps are often required for the benefits of research to be realised. These steps might include additional research, changes in clinical practice, product development, regulation/law and/or policy changes. Consumers also recognise that outcomes achieved in a single body of work may make significant advances to the knowledge of asthma, but not necessarily benefit people with asthma immediately.</p> <p>Applicants should identify the further steps required for benefit to be achieved and detail these, dot points or numbered timeframe are appropriate. These steps should detail the pathway to realise the benefit of the research, rather than the steps required to complete the research project. It is understood these steps will likely extend beyond the requesting funding period.</p> <p>Applicants should also note here any potential barriers to translation and how they propose to address them.</p>

Equity This section should describe **who** benefits as a result of this research, and should address how the research benefits can be distributed to the wider population or how they benefit people most vulnerable to poor asthma outcomes (e.g. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People, people experiencing socioeconomic hardship and people with severe asthma for example).

If a research project focuses on a specific population, the applicant should provide an explanation for the rationale behind this focus, including how relevant groups have been considered/consulted. The applicant should also provide explanation around if/how the benefits could be expanded or apply to other groups in the future.

This is not to say research cannot have a focus on a specific population group to be equitable. In fact, research which prioritises the health of vulnerable populations is a priority of the Asthma Australia research program. However, a study of a new treatment may be inequitable if the results can only benefit people in metropolitan areas or those who can access and afford them.

Consumer centred Asthma Australia is committed to being a consumer-centred organisation, which meets the diverse needs of people with asthma and carers. Applicants should outline how relevant informed consumers have been involved during the development of the research proposal and/or the plan for how they will continue to participate in the research once underway.

Some examples of consumer involvement are:

- Work with researchers to define or refine the research topic
 - Provide informed input on research design and proposed methods
 - Conduct lay reviews of research proposals
 - Participate in recruiting participants to research
 - Assist researchers to develop links to hard-to-reach populations
 - Conduct reviews of participant information sheets and consent forms
 - Assist researchers to pilot a research questionnaire
 - Support the development of lay summaries
 - Assist in disseminating information to the wider community
-

Peer Review Guide

Peer reviewers should assess applications on the extent to which they address the criteria below. Applications will be assessed against the domains described on the following pages. While the described domains provide peer reviewers with some benchmarks for appropriately scoring each application, **it is not essential that all descriptors relating to a given score are met.** The domains are a guide to a ‘best fit’ outcomes. Peer reviewers will consistently refer to these domains to ensure thorough equitable and transparent assessment of applications.

Peer Review Categories	Weight
Research environment and supervision team	40%
Quality and feasibility of the research proposal	30%
Impact	30%

Research environment and supervisor (40%)

Applicants should clearly demonstrate how the research supervisor and wider environment will recruit an appropriate candidate to the project, support successful outcomes of the PhD project, positive impact the career development of PhD candidate.

Descriptions	Mark
The research environment and supervision team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are well matched to the proposed project • Offer outstanding quality research support systems and mentoring for the applicant • Offer outstanding potential to extend the applicant’s knowledge and skills • Will be able to successfully recruit an outstanding PhD candidate to the project 	Outstanding (10-9)
The research environment and supervision team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is suited to the applicants proposed project • Offer good quality research support systems and mentoring for the applicant • Offer very good potential to extend the applicant’s knowledge and skills • Are likely to be able to recruit an outstanding PhD candidate to the project 	Very good (8-6)
The research environment and supervision team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is somewhat suited to the applicants proposed project • Offer satisfactory research support systems and mentoring for the applicant • Offer satisfactory potential to extend the applicant’s knowledge and skills • Will be able to recruit a PhD candidate to the project 	Satisfactory (5-3)
The research environment and supervision team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is not suited to the applicants proposed project • Offer limited research support systems and mentoring for the applicant • Offer limited potential to extend the applicant’s knowledge and skills • Are unlikely to be able to recruit a PhD candidate to the project 	Poor/limited (2-1)

Quality and feasibility of the research proposal (30%)

Applicants should clearly demonstrate the need and rationale behind the research, aims and objectives, scientific quality of the methodology, expected outcomes, timeframes and feasibility of the research.

Descriptions	Mark
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has objectives that are well-defined Is very well designed Is highly feasible 	Outstanding (10-9)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has objectives that are clear Is well designed Is feasible 	Very good (8-6)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has objectives that are adequately defined Overall clear research design, but raises some concerns Raises some concerns with respect to feasibility 	Satisfactory (5-3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has objectives that are unclear Raises major concerns with respect to the research design Raised major concerns with respect to the feasibility 	Poor/limited (2-1)

Impact (30%)

Applicants will provide responses which describe the potential impact of this research for people with asthma, how the research addresses one or more of Asthma Australia's research priority areas and how the scholarship will contribute to the applicant's career or future career aspirations.

Peer reviewers should consider the five Asthma Australia research priority areas in their assessment. If applicants are asked to address a specific priority area to be eligible for the grant, reviewers will be advised. Otherwise, applicants can address one or more area.

- Research that focuses on primary and secondary **prevention**
- Research, interventions and other methods of enquiry which seek to address the inequity of asthma impact on **vulnerable groups** in Australia.
- Research or design and testing of **models and systems** which seek to address the systemic contributions to asthma health or illness.
- Research which explores and minimises the impact of the changing **environment** on asthma health.
- **Influencing policy** through the consolidation of experience, evidence and consultations with the wider research community.

Descriptions	Mark
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> will result in a highly significant advance in knowledge in this field which addresses an issue of great importance to people with asthma Has a strong focus on one or more of the National Asthma Research Program priority areas Will make an excellent contribution to the applicant's future career aspirations 	Outstanding (10-9)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> will advance knowledge in this field which addresses an issue of importance to people with asthma Has a focus on the National Asthma Research Program priority area/s Will make a good contribution to the applicant's future career aspirations 	Very good (8-6)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> may incrementally advance knowledge in the field which addresses an issue of some importance to people with asthma Has some implications for a National Asthma Research Program priority area 	Satisfactory (5-3)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will make a satisfactory contribution to the applicant’s future career aspirations 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • addresses an issue of some concern to people with asthma • Has no implications for a National Asthma Research Program priority area • Will make a limited contribution to the applicant’s future career aspirations 	Poor/limited (2-1)

Consumer Review Guide

Consumer reviewers independently score each of the review criteria on a scale of 1-10. The scoring guide below and the detailed description of each criterion is provided to consumer reviewers and is provided here for applicants' information.

Descriptions	Mark
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal is of the highest quality, provides all the information required, is easily understood, and there is no possibility for improvement. 	10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An impressive proposal that provides all required information clearly and in detail. 	9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal provides most of the information required in a clear and detailed way. Little else could be included. 	8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is sound but could be improved with addition of detail. The response contains minor gaps, or slight confusion in some parts. 	6-7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A barely acceptable proposal which addresses the criterion but provides minimal detail, causes confusion and/or includes some irrelevant information. 	4-5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal suffers serious inadequacies such as little or no detail, irrelevant information and/or causes confusion. 	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal does not address the question except in the most fleeting way or is inappropriate to the question. The information provided is very brief or generally irrelevant. 	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no proposal, or a response that does not address the question. Nowhere else in the Consumer Review Form is there any information relevant to the question. 	1

In assigning your score, please refer to the general guide to scoring depicted on the scale and considering the following key points:

Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the researcher explained the extent of the problem and its importance? Has the researcher explained how the research will lead to tangible benefit/s to people with asthma? Are there a number of benefits? Has the researcher indicated the probability, magnitude and/or duration of these potential benefits? Has the researcher indicated when in the future the potential benefits might be achieved? Does the research address at least one Asthma Australia research priority area?
Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the researcher explained how the findings could be generalised or applied to other population groups who are not part of the research? Does the research have the potential to provide benefit across all relevant persons groups and/or places? Does the research address an under-studied or under-served population? Does the research address a population with a high burden of illness or poorer outcomes?

Translation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Has the researcher explained how the research findings may be translated or further developed to enable translated into meaningful outcome for people with asthma?• Do you understand when in the future the benefits might be achieved?• Has the researcher provided a description of the broad steps or stages required to reach the stated benefits of the research?
Consumer involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Has consumer consultation into the development of this specific project already been undertaken?• Are there formal processes/structures in place that link the researchers with consumers?• Is the nature of consumer involvement clearly described, including the matters on which consumers will be consulted and the mechanisms by which this consultation will occur, and is the involvement two-way?• Has an individual consumer, or a consumer organisation, agreed to act as the consumer representative on this project?• Given the nature of the research, does the extent and type/s of consumer involvement seem appropriate? Eg we would not expect a laboratory research project to include extensive consumer involvement• Is there a plan for ongoing consumer involvement in the research?• Has the researcher considered the role of consumers in the translation of their findings?
