

Assessment Criteria

Last updated: 3rd February 2022

1 Assessment Process

The Disability Under Siege Network is committed to assessing grant applications fairly, to ensure the best projects are funded.

When you have submitted your application, the Disability Under Siege Project Team will:

1. Check the application to ensure it meets the stated eligibility criteria (If the application does not meet the criteria the applicant will be informed)
2. Submit the application to the Network and Knowledge Exchange Assessment Panel members for review.
3. Panel members will assess the application independently of one another against the criteria detailed in the table below.
4. Panel members will assign the application a score between 1 and 6, where 1 is 'unfundable' and 6 is 'outstanding'.
5. The assessment panel will then meet online to discuss the suggested scores, agree on the final grade, and rank applications in order of funding priority and will decide how many projects to fund for each core country to ensure a balanced portfolio of projects.

2 Assessment Panel Members

Professor Dina Kiwan (Chair)

Principal Investigator – Disability Under Siege Network, University of Birmingham

Professor Rita Giacaman

Co-Investigator – Disability Under Siege Network, Birzeit University

Dr Maha Shuayb

Co-Investigator - Disability Under Siege Network, Centre for Lebanese Studies

Professor Anthony Downey

Co-Investigator - Disability Under Siege Network, Birmingham City University.

3 Network and Knowledge Exchange Funding Call Assessment Criteria

Assessment Criteria 1	Originality: Potential contribution to knowledge
Assessment Criteria 2	Strategic aims and methods
Assessment Criteria 3	Value for Money
Assessment Criteria 4	Innovative collaborations / networking
Assessment Criteria 5	Outputs, Dissemination and Impact

4 Assessment Grading

The Panel as a whole will agree an overall grade from 6-1 for each proposal, reached through discussion of the proposals – taking into account the Introducers' initial grades and comments, alongside the comments of the panel as a whole. The overall grade will be used in determining the proposal's relative ranking.

The panel should rank proposals relative to one another as they proceed through the meeting. Some panels may find it useful to use decimals or high/mid/low when allocating grades if they have a high number of proposals to rank e.g. 5.5 or 5 mid. At the end of the meeting, the panel will review the ranking list before finally agreeing the ranked order. Proposals given a 3, 2 or 1 grade do not need to be ranked. them.

Please access the [AHRC's Assessment Panel Guidance](#) for further detailed information on this process.

5 Grading Scale

Score	Description	Definition
1	Exceptional Should be funded as a matter of the very highest priority	Work that is at the leading edge internationally, in all of the assessment criteria – scholarship, originality, quality and significance, and meets the majority of them to an exceptional level. Likely to have a significant impact on the field. The proposal's evidence and justification are fully and consistently provided and management arrangements are clear and convincing.
2	Excellent Should be funded as a matter of priority	Work that is internationally excellent in all of the assessment criteria – scholarship, originality, quality and significance, and meets them to an excellent level. Will answer important questions in the field. The proposal's evidence and justification are fully and consistently provided and management arrangements are clear and convincing.
3	Very Good Worthy of consideration for funding	Work that demonstrates high international standards of scholarship, originality, quality and significance. Will advance the field of research. It meets all assessment criteria. The proposal's evidence and justification are good and management arrangements are clear and sound
4	Satisfactory In a competitive context, the proposal is not considered of sufficient priority to recommend for funding	Work that is satisfactory in terms of scholarship and quality but lacking in international competitiveness. It is limited in terms of originality, innovation and significance and its contribution to the research field. It meets minimum requirements in terms of the assessment criteria and the proposal's evidence and justification are adequate overall.
5	Not Competitive Not recommended for funding	Work that is of inconsistent quality with some strengths, innovative ideas and good components, but has significant weaknesses or flaws in its conceptualisation, design, methodology and management. Unlikely to advance the field significantly. It does not meet all scheme assessment criteria.
6	Unfundable Not suitable for funding	A proposal that has an unsatisfactory level of originality, quality and significance. Has limited potential to advance research within the field and may be unconvincing in terms of its management arrangements or capacity to deliver proposed activities, especially for the amount of funding being sought. Unlikely to advance the field. It falls short of meeting the assessment criteria for the scheme