



**BAM and SIMA Collaborative Research Grant Scheme 2026
Assessment criteria**

Criterion // Numeric value	5	4	3	2	1
1. Quality of project					
1.1 Does the application demonstrate sound knowledge of the field including literature(s) relevant to the project? Fully – aims and objectives and/or research questions are clearly located with reference to a critical evaluation of the literature on the topic. Not at all – aims and objectives and/or research questions are not informed or located with reference to the literature, or appreciation of the literature shows critical weaknesses.	Fully	Largely	Somewhat	Partially	Not at all
1.2 Are the proposal methodology, research design, and/or method of high quality and original? Fully – methodology and/or research design is explained transparently and in detail so that it is clear how methods will be used to answer research questions. Methodology and/or research design is informed by latest high-quality research and methodological development. Claims of methodological innovation or originality are clearly explained and justified. Not at all – minimal explanation of methods to be used for data collection and analysis leading to limited clarity about how research questions can be answered. No evidence of originality or innovation in methodology or research design (or claims or innovation/originality that are not adequately supported with reference to the literature).	Fully	Largely	Somewhat	Partially	Not at all



1.3 Are the project and the project workplan viable? Fully – application details a realistic process of the envisaged research process. It shows appreciation of the likely challenges in collecting and analysing proposed data and demonstrates clear awareness of how challenges can be overcome while acknowledging risks. Not at all – application contains no meaningful detail of the envisaged research process and does not demonstrate understanding of any challenges that might be encountered.	Fully	Largely	Somewhat	Partially	Not at all
1.4 Does the project have potential to contribute to the field (i.e., conceptual originality and relevance to the wider management and business community)? Significant potential – clearly explains how it is hoped the research will advance theory and/or methodological developments. Explains the potential significance of any theoretical or methodological developments or innovation to academia and/or practice with reference to relevant literature. No potential – does not address how the research could lead to a theoretical or methodological development. Significance of the anticipated theoretical or methodological innovation is poorly explained or the anticipated theoretical or methodological development is of marginal significance to academia and/or practice.	Significant potential	Strong potential	Some potential	Little potential	No potential
1.5 Have the implications of the project on ethics and Equality, Diversity, Inclusivity and Respect (EDIR) or Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) been appropriately considered in the application? Fully – clear explanation of ethical and EDIR issues and challenges raised by the research and how these will be addressed. Clear explanation of mechanisms for oversight and governance of research ethics (i.e., if applicant already has or will be seeking approval from an institutional ethical review body prior to commencing research) and provision for EDIR.	Fully	Largely	Somewhat	Partially	Not at all

Not at all – ethical and EDIR issues are poorly addressed, leaving key ethical and EDIR challenges unaddressed. Limited explanation of institutional ethical review processes or provision for EDIR.					
2. Engagement with the BAM and SIMA communities?					
2.1 To what extent does the project fit with the Grant Scheme remit? Fully – aims and objectives clearly address the remit of the grant scheme as set out in section 1 (introduction) of the guidance for applicants. Not at all – aims and objectives poorly address the remit of the grant scheme as set out in section 1 (introduction) of the guidance for applicants.	Fully	Largely	Somewhat	Partially	Not at all
2.2 To what extent is the project aligned with one or more of BAM or SIMA's Special Interest Groups or the BAM Management Knowledge and Education group, BAM or SIMA's Mission and one or more of BAM, ANZAM, IAM or SIMA's Strategic objectives (see https://www.bam.ac.uk/about-bam/strategy-2024.html and for details Fully – application clearly explains how proposed research relates to relevant constituent parts of BAM and directly aligns to BAM's and/or SIMA's Mission and strategic objectives. Proposed research addresses an issue of strategic importance. Not at all – application does not explain how proposed research relates to relevant constituent parts of BAM nor mentions or directly aligns to BAM's, and/or SIMA's Mission or strategic objectives.	Fully	Largely	Somewhat	Partially	Not at all
3. Publication, dissemination and impact plans and value for money					
3.1 Is the project publication and dissemination plan to academic audiences ambitious, specific, and aligned with the Grant Scheme remit as set out in Section 1 (introduction) of the guidance for applicants?	Fully	Largely	Somewhat	Partially	Not at all

Fully – application states clearly expected number and type of outputs (e.g., review, conceptual, empirical, methodological) which is clearly aligned to the scope of the project. Special attention has been given to involvement of BAM's special interest groups and/or the wider BAM, and/or SIMA community. Not at all – application does not indicate the expected number and type of outputs (e.g., review, conceptual, empirical, methodological) or is insufficiently or overly ambitious in publication and dissemination plan. No attention has been given to involvement of BAM's special interest groups and/or the wider BAM and/or SIMA community.					
3.2 Is the project impact and engagement plan with non-academic audiences ambitious, specific and aligned with the Grant Scheme remit as set out in Section 1 (introduction) of the guidance for applicants? Fully – application clearly identifies a comprehensive group of key potential beneficiaries of the research and demonstrates specific pathways through which findings will be disseminated to potential beneficiaries. For the criterion to be fully met, plans need to consider all significant potential beneficiary groups. Not at all – application does not identify key non-academic audiences, how they will be engaged with, and/or how they might benefit from the proposed research.	Fully	Largely	Somewhat	Partially	Not at all
3.3 Does the project offer value for money? Fully – value for money is demonstrated through a combination of: the importance of the research (in terms of addressing issues of theoretical and practical significance); a clear link between the funding being requested and the resources needed to carry out the research to a standard that will allow the research questions to be answered; an appreciation of the risks involved and the reasonable steps that might be taken to mitigate risk; and clear evidence of added value from the grant (i.e., evidence that the applicant needs external funding to carry out the research, and would not be able to conduct the research with resources provided by their institution).	Fully	Largely	Somewhat	Partially	Not at all

Not at all –the research does not address a significant topic; the risks are high and there is no evidence of risk mitigation strategies; the proposed project is considerably under-resourced; or there is a poor explanation of the value added that the grant would provide.					
---	--	--	--	--	--