

**SAMS/BAM Research and Capacity Building Grant Scheme 2024 assessment criteria**

Criterion // Numeric value	5	4	3	2	1
<b>1. Quality of project</b>					
<p>1.1 Does the application demonstrate sound knowledge of the field including literature(s) relevant to the project?</p> <p>Fully – aims and objectives and research questions are clearly located with reference to a critical evaluation of the existing literature on the topic.</p> <p>Not at all – aims and objectives and research questions are not informed or located with reference to existing literature, or appreciation of the literature shows critical weaknesses.</p>	Fully	Largely	Somewhat	Partially	Not at all
<p>1.2 Are the proposal methodology, research design and method of high quality and original?</p> <p>Fully – methodology is explained transparently and in detail so that it is clear how methods will be used to answer research questions. Methodology is informed by latest high-quality research and methodological development. Claims of methodological innovation or originality are clearly explained and justified.</p> <p>Not at all – minimal explanation of methods to be used for data collection and analysis leading to lack of clarity about how research questions can be answered. No evidence of originality or innovation in methodology (or claims or innovation/originality that are not adequately supported with reference to the literature).</p>	Fully	Largely	Somewhat	Partially	Not at all
<p>1.3 Are the project and the project workplan viable?</p>	Fully	Largely	Somewhat	Partially	Not at all

<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>					
<p>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)?</p> <p>Significant potential – clearly explains how it is hoped the research will lead to development and/or testing of new theory. Explains the potential significance of any theoretical development or innovation to academia and/or practice with reference to relevant literature.</p> <p>No potential – does not address how the research could lead to theoretical development and/or practical testing of new theory. Significance of hoped for theoretical innovation is not explained with relevant literature or hoped for theoretical development is of marginal significance to academia and/or practice.</p>	Significant potential	Strong potential	Some potential	Little potential	No potential
<p>1.5 Have the implications of the project on ethics and EDIR been appropriately considered in the application?</p> <p>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.</p>	Fully	Largely	Somewhat	Partially	Not at all

Not at all – ethical and EDIR issues are not addressed or addressed in a superficial way that leaves key ethical and EDIR challenges unaddressed. No explanation of institutional ethical review processes or provision for EDIR.					
<b>2. Engagement with the SAMS and BAM communities?</b>					
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 do not 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 BAM Special Interest Groups or the BAM Management Knowledge and Education group as well as SAMS and/or BAM's Mission and one or more of BAM's Strategic objectives (see <a href="http://www.socadms.oq.uk">http://www.socadms.oq.uk</a> and <a href="https://www.bam.ac.uk/about-bam/strategy-2024.html">https://www.bam.ac.uk/about-bam/strategy-2024.html</a> for details)?  Fully – application clearly explains how proposed research relates to relevant constituent parts of BAM and directly aligns to SAMS and/or BAM'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 and/or mention or directly align to SAMS nor BAM's Mission or strategic objectives.	Fully	Largely	Somewhat	Partially	Not at all
<b>3. Publication, dissemination and impact plans and value for money</b>					
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

<p>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 community.</p> <p>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 community.</p>					
<p>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?</p> <p>Fully – application clearly identifies a comprehensive group of key potential beneficiaries of the research and demonstrate 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.</p> <p>Not at all – application does not identify key non-academic audiences and/or how they will be engaged with, and/or how they might benefit from the proposed research.</p>	Fully	Largely	Somewhat	Partially	Not at all
<p>3.3 Does the project offer value for money?</p> <p>Fully – value for money is demonstrated through a combination of 1) the importance of the research (in terms of addressing issues of theoretical and practical significance). 2) 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. 3) An appreciation of risks involved and reasonable steps that might be taken to mitigate risk. 4) 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.</p>	Fully	Largely	Somewhat	Partially	Not at all

<p>Not at all – value for money could be considered poor if: (1) the research does not address a significant topic. (2) if risks are high and there is no evidence of risk mitigation strategies (because this means there is a substantial risk that resources will be wasted on a project that fails. Note, high risk research is not itself an indicator of poor value for money if risks and risk mitigations are well understood by applicants). (3) If there is a mismatch between resources for data collection and analysis being requested and the amount of work required to complete the project (note that an application that proposes to try to do more than that which might be reasonably achieved with the requested resources could be considered poor value for money because there is a risk the applicants will not be able to achieve their aims and objectives because they do not have the resources to do so). (4) If there is no explanation of the value added that the grant would provide.</p>					
<p>Do the proposed research justify the funding requested? This score represents an average of the reviewers' assessments of the above criteria.</p>	Fully	Largely	Somewhat	Partially	Not at all