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1. About Kidney, Transplant & Diabetes Research Australia

Kidney, Transplant & Diabetes Research Australia (KTDRA) supports ground-breaking translational medical research that is helping to improve the lives of people suffering with these diseases.

KTDRA supports doctors, scientists and students based at the Royal Adelaide Hospital who focus their research on the mechanisms of disease and potential avenues for improving patient outcomes in transplantation and immunological kidney diseases. KTDRA also proudly promotes wide collaboration with many research groups in Australia and world-wide, working to improve the health and wellbeing of people living with diabetes and kidney disease.

KTDRA is a charity of The Hospital Research Foundation (THRF) Group. THRF Group supports people in the community by funding vital medical research and patient care initiatives in hospitals.

2. About Renal Society of Australasia (RSA)

The Renal Society of Australasia (RSA) aims to advance the care of people with kidney disease and to be the peak body for renal nursing and related allied health professionals by:

- providing professional development for renal nurses, related allied health professionals and other relevant parties
- communicating knowledge and information about kidney disease and associated treatments
- advocating for the interests of nurses, health professionals and people with kidney and/or associated diseases
- supporting practice development, research, quality improvement and innovation
- setting standards for nurses and health professionals caring for people with kidney disease

3. About the Grant Round

3.1 General information

KTDRA is supporting RSA with a national grant round to provide renal nurses the opportunity to deliver a project which improves the care and outcomes for patients with kidney disease and aims to provide learnings to guide best practice for renal medicine in Australia.

3.2 Novice, early career and experienced streams

The round is divided in three streams: a novice, an early-career and an experienced stream.

Each application will be assessed through the same process but each stream will be associated with different weights for the assessment criteria (see paragraph 8.2 for details).

The following Fellowships are available:

- **Novice Research Fellowship**: 2 research fellowships at a maximum of $10,000 per research fellowship over 12 months
- **Early-Career Research Fellowship**: 2 research fellowships at a maximum of $10,000 per research fellowship over 12 months
- **Experienced Research Fellowship**: 1 research fellowship at a maximum of $10,000 per research fellowship over 12 months

Applicants who are unsure of which stream they should apply for should contact THRF Research Office at savelives@hospitalresearch.com.au.
4. Terms and Conditions

- A researcher can be the Chief Investigator on a maximum of one research application for the round
- Applications must be for new research projects and must not be related to any studies currently funded from the KTDRA money (for example, funds are not available as ‘top up’ funds)
- Progress reports against agreed milestones will be expected during the project
- Impact and follow-up reports will be expected
- THR standard Intellectual Property Agreement Clause will apply
- THR funding is not to be used to support Intellectual Property and Patent costs
- Chief Investigators must also agree to:
  - Sign an undertaking to acknowledge THR funding support in all presentations and papers etc
  - Provide updates upon request about research progress to THR Communications and Marketing Teams
  - Participate in media opportunities coordinated by THR where necessary, including local radio and local and national media announcements. Relevant media advice and preparation will be available via THR’s Communications team; and
  - Ensure THR is consulted regarding any media opportunities led by the recipient’s university, SA Health or other organisation.

5. Requirements

5.1 Membership requirements

- Only a RSA or Transplant Nurses’ Association (TNA) member is eligible to apply for a grant as a Chief Investigator (CI)
- The CI must have been a RSA or TNA member for at least 3 consecutive years.

5.2 Eligibility requirements

- The applicant must currently be working in the field of renal nursing
- Streams requirements
  - Novice stream: the applicant does not hold a Masters degree nor a PhD. Applicants who hold an Honors Degree should apply to the novice stream.
  - Early career stream: the applicant holds a Masters degree but not a PhD - An English Language copy of the letter saying the applicant qualifies academically for the Masters degree (“award letter”) with a date is required when submitting the application.
  - Experienced stream: the applicant holds a PhD - An English Language copy of the letter saying the applicant qualifies academically for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (“award letter”) with a date is required when submitting the application.

6. Funding Available

6.1 Funding rules

The grant amount is up to $10,000 per research fellowship for 12 months. The project duration is 12 months from date of commencement.
Funding includes direct research costs such as consumables and salary for a research assistant or another external assistant. Funding does not include a travel allowance for conferences or study tours but travel to named sites of the research project is allowed. A detailed budget must be supplied and will be assessed for validity.

6.2 Administering Institutions (AIs)
THRF will enter into a funding agreement with the administering institution (AI).

There can only be one AI for the project.

It is the applicant’s responsibility to facilitate and ensure that the chosen AI can administer the grant and is willing to accept THRF Grant terms and conditions of funding which includes execution of the THRF Grant funding Deed.

7. Application requirements and submission
Once the round closes, the submitted application cannot be amended.

Applicants are expected to submit on time (Wednesday, 16th October 2019 at 4.00 PM ACST). THRF staff reserves the right to request additional information if deemed necessary for evaluation, however THRF expects applicants to provide all necessary information to make evaluation possible on the SmartyGrants application form.

8. Selection process

8.1 Eligibility assessment

Applicants will receive a confirmation of receipt of the application by email following submission to the SmartyGrants platform. If the email is not received applicants should assume the submission hasn’t been received.

THRF Research Office will screen all submitted applications to ensure that eligibility criteria have been met prior to evaluation.

8.2 Applications assessment

The applications will be assessed by an expert panel of renal nurses and nephrologists, composed of:

- The governance group of Kidney Transplant and Diabetes Research Australia and
- Two RSA Board Members including the President of RSA

The applications will be assessed using the following criteria and weights:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Track record of Chief Investigator</th>
<th>2. Research Quality</th>
<th>3. Significance and/or innovation</th>
<th>4. Adequate and appropriate budget</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice stream</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early career stream</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced stream</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The members of the expert panel review and grade each application independently.

An average score for each assessment criteria will be calculated, and an average overall score using the weights. The applications will then be ranked by order.

Each panel member will declare any perceived or actual conflicts of interest and withdraw from considering applications where such conflict does or may be perceived to exist.

Each panel member will contract to preserve the confidentiality of any information supplied and will not make copies of or disclose information unless explicitly authorised by The Hospital Research Foundation or required to do so by law.

THRF may enter into direct negotiations with applicants to seek further information or detail in relation to specific applications.

In the event that THRF deems any research applications to be similar or complementary to other applications received, THRF may request that the applicants consider some or greater cooperation between the researchers (where appropriate). There is no obligation imposed on applicants under this condition. Any cooperation that might arise from such a suggestion by THRF would be voluntary.
The descriptors for the assessment criteria are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Significance and/or innovation** | • 10 = The planned work addresses an issue of utmost importance to human health in a way that challenges and shifts current paradigms. It will make a major contribution in the scientific community and/or in the international practice of clinical medicine or public health  
• 9 = The planned work addresses an issue of major importance to human health and introduces ideas that challenge and shift current paradigms. It will make a highly significant contribution in the scientific community and/or in the national and international practice of clinical medicine or public health  
• 8 = The planned work addresses an issue of major importance to human health in a highly innovative and creative way. It will make a very significant contribution in the scientific community and/or in the local and national practice of clinical medicine or public health  
• 7 = The planned work addresses an issue of high importance to human health in a very innovative and creative way. It will make a significant contribution in the scientific community and/or in the local or national practice of clinical medicine or public health  
• 6 = The planned work addresses an issue of importance to human health. The work contains innovative and creative ideas. It will make a moderate contribution in the scientific community and/or in the local practice of clinical medicine or public health  
• 5 = The application is average: the planned work addresses a relevant issue to human health and contains a few innovative ideas. The work would make a small contribution in the scientific community and/or in the local practice of clinical medicine or public health  
• 4 = The planned work addresses an issue relevant to human health and contains at least one innovative idea. However, on balance the impact in the scientific community and/or in the local practice of clinical medicine or public health would be limited.  
• 3 = The application displays some good features but is not competitive. The work would make a very minor contribution in the scientific community and/or in the local practice of clinical medicine or public health  
• 2 = The application is not competitive and would likely not have an impact the scientific community and/or in the local practice of clinical medicine or public health  
• 1 = The application is poorly written without any innovative or creative idea, that would not result in an impact the scientific community and/or in the local practice of clinical medicine or public health |
| **Research Quality**          | • 10 = The proposal is clear in its objectives, exemplary in design and almost certain to be accomplished.  
• 9 = The proposal is clear in its objectives and has a near-flawless design. There is a very high probability of successful accomplishment.  
• 8 = The proposal has clarity of its objectives, with only minor reservations in the design. There is a very high probability of successful accomplishment.  
• 7 = The proposal has clarity of its objectives, with some areas of minor concern in the experimental design or feasibility. There is a high probability of successful accomplishment. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track record of Chief Investigator (CI) – Early career stream</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The record of achievement includes but is not limited to: quality and influence of your publications, experience of attainment of prizes and awards, further funding, speaking at national or international conferences, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 = The CI has a highly significant record of achievement compared to their peers and are on their way to establish a national and/or international reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 = The CI has a very significant record of achievement compared to their peers and are on their way to establish a national reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 = The CI has a significant record of achievement compared to their peers and are on their way to establish a local reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 = The CI has a solid record of achievement compared to their peers in the area requested for funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 = The CI has a good record of achievement compared to their peers in the area requested for funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = The CI has a reasonable record of achievement compared to their peers in the area requested for funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = The CI has a limited record of achievement compared to their peers in the area requested for funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = The CI has a very limited record of achievement compared to their peers in the area requested for funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = The CI has some research experience in the area requested for funding but no record of achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = The CI has no research experience in the area requested for funding and no record of achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track record of Chief Investigator (CI) – Experienced stream</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research impact categories include: advancement of knowledge and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 = The CI has an established international reputation with a highly significant record of impact across multiple categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 = The CI has a growing national or international reputation with a very significant record of impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 = The CI has a growing national reputation with a significant record of impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 = The CI has a strong local reputation and are recognised nationally with a solid record of impact in the area requested for funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 = The CI has a strong local reputation and are becoming recognised nationally with a good record of impact in the area requested for funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = The CI has a strong local reputation with a reasonable record of impact in the area requested for funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 6 = The proposal has satisfactory clarity of its objectives, however there are several areas of concern in the experimental design or feasibility. There is a moderately high probability of successful accomplishment.
- 5 = The proposal has reasonable clarity of its objectives with one significant area of concern in the experimental design or feasibility. There is a moderate probability of successful accomplishment.
- 4 = The proposal has reasonable clarity of its objectives with several significant areas of concern in the experimental design or feasibility. There is a low probability of successful accomplishment.
- 3 = The proposal has little clarity of its objectives with several areas of major concern in the experimental design or feasibility. There is a very low probability of successful accomplishment.
- 2 = The proposal has poor clarity of its objectives with multiple areas of major concern in the experimental design or feasibility. There is no probability of successful accomplishment.
- 1 = The proposal has no clear objectives with multiple areas of major concern in the experimental design and feasibility. There is no probability of successful accomplishment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dissemination of results, clinical implementation and healthcare practices, policymaking, economic impact and community impact</th>
<th>Adequate and appropriate budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • 4 = The CI has some local reputation with a limited record of impact in the area requested for funding  
• 3 = The CI has little local reputation with a very limited record of impact in the area requested for funding  
• 2 = The CI has very little local reputation with some research experience in the area requested for funding, but with no record of impact in the area requested for funding  
• 1 = The CI has no research experience and no record of impact in the area requested for funding | • 10 = The budget is clear, flawless and all items are almost certain to be followed  
• 9 = The budget is clear and near-flawless; there is a very high probability that all items will be followed  
• 8 = The budget has clarity, with only minor reservations; there is a very high probability that all items will be followed  
• 7 = The budget has clarity, with some areas of minor reservations; there is a high probability that all items will be followed  
• 6 = The budget is satisfactory, with several concerns; there is a moderately high probability that all items will be followed  
• 5 = The budget is reasonable, with one significant concern; there is a moderate probability that all items will be followed  
• 4 = The budget is reasonable, with several significant concerns; there is a low probability that all items will be followed  
• 3 = The budget has little clarity, with several major concerns; there is a very low probability that all items will be followed  
• 2 = The budget has poor clarity, with multiple major concerns; there is no probability that all items will be followed  
• 1 = The budget has no clarity, with multiple major concerns; there is no probability that all items will be followed |
8.3 Final decision

Final weighted scores will range between 1 and 10.

Only the highest-ranking applications for each stream will be considered.

9. How to apply

Researchers should complete and submit the electronic application form through THRF’s online application portal SmartyGrants.

Only electronic submission of applications through the SmartyGrants system will be accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round closes on Wednesday, 16th October 2019 at 4 PM (ACST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All queries should be directed to <a href="mailto:savelives@hospitalresearch.com.au">savelives@hospitalresearch.com.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete or late applications will not be considered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Round timetable

| Round opens | Wednesday, 4th September at 1 PM (ACST) |
| Round closes | Wednesday, 16th October 2019 at 4 PM (ACST) |
| Notification to applicants: | December 2019 |
| Funding available | December 2019 |
| Project to start | Latest 1st July 2020 |