



International Relations Committee – grant scoring

Applications are scored by members of the International Relations Committee (IRC). Decisions are made on the information included in the submitted applications and will be scored out of 20 using the scoring matrix below. Funding recommendations are decided using the average reviewer scores received and discussions during the IRC meeting. Applications which are incomplete, or do not meet the criteria of the IRC grants will not be assessed by the committee.

Funding partners of the IRC include: Association of Anaesthetists, Paediatric Care Society (PCCS), Regional Anaesthesia UK (RA-UK), Royal College of Anaesthetists (RCOA), Society for Intravenous Anaesthesia (SIVA) and World Anaesthesia Society (WAS).

Funding recommendations:

Average score	Recommendation
4 - 12	Funding not recommended
12.001 - 16	Partially fund
16.001 - 20	Fund in full

Travel grant score set

Experience of applicant

1. Unsuitable level of experience, lack of evidence of supervision (if trainee)
2. Questionable level of experience. Questionable levels of supervision (if trainee)
3. Applicant of suitable experience, adequate proof of supervision (if trainee)
4. Well experienced applicant, good levels of supervision (if trainee)
5. Excellent level of experience, applicant will be well supervised (if trainee)

Relevance to anaesthesia/pain/peri-operative medicine/ICM

1. No obvious relevance
2. Some relevance; but limited educational benefit
3. Likely exposure to specialty; unlikely to make full use of opportunities
4. Clear relevance; some useful experience will be gained
5. Offers excellent exposure to specialty; clear benefits

Defined learning objectives

1. No objectives; vague description only
2. An outline of objectives, but no clear plan
3. Clear objectives, but unrealistic
4. Clear objectives but may not be completed
5. Clear objectives and defined outcome

Value for money/benefit to visiting centre

1. High/unrealistic costs, little benefit to applicant and visiting centre
2. Unrealistic costs and limited benefit to applicant and visiting centre
3. Reasonable value for money with some benefit to applicant and visiting centre
4. Good value for money with benefits to applicant and visiting centre
5. Excellent value for money with clear benefit to applicant and visiting centre

Reducing environmental impact (not scored)

1. The applicant has not considered the environmental impact of their project/trip
2. The application has considered the environmental impact of their trip

Safety

1. Has all due diligence with regard to the safety of individuals been completed?
2. Is this trip absolutely necessary for the project outcomes and cannot be delayed and/or delivered through alternative methods e.g. virtually?
3. Has this project through a visit been sanctioned by independent parties such as the Ministry of Health



International Relations Committee – grant scoring

Project grant score set

Relevance to anaesthesia/pain/peri-operative medicine/ICM

- 1 No obvious relevance
- 2 Some relevance; but limited educational benefit
- 3 Likely exposure to specialty; unlikely to make full use of opportunities
- 4 Clear relevance; some useful experience will be gained
- 5 Offers excellent exposure to specialty; clear benefits

Defined objectives

- 1 No objectives; vague description only
- 2 An outline of objectives, but no clear plan
- 3 Clear objectives, but unrealistic
- 4 Clear objectives but may not be completed
- 5 Clear objectives with strong possibility of full completion

Long-term sustainability, output and outcomes

- 1 No details of any outcomes or long term sustainability of the project
- 2 Limited details of any outcomes and long term sustainability of the project, but may not be realistic
- 3 Realistic plans for potential outcomes and vision long term sustainability of the project, but may not be viable
- 4 Well thought out plans for potential outcomes and vision for long term sustainability of the project. Good chance of being realised
- 5 Excellent outcome plans and well thought out vision for long term sustainability of the project. Strong chance of being realised.

Funding

- 1 High/unrealistic costs. No evidence of seeking funding from other sources
- 2 Unrealistic costs. Little evidence of seeking funding from other sources.
- 3 Reasonable value for money. Some evidence of seeking alternative funding
- 4 Good value for money. Evidence of seeking alternative funding. Will be of good benefit to local/wider community
- 5 Excellent value for money. Evidence of seeking alternative funding. Excellent benefit to local/wider community

Reducing environmental impact (not scored)

- 1 The applicant has not considered the environmental impact of their project/trip
- 2 The application has considered the environmental impact of their trip

Safety

- 1 Has all due diligence with regard to the safety of individuals been completed?
- 2 Is this trip absolutely necessary for the project outcomes and cannot be delayed and/or delivered through alternative methods e.g. virtually?
- 3 Has this project through a visit been sanctioned by independent parties such as the Ministry of Health



International Relations Committee – grant scoring OOPTE grant / Volunteer grant score set

Experience of applicant

1. Unsuitable level of experience, lack of evidence of supervision
2. Questionable level of experience. Questionable levels of supervision
3. Applicant of suitable experience, adequate proof of supervision
4. Well experienced applicant, good levels of supervision
5. Excellent level of experience, applicant will be well supervised

Relevance to anaesthesia/pain/peri-operative medicine/ICM

1. No obvious relevance
2. Some relevance; but limited educational benefit
3. Likely exposure to specialty; unlikely to make full use of opportunities
4. Clear relevance; some useful experience will be gained
5. Offers excellent exposure to specialty; clear benefits

Defined learning objectives likely to generate sustainable interest in supporting anaesthesia in developing countries

1. No objectives; vague description only
2. An outline of objectives, but no clear plan
3. Clear objectives, but unrealistic
4. Clear objectives but may not be completed
5. Clear objectives and defined outcome

Value for money/benefit to visiting centre

1. High/unrealistic costs, little benefit to applicant and visiting centre
2. Unrealistic costs and limited benefit to applicant and visiting centre
3. Reasonable value for money with some benefit to applicant and visiting centre
4. Good value for money with benefits to applicant and visiting centre
5. Excellent value for money with clear benefit to applicant and visiting centre

Reducing environmental impact (not scored)

- 1 The applicant has not considered the environmental impact of their project/trip
- 2 The application has considered the environmental impact of their trip

Safety

- 1 Has all due diligence with regard to the safety of individuals been completed?
- 2 Is this trip absolutely necessary for the project outcomes and cannot be delayed and/or delivered through alternative methods e.g. virtually?
- 3 Has this project through a visit been sanctioned by independent parties such as the Ministry of Health



International Relations Committee – grant scoring

E-education grant score set

Relevance to anaesthesia/pain/peri-operative medicine/ICM

- 1 No obvious relevance.
- 2 Some relevance; but limited educational benefit.
- 3 Likely exposure to specialty; unlikely to make full use of opportunities.
- 4 Clear relevance.
- 5 Offers excellent exposure to specialty; clear benefits.

Innovation and accessibility

- 1 Nothing to add to existing ideas/concepts.
- 2 Little to add to existing ideas/concepts.
- 3 Some innovative ideas and concepts.
- 4 Rather innovative and adds to existing concepts.
- 5 Excellent innovation, completely new concepts.

Long-term sustainability, output and outcomes

- 1 No details of any outcome and long term sustainability of the project. No evidence of GDPR compliance.
- 2 Limited details of any outcomes and long term sustainability of the project, but may not be realistic.
- 3 Realistic plans for potential outcomes and vision long term sustainability of the project, but may not be viable.
- 4 Well thought out plans for potential outcomes and vision for long term sustainability of the project. Good chance of being realised.
- 5 Excellent outcome plans and well thought out vision for long term sustainability of the project. Strong chance of being realised.

Funding

- 1 High/unrealistic costs. No evidence of seeking funding from other sources
 - 2 Unrealistic costs. Little evidence of seeking funding from other sources.
 - 3 Reasonable value for money. Some evidence of seeking alternative funding
 - 4 Good value for money. Evidence of seeking alternative funding. Will be of good benefit to local/wider community
 - 5 Excellent value for money. Evidence of seeking alternative funding. Excellent benefit to local/wider community
-