Guide to scoring of Association of Anaesthetists undergraduate elective funding applications

Applications are assessed using the scoring criteria below by a panel of undergraduate elective assessors and members of the Research & Grants Committee. All applications are blinded to reviewers.

Relevance to anaesthesia/pain/peri-operative medicine/intensive care medicine
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 project or learning objectives
1  No project or objectives; vague description only
2  An outline of project or objectives, but no clear plan
3  Clear project or objectives, but unrealistic
4  Clear project or objectives & will deliver some benefits; may not be completed
5  Clear project plan or objectives; defined outcome and benefits

Partnership working with developing country (DC)
0  Not a developing county elective
1  No evidence of engaging with DC partners in project plan
2  Some evidence of engagement limited to practical arrangements
3  Likely alignment of project with needs of the DC partners
4  Clear engagement of the DC partners in the proposed project
5  Clear engagement with obvious alignment with DC’s local and national aims

Value for money/sustainability
1  No details provided; costs unclear
2  Unrealistic budget; no clear plan to fund
3  A plan to fund presented, but project or objectives may not be achievable within budget; poor ‘value for money’
4  Sensible budget; clear plan to raise money
5  Excellent ‘value for money’

General quality of application
1  Very poor; confused presentation with important information missing
2  Some details missing or unclear; poorly laid out
3  Most details provided; untidy in parts
4  Clear and addresses most of questions asked; layout could be improved
5  Clear, comprehensive and concise; well presented