

August 2022

2023 EMERGING RESEARCHER FIRST GRANT (ERFG) APPLICATION GUIDELINES

To use with the following forms:

**2023 Rangahau Hauora Māori Emerging
Researcher First Grant Application Form**

**2023 Pacific Emerging Researcher First Grant
Application Form**

**2023 Health Delivery Emerging Researcher
First Grant Application Form**

**2023 General Emerging Researcher First Grant
Application Form**

Table of Contents

Part A: What is an Emerging Researcher First Grant	3
1.Introduction.....	3
2.Eligibility criteria.....	3
3.Emerging Researcher First Grant categories.....	4
Part B: General rules for submitting an Emerging Researcher First Grant application	5
1.Use of 2023 Emerging Researcher First Grant Application Forms.....	5
2.Format	5
3.Copies of applications required.....	6
4.Closing dates.....	6
5.Privacy provisions.....	6
6.Enquiries.....	7
Part C: Submitting an application – Completion of the 2023 Emerging Researcher First Grant Application Forms	8
1.Use of 2023 Emerging Researcher First Grant Application Forms.....	8
2.Module 1: General information	8
3.Module 2: Research	11
4.Module 3: References	16
5.Module 4: Contract information and budget	16
6.Module 5: NZ standard CV	21
7.Module 6: Research classification.....	21
Appendix 1: Criteria for assessing and scoring Emerging Researcher First Grant applications	24
Appendix 2: Assessment process for Emerging Researcher First Grant applications	32

Part A: What is an Emerging Researcher First Grant

1. Introduction

These grants are available to provide research funds to support emerging researchers who are seeking to establish independent careers in health research and who have NOT previously held a competitive research grant for research expenses of \geq \$105,000 from any source (including institutional or internal funding). Each award is limited to a maximum of \$250,000 for a maximum of three years. Research proposals should represent an independent research stream, with the applicant able to undertake overall responsibility for the work to be completed. These contracts include working expenses, as well as salary for the first named investigator. Salary can also be claimed for research assistants, research managers, research fellows etc. Salary can also be claimed for other named investigators, but only where they are supporting the applicant and/or research in a capacity beyond what would be expected of them in their employed position. All other academics, professional supervisors or senior researchers should be included as named investigators on a **time-only** basis.

An emerging researcher is:

“Someone who is at the beginning of their research career in health with a clear development path and is working in a strongly supportive research environment”.

Overarching requirements for emerging researchers in any discipline are demonstrated research capability and a desire to establish an independent health research career. Applicants should detail the extent to which this grant will support them as independent researchers and how it will enable a step change in their career. The applicants need to describe how the grant will support the development of a new research programme.

Note: The Emerging Researcher First Grant can be seen as ‘seeding’ funding for the applicant’s future research.

Applicants will be assessed on specific score criteria that is relevant to the category of Emerging Researcher First Grant that the application is submitted to. Detailed information about the score criteria can be found in Appendix 1 at the end of this document.

2. Eligibility criteria

Note: first named investigators applying to the Rangahau Hauora Māori Emerging Researcher First Grant are required to be of Māori descent. First named investigators applying to the Pacific Emerging Researcher First Grant are required to be of indigenous Pacific descent.

Applicants are eligible if they:

- have New Zealand as their principal domicile (see definition in the HRC Rules) and their principal place of employment¹
- have not previously held a competitive research grant as a first named investigator for research expenses of \geq \$105,000 from any source at the time of assessment (including institutional or internal funding), not at the time of application. Scholarship and fellowship stipends are not included, provided the expenses component of such awards does not exceed the \$105,000 expenses threshold. Applicants are required to list the amount of research expenses of their previous awards in this application
- are no more than 6 years from attaining a postgraduate degree at the time of their application, although this period could be greater considering parental leave, caring responsibilities, career breaks, ill health, or other justified reasons. Time spent working in a career other than research is not considered a justified reason. Eligibility will be counted from the date of degree conferment, which should be confirmed in the application

¹ Note: Host organisations are responsible for ensuring that New Zealand is the principal domicile and principal place of employment for the First Named Investigator. By submitting an application, the host is satisfied that this condition has been met.

- are developing an independent research stream
- are not studying for a PhD degree
- justify how they fit the definition of emerging researcher as defined above. The HRC reserves the right to accept the assessment of the assessing committee regarding this justification.

There is a clear distinction between eligibility, defined above, and suitability. Applicants are required to clearly state their suitability in Section 2B: Description of proposed research – Suitability of applicant. The committee’s assessment, that an applicant is not suitable because, for example, that applicant is already established in an independent research pathway, will be accepted by the HRC as final.

3. Emerging Researcher First Grant categories

Note: the ‘General’ category replaces the previous ‘Health and Wellbeing in New Zealand’ and ‘Improving Outcomes for Acute and Chronic Conditions in New Zealand’ research investment streams, which are not applicable for the 2023 Emerging Researcher First Grant funding round.

Applicants **must** select one of the following categories:

- **Rangahau Hauora Māori Emerging Researcher First Grant:** Supporting Māori health research that upholds rangatiratanga and uses and advances Māori knowledge, resources, and people.
- **Pacific Emerging Researcher First Grant:** Making significant improvements in, or developing knowledge contributing to, Pacific health outcomes.
- **Health Delivery Emerging Researcher First Grant:** Having the potential to directly inform changes to health delivery policy, practice or systems; and demonstrating a clear connection to a healthcare need².
- **General Emerging Researcher First Grant**

The same proposal cannot be submitted to different categories as this creates avoidable duplication of both application and assessment effort.

The HRC does not provide advice on choice of category as that decision is best made by the investigator. Applicants may change their final choice of category by creating duplicate applications and deciding on the most appropriate category before the closing date for registration.

² For the Health Delivery Emerging Researcher First Grant, healthcare needs are expected to be identified with involvement of health delivery sector leadership or meaningful end-user involvement, and substantiated by evidence of a gap in knowledge. As such, end-user engagement is expected, comprising consumer, clinical, health provider, support worker, community or population collaboration and/or partnership from the outset of the research proposal and throughout the research process.

Part B: General rules for submitting an Emerging Researcher First Grant application

1. Use of 2023 Emerging Researcher First Grant Application Forms

1.1 Which form to use

Each category has a corresponding application form that should be used:

- The 2023 Rangahau Hauora Māori Emerging Researcher First Grant Application Form
- The 2023 Pacific Emerging Researcher First Grant Application Form
- The 2023 Health Delivery Emerging Researcher First Grant Application Form
- The 2023 General Emerging Researcher First Grant Application Form

1.2 Prior to submission

The HRC only accepts applications on HRC Gateway. Prior to any submission, named investigators must have a current HRC Gateway account that is updated annually. Key opening and due dates are in Section 4 below.

Before submitting this application form, applicants should read:

- this document for eligibility and specific instructions
- Māori Health Advancement Guidelines
- Rangahau Hauora Māori Investment Stream details³
- Health Delivery Research Investment Signal⁴
- Guidelines on Ethics in Health Research
- Guidelines for Researchers on Health Research Involving Māori
- Guidelines for Pacific Health Research
- HRC Research Impact Slideshow.

The most up-to-date reference documents and forms are on HRC Gateway.

1.3 New host organisation

New host organisations that have not previously been funded by the HRC will be required to provide due diligence information before a contract can be offered. Please contact the HRC for further information. The host organisation is the institution or organisation that will be responsible for ensuring an awarded grant is completed according to the requirements of this grant type.

2. Format

2.1 General formatting

Proposals must be written in a clear, concise manner with sufficient detail to enable the reviewers to understand the scope and implications of the proposal.

Applications must be in English or te reo Māori; if in te reo Māori, a translation in English must also be provided (any translation will not be included in the page limit).

Use the correct HRC form as it contains special features.

Applicants must:

- use Arial 10-point type font or larger
- use default margins
- use single line spacing
- not exceed any page limits.

³ Only if applying to the Rangahau Hauora Māori category.

⁴ Only if applying to the Health Delivery category.

2.2 Compliance

The HRC will not process any application that does not comply with stated page limits, font sizes/styles or eligibility requirements.

2.3 Additional documents

No other documents are to be included.

3. Copies of applications required

3.1 Electronic copy

Submit the form as a PDF file using HRC Gateway. Ensure that the PDF version meets page limits, and that graphics and tables are converted correctly from the Word version.

Submit the budget information file in both xlsx and PDF formats. Use the HRC file as it contains special features used for HRC processes.

HRC Gateway will allocate file names.

Important

The application is submitted to the host Research Office when the applicant uploads the files through HRC Gateway. The application will be forwarded to the HRC after host Research Office approval. Always allow sufficient time before the HRC closing date for this approval step. For organisations without a Research Office, the application will be forwarded directly to the HRC.

3.2 Do not send files

Do not send digital files directly to the HRC. Independent researchers and research providers requiring assistance with using HRC Gateway should contact the HRC in the first instance.

4. Closing dates

4.1 Submission of Emerging Researcher First Grant application online

Upload the Emerging Researcher First Grant Application Form appropriate for the category that is being applied to, as detailed in Module 1.1, using HRC Gateway.

There is no separate closing date for registration of applications, but this step is still required. The closing date for online submission of the Emerging Researcher First Grant application to the HRC is **1pm, Thursday 29 September 2022**. The application is released to the HRC only after approval by the Research Office. It must be submitted to the HRC online by the closing date and time. No applications will be accepted after the closing date and time unless written authorisation has been received from the HRC at least one week prior to the closing date.

Note: Host institutions will be notified of the outcome of the assessment process in **early May 2023**.

4.2 Incomplete applications

Incomplete applications will be regarded as withdrawn.

5. Privacy provisions

5.1 Statistical and reporting purposes

The information provided in an application will be used for assessing that application and, in a non-identifiable form, some information will be used for HRC statistical and reporting purposes. The HRC undertakes to store all applications in a secure place, which may include the New Zealand Research Information System (NZRIS) curated by the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment with details provided by funders of the science sector.

5.2 Personal information

Personal information contained in the application will be made available to members of the HRC committees relevant to the review of the application.

5.3 Media release

The HRC publishes details of research contracts, including named investigators, host institution, research title, lay summary, and funding awarded, for public interest purposes and to meet the statutory requirements of the Health Research Council Act 1990.

5.4 Official Information Act

Official Information Act requests for information about an application or research contract will be discussed with the host institution and investigator before responding to the request. Where appropriate, the request may be transferred to the host institution.

6. Enquiries

All enquiries related to HRC applications are to be directed in the first instance to the Research Office of the applicant's host institution.

For organisations without a Research Office or where the Research Office cannot assist, or for technical enquiries relating to applications, please send an email to info@hrc.govt.nz and one of our team will be in touch.

Part C: Submitting an application – Completion of the 2023 Emerging Researcher First Grant Application Forms

Module 1 of the Emerging Researcher First Grant application must be completed on HRC Gateway. The 2023 Emerging Researcher First Grant Application Forms for the four categories contain a coversheet, Module 2, Module 3, and Sections 4A – 4D of Module 4. Supporting documents (as listed in Section 4D) are required to be uploaded separately in HRC Gateway. The budget Excel file for Module 4 must be uploaded separately. Module 5 contains named investigator CVs that are uploaded separately. Module 6 is the research classification that must be completed online.

The correct form must be downloaded and completed by applicants before being uploaded to HRC Gateway as a PDF file. The complete application with all Modules will be generated by HRC Gateway for downloading and printing.

Note: By submitting an application to HRC Gateway, the applicant and the host organisation are confirming that the submitted application complies with all requirements, including formatting and page limits. The HRC will not accept changes after the closing date.

1. Use of 2023 Emerging Researcher First Grant Application Forms

Please use the original application forms and budget Excel file as these contain special features. Please ensure the correct form for the relevant research investment stream is used.

The form is compatible with most Windows PC and MAC computers. The form has default formatting that conforms to HRC requirements. Figures and tables are best pasted in from a draft document instead of created directly in the form.

Remember:

- Input HRC reference ID# and first named investigator surname on the coversheet (HRC Gateway will remove the coversheet from the final system-generated PDF).
- Use the original HRC document templates. Do not copy and paste into a new document as this can drastically change fonts and remove other features required for HRC processes.
- Enter information only at the indicated form fields.
- Do not reformat Module and Section headings.
- Do not delete spreadsheet columns/shaded rows, but you may insert more unshaded rows.

2. Module 1: General information

This Module must be completed in HRC Gateway. Start the application process by clicking on the 'Apply now' button on the 2023 Emerging Researcher First Grant information page. The 'Apply now' button will only appear when the application submission period is open. Clicking on the 'Apply now' button will open a dialog form where the following information will be required.

First step

The applicant will first be required to select an Emerging Researcher First Grant category, enter a research title and select a host organisation (there will also be options to select a specific Research Office and Research Office contact, if applicable).

Emerging Researcher First Grant category

Select the category for the Emerging Researcher First Grant.

The HRC cannot re-assign applications that are entered into the wrong category. If you wish to change streams while applying, you need to create a new registration on HRC Gateway.

Research title

The research title should be succinct and clearly describe the proposed research. The title must not exceed 80 characters, including spaces and punctuation (e.g. 'growth factors' contains 14 characters). Do not use all uppercase type.

Host organisation

The host organisation is the organisation that will be responsible for administering any contract awarded. For example, for those applicants at Wellington School of Medicine, Dunedin School of Medicine, or Christchurch School of Medicine, the host institution is the University of Otago.

Select the relevant 'Host organisation' from the drop-down list (this shows host organisations currently recognised by the HRC). If applicable, a specific Research Office and Research Office contact will be able to be selected.

Note: If your host organisation does not appear in the drop-down list, please tick the check box 'My host organisation is not in the list'. A field called 'Host organisation details' will appear in the next section and the name of the host organisation should be entered here.

If the host organisation has a Research Office with more than one staff member, please select the contact in the Research Office who will most likely be handling the application or who will be the principal contact.

If the host organisation has more than one Research Office, please select which Research Office will be handling the application.

Second step

First named investigator

Some of this information will be automatically populated from the first named investigator's profile in HRC Gateway (e.g. organisation and department). If the profile is not current, details must be updated. The details listed on the application will be automatically refreshed after the profile is updated. Click on the 'Update' button to enter and update the information requested.

The first named investigator will be considered the first point of contact during the application and assessment process, and will be understood to be acting for, and in concurrence with, the other named investigators. All correspondence for the application will be addressed to this person and the host. Once an application is created, the first named investigator cannot be changed.

Third step

Click on the 'Update' button to enter details for the following fields.

Named investigators

All named investigators must be registered users of HRC Gateway before they can be added to the application. User profiles must be updated by each named investigator before submitting an application so that their current details are in the application. Click on the 'Update' button to enter additional information as requested. All named investigators on successful applications may be cited by the HRC in its various communication channels.

Role in project should include brief information on what the investigator will undertake in the study (1-2 sentences max).

Information on ethnicity, gender, and whether the researcher is a clinician (and is practicing) is used for HRC information purposes only.

Note: Ethnicity, iwi, clinician, or practising clinician are not required to be entered as these details will automatically populate from the individual person profiles. Each named investigator will need to sign-in to HRC Gateway and check and update their details before applications are submitted.

You may wish to designate a hapū, iwi, or Māori organisation conducting the research that needs to be acknowledged in their own right as investigators on the application. It is still essential to list supporting named investigators.

FTE for each named investigator is also required, as the assessing committee needs to know the level of commitment or responsibility of each team member. It is particularly important to identify more junior investigators who may undertake key components for the proposed research. The FTE value should be the value for the first year of that investigator's involvement (from the budget spreadsheet).

Research location(s)

This is a specific department(s) and organisation where the majority of research or data analysis will be undertaken.

Discipline

Select from the drop-down box.

Duration

Enter the proposed term of the research (months).

Type of research

Select from the drop-down list what you consider the most appropriate term for broadly describing the research proposal for assessment purposes.

Commencement date

Enter the proposed commencement date.

Note: Contracts cannot be activated until 1 June 2023 at the earliest. Recipients are required to begin within three months of contract offer.

Lay summary

The lay summary should summarise the intent of the research, planned methodologies, as well as the potential health benefits or outcomes that could arise as a result of the HRC supporting this application. This information will be used to inform the Council in the final approval process if the application is recommended for funding. The lay summary will also be publicised through the HRC's communication channels (e.g. website) and should be written to be readily understood by members of the public (150-word limit).

Research costs

Enter in the relevant totals for staff costs, overhead, working expenses, and total cost of research (from the Excel budget spreadsheet).

Objectives and milestones

Objectives and milestones are assessed along with budget requests, included in awarded research contracts, and used for contract reporting templates. This section is inserted immediately after the list of named investigators in the final system-generated PDF.

Poorly described milestones and objectives can result in delayed processing of an application or requests for further information at contracting.

Objectives

Briefly describe the intended deliverables of this research application. Objectives should be **clear** and **measurable** to allow evaluation of research performance of an awarded contract.

Note: The HRC suggests a minimum of three objectives, with sufficient standalone operational detail and scientific information included to be able to inform progress assessment in subsequent years. There is no limit to the number of objectives and milestones.

Milestones

Provide key milestones that you aim to achieve. Each milestone must relate to one or more of the objectives, e.g.:

Year	Milestone	Objective(s)
1	Recruit 200 patients for study	Objective 2
1	Complete data entry and analysis (lab study)	Objective 1
2	Complete statistical analysis (clinical study)	Objective 2
2	Submission of manuscript to NZMJ	All objectives

Remember that any contract will be monitored, and progress measured against the objectives and milestones provided in this proposal.

For contract monitoring, and HRC accountability reporting, if the research requires **ethical consent**, this should be identified as a milestone.

ANZSRC and keywords

This information is for HRC data collection purposes only.

Categorise the proposed research using the ANZSRC codes for the Fields of Research (FOR) and Socioeconomic Objective (SEO). Enter the percentage to the nearest 10% for each category to a total of 100%.

Enter keywords that categorise the research.

3. Module 2: Research

3.1 Section 2A: Summary of proposed research (1-page limit)

This section should clearly summarise the suitability of the applicant, goals and objectives, research plan (including outline of methods), and significance and/or relevance of the research proposal. A clear and succinct summary including all important points of the application provides a good overview and is useful as a quick reference for assessing committee members. Use the headings and add subheadings if required.

3.2 Section 2B: Description of proposed research (7-page limit, excluding references)

The section headings provided must be used. The assessing committee membership is broadly discipline-based, matched to the range of applications assigned to that committee, so not all members will have working knowledge of every research topic. Write the proposal for scientists with a general understanding of the research area.

The use of graphics and tables is an efficient use of space but ensure that the format of non-text content is compatible with PDF conversion software.

Suitability of applicant

Emerging researcher

Justify how you fit the emerging researcher definition, briefly taking into account your postgraduate qualifications and other factors. Please specify the date of your most recent postgraduate degree conferment. Also state why you would be a suitable recipient for this funding support. Describe the direction of your research career to date, note any highlights and outline your career aspirations. If you are more than 6 years from your most recent postgraduate qualification, clearly explain why you still feel you are eligible for this grant (e.g. if you have taken parental leave or other justified leave).

Research capabilities

Include here information that you feel is essential for the reader of the application to better appreciate and understand your research capabilities. Describe how your current or previous research outcomes are relevant to the proposed research, and any new research skills this project will help you to develop. Highlight the number of publications for which you have been lead, senior, or corresponding author. Describe how your research interests align with those of the department/division in which you work and outline your contribution to the department/division to date. Ensure that end of contract reports on previous HRC contracts have been submitted, as assessing committees may incorporate this information in their scoring of track record.

Attach a letter of support from your programme leader/head of department/research mentor. The letter should confirm that you will be working independently and specifically outline your contribution to the research. Confirmation that you will have access to necessary resources and support should also be included. The letter of support must be included with the application and state the relevant HRC reference number. Attach the letter at the end of Section 2B (this is not included in the page limit).

Plan for independence

Include your vision of how your research career would develop over the duration of this contract, should it be funded. How will this project enable you to develop your research leadership skills? For

example, you could comment on opportunities to train and manage research staff and supervise students. How will this project enable you to establish your independence? Some projects by necessity are carried out in a team environment, so it is helpful to identify new and existing collaborations. It is also important to define which parts of the project are your responsibility, especially when continuing to work with previous mentors/colleagues. Overall, this section ought to clearly articulate how this project will help you become established as an independent researcher.

Rationale for research

Include information that you feel is essential for the assessor to appreciate or understand the rationale for your research application. Where does this research fit relative to the worldwide perspective? For example, is it unique to New Zealand? Does it support or contribute to research being conducted elsewhere? Is it part of a worldwide collaborative research project?

Research design and methods

Include your specific research hypothesis (if relevant), and a detailed design that describes, for example, subject recruitment and characteristics (including number, recruitment rate, gender, and ethnicity, where relevant), study methodology, technical development and proposed methods of data analysis. Indication of timelines for the research should be included. Consult specialists such as methodologists, statisticians, and health economists before finalising your research design. Clinical trial applications must include a description of data and safety monitoring processes.

Research impact

In addressing research impact for Emerging Researcher First Grants, applicants should focus on describing the potential benefits arising from the proposed research and the likely pathway to impact. This description of research impact should be considered relative to the scope and context of an Emerging Researcher First Grant. **Each category of Emerging Researcher First Grant has different requirements regarding research impact – please see relevant sections below.**

Rangahau Hauora Māori (RHM) Emerging Researcher First Grant

Note: Research impact for RHM applications has been restructured to encourage applicants to consider all potential ways in which their proposal can benefit Māori and add value for New Zealand, and what actions within their influence can help achieve this potential. Assessment of impact for RHM has been restructured to include two components: 1) a **description** of how your research might be used and the anticipated benefits for Māori and New Zealand, and 2) the **action plan** to **address all 6 goals of the RHM investment stream** to maximise the use and benefits of the research. See the [HRC's impact assessment slideshow](#) for additional guidance on completing this section.

What types of benefits are expected to arise from your research, and **who will benefit?** This section should provide a realistic description of how research findings could contribute to improved Māori health or other societal benefits over time (a 'line of sight' or 'pathway' to impact). Importantly, it should also identify the more immediate benefits, and users of the research who will form a focal point for your action plan (below). The balance between describing short-term benefits and potential longer-term impact will be dependent on the specific research context, with emphasis on considerations within your sphere of influence throughout the life of the research project.

The [HRC's impact assessment slideshow](#) includes discussion of elements that should be covered in this section, including the **types of benefits and research users**, and the **geographical distribution of benefits** (such as how contribution to international research effort will benefit New Zealand). Research-related benefits, such as capacity and capability gains for New Zealand, and influence on future research agenda setting, may be included where relevant.

What specific activities have been, or will be, undertaken, throughout the life of the research project, to **address all 6 goals of the RHM investment stream** to maximise the use and benefits of your research?

Note: Applicants **must** address all 6 investment signal goals. Applicants are encouraged to cross-reference sections written under other headings to avoid repetition. Applicants must use the following subheadings in section 2 to describe activities that have contributed, or will contribute to, each of the investment signal goals:

[i] Contribute to the Creation of Māori Health Knowledge

[ii] Contribute to the Translation of Findings into Māori Health Gains

- [iii] Incorporate Māori Health Research Processes
- [iv] Incorporate Māori Ethics Processes
- [v] Contribute to Building a Highly Skilled Māori Health Research Workforce
- [vi] Respond to the Needs of, and Work in Partnership with, Māori Stakeholders and Communities

Describe what targeted actions have been, or will be, taken⁵ to improve the likelihood of research uptake and impact, and to ensure that the next-users or end-users (identified in the previous section) can meaningfully contribute to, and/or benefit from, the research. Information must be provided about the contribution of the proposed research to: Māori health knowledge and the translation of knowledge into health gains; the use of Māori health research and ethics processes; the contribution to Māori health research workforce development and leadership; and, responsiveness to, and partnership with, Māori stakeholders and communities. Describe other planned dissemination activities that are designed to reach broader audiences. Who can enable the uptake of your research, and how have they been involved in your research? Identify uncertainties to uptake, or systematic/institutional barriers, and your mitigation strategies (where relevant).

What elements of the **team's track record of knowledge transfer** provide confidence in the likelihood of research uptake? For example: existing links, relationships, or networks with relevant research next-users or end-users; demonstrable examples of knowledge mobilisation, or changes in health outcomes or societal impact generated from similar research. This component is considered relative to opportunity.

Pacific Emerging Researcher First Grant

Note: Assessment of impact for Pacific health research has been restructured to include two components: 1) a **description** of how your research might be used and the anticipated benefits for Pacific peoples and New Zealand, and 2) the **action plan to address all 4 Pacific research priorities** to maximise the use and benefits of the research. See the [HRC's impact assessment slideshow](#) for additional guidance on completing this section.

What types of benefits are expected to arise from your research, and **who will benefit?** This section should provide a realistic description of how research findings could contribute to improved Pacific health or other societal benefits over time (a 'line of sight' or 'pathway' to impact). Importantly, it should also identify the more immediate benefits, and users of the research who will form a focal point for your action plan (below). The balance between describing short-term benefits and potential longer-term impact will be dependent on the specific research context, with emphasis on considerations within your sphere of influence throughout the life of the research project.

The [HRC's impact assessment slideshow](#) includes discussion of elements that should be covered in this section, including the **types of benefits and research users**, and the **geographical distribution of benefits** (such as how contribution to international research effort will benefit New Zealand). Research-related benefits, such as capacity and capability gains for New Zealand, and influence on future research agenda-setting, may be included where relevant.

What specific activities have been, or will be, undertaken, throughout the life of the research project, to **address the 4 Pacific health research priorities** to maximise the use and benefits of your research?

Note: Applicants **must** address all 4 Pacific health research priorities in this section:

- [i] Enhance health and wellbeing for Pacific peoples
- [ii] Contribute to the creation of Pacific health knowledge
- [iii] Contribute to the translation of research findings into Pacific health gains
- [iv] Build the capacity and capability of the Pacific health research workforce

⁵ Consult HRC guidelines and funding rules for information on support of knowledge transfer activities and include these activities in objectives/milestones where appropriate. Progress against implementing the action plan will form part of the milestones that the HRC monitors with respect to contractual compliance and delivery.

Describe what targeted actions have been, or will be, taken⁶ to improve the likelihood of research uptake and impact, and to ensure that the next-users or end-users (identified in the previous section) can meaningfully contribute to, and/or benefit from, the research. Describe other planned dissemination activities that are designed to reach broader audiences. Who can enable the uptake of your research, and how they have been involved in your research? Identify uncertainties to uptake, or systematic/institutional barriers, and your mitigation strategies (where relevant).

What elements of the **team's track record of knowledge transfer** provide confidence in the likelihood of research uptake? For example: existing links, relationships, or networks with relevant research next-users or end-users; demonstrable examples of knowledge mobilisation, or changes in health outcomes or societal impact generated from similar research. This component is considered relative to opportunity.

Health Delivery Emerging Researcher First Grant

Note: applications to the Health Delivery category must be in scope of the [Health Delivery Research Investment Signal](#), having the potential to directly inform decisions or changes to policy, practice or systems in the Aotearoa New Zealand health and disability sector. Assessment of for this category has been restructured to include two components: 1) a **description** of how your research might be used and the anticipated benefits for New Zealand, and 2) the **action plan** to maximise the use and benefits of the research. See the [HRC's impact assessment slideshow](#) for additional guidance on completing this section.

What types of benefits are expected to arise from your research, and **who will benefit?**

This section should provide a realistic description of how research findings could contribute to improved health or other societal benefits over time (a 'line of sight' or 'pathway' to impact). Importantly, it should also identify the more immediate benefits, and users of the research who will form a focal point for your action plan (below). The balance between describing short-term benefits and potential longer-term impact will be dependent on the specific research context, with emphasis on considerations within your sphere of influence throughout the life of the research project.

The [HRC's impact assessment slideshow](#) includes discussion of elements that should be covered in this section, including the **types of benefits and research users**, and the **geographical distribution of benefits** (such as how contribution to international research effort will benefit New Zealand). Research-related benefits, such as capacity and capability gains for New Zealand, and influence on future research agenda-setting, may be included where relevant.

What specific activities will you undertake, throughout the life of the research project, to maximise the use and benefits of your research?

Describe what targeted actions have been, or will be, taken⁷ to improve the likelihood of research uptake and impact, and to ensure that the next-users or end-users (identified in the previous section) can meaningfully contribute to, and/or benefit from, the research. Describe other planned dissemination activities that are designed to reach broader audiences. Who can enable the uptake of your research, and how have they been involved in your research? Identify uncertainties to uptake, or systematic/institutional barriers, and your mitigation strategies (where relevant).

What elements of the **team's track record of knowledge transfer** provide confidence in the likelihood of research uptake? For example: existing links, relationships, or networks with relevant research next-users or end-users; demonstrable examples of knowledge mobilisation, or changes in health outcomes or societal impact generated from similar research. This component is considered relative to opportunity.

⁶ Consult HRC guidelines and funding rules for information on support of knowledge transfer activities and include these activities in objectives/milestones where appropriate. Progress against implementing the action plan will form part of the milestones that the HRC monitors with respect to contractual compliance and delivery.

⁷ Consult HRC guidelines and funding rules for information on support of knowledge transfer activities and include these activities in objectives/milestones where appropriate. Progress against implementing the action plan will form part of the milestones that the HRC monitors with respect to contractual compliance and delivery.

General Emerging Researcher First Grant

Note: Applicants for the General Emerging Researcher First Grant are no longer required to link their impact section to the Goals of the previous investment streams. This is to encourage applicants to consider all potential ways in which their proposal can add value for New Zealand, and what actions within their influence can help achieve this potential. Assessment of Impact for this category has been restructured to include two components: 1) a **description** of how your research might be used and the anticipated benefits for New Zealand, and 2) the **action plan** to maximise the use and benefits of the research. See the [HRC's impact assessment slideshow](#) for additional guidance on completing this section.

What types of benefits are expected to arise from your research, and who will benefit?

This section should provide a realistic description of how research findings could contribute to improved health or other societal benefits over time (a 'line of sight' or 'pathway' to impact). Importantly, it should also identify the more immediate benefits, and users of the research who will form a focal point for your action plan (below). The balance between describing short-term benefits and potential longer-term impact will be dependent on the specific research context, with emphasis on considerations within your sphere of influence throughout the life of the research project.

The [HRC's impact assessment slideshow](#) includes discussion of elements that should be covered in this section, including the **types of benefits and research users**, and the **geographical distribution of benefits** (such as how contribution to international research effort will benefit New Zealand). Research-related benefits, such as capacity and capability gains for New Zealand, and influence on future research agenda-setting, may be included where relevant.

What specific activities will you undertake, throughout the life of the research project, to maximise the use and benefits of your research?

Describe what targeted actions have been, or will be, taken⁸ to improve the likelihood of research uptake and impact, and to ensure that the next users or end users (identified in the previous section) can meaningfully contribute to, and/or benefit from, the research. Describe other planned dissemination activities that are designed to reach broader audiences. Who can enable the uptake of your research, and how have they been involved in your research? Identify uncertainties to uptake, or systematic/institutional barriers, and your mitigation strategies (where relevant).

What elements of the **team's track record of knowledge transfer** provide confidence in the likelihood of research uptake? For example: existing links, relationships, or networks with relevant research next-users or end-users; demonstrable examples of knowledge mobilisation, or changes in health outcomes or societal impact generated from similar research. This component is considered relative to opportunity.

Māori health advancement (Pacific⁹, Health Delivery and General categories only)

The description of Māori health advancement should be considered within the context and scope of an Emerging Researcher First Grant and relative to the applicant's career stage and opportunity.

The HRC expects applicants for HRC research funding to consider all potential ways in which their proposal will advance Māori health, and to outline what actions they will undertake to help achieve this potential. Assessment of Māori health advancement will explicitly consider two components:

- An outline of contributions the research may make to advancing Māori health.
- Specific actions that have been, and will be, undertaken to realise the contribution to advancing Māori health through the life of the project and also beyond it.

All applicants for HRC funding will be required to address these two questions in their proposals. In responding to these questions, applicants should consider how their research is informed by the four domains of Māori health advancement (see the Māori Health Advancement Guidelines for more details). Researchers are encouraged to consider the domains during development of their research,

⁸ Consult HRC guidelines and funding rules for information on support of knowledge transfer activities and include these activities in objectives/milestones where appropriate. Progress against implementing the action plan will form part of the milestones HRC monitors with respect to contractual compliance and delivery.

⁹ While the Māori health advancement section is part of the Pacific Emerging Researcher First Grant application form, please note that there is no Māori health advancement assessment criterion for this category.

as this may identify aspects of the research not previously considered. It is not a requirement that all four domains are specifically addressed in the proposal, but researchers are advised to consider each in formulating the strongest rationale for the application. **Consideration of Māori health advancement is context-specific, as determined by the nature and scope of the research.**

Alignment of the response to the Māori health advancement criterion and other assessment criteria will strengthen an application.

1. How will the outcomes of your research contribute to Māori health advancement?

Provide a realistic description of how this research could contribute to improved Māori health outcomes or reductions in inequity over time. Consideration should be given to potential short-term and/or longer-term Māori health gains, within the specific context of the research and where it is positioned along the research pathway (cf. potential 'line of sight' or 'pathway' to impact). In addition, more immediate users and beneficiaries of the research who can use the research findings for Māori health gain should be identified.

2. What activities have you already undertaken (that are relevant to this project), and what will you undertake during this project, that will realise your research contribution to Māori health advancement?

Describe specific actions that have been, and will be, undertaken (from the development of the research idea through to the completion of the project) to maximise the likelihood that this research will contribute to Māori health advancement. Outline actions taken to ensure that the next users or beneficiaries of the research can use the findings for Māori health gain.

If the research is not expected to make direct contributions to Māori health, identify actions that will be undertaken throughout the life of the project to contribute to other facets of Māori health advancement. Identify barriers to actioning your aspirations for advancing Māori health, and your mitigation strategies (where relevant). Identify elements of the team's track record that provide confidence that this research will optimally contribute to Māori health advancement. For example: existing links, relationships, or networks with relevant Māori communities and next-users or end-users of research; demonstrable examples of knowledge translation and uptake; or changes to practice or policy that have enhanced equity and advanced Māori health. This component is considered relative to opportunity (i.e. stage of career progression, nature of research, and institutional capacity and capability).

4. Module 3: References

Ensure this section starts on a new page.

Citations for key references in the text in Module 2 should be supplied. There is no limit to the number of reference pages. Reference to Māori terms in the application with brief translation should be included here. Asterisks are to be placed beside applicants' publications. Endnote lists must be copied into a plain text editor before pasting in here. Details must include a **full list of all author(s)**, title of article, journal, year, volume and page numbers; however, if references are multi-authored, there is discretion to limit the author list to a more convenient number to fit any space limitations.

5. Module 4: Contract information and budget

Section 4A – 4D are parts of this form.

Section 4E – 4H are to be completed on the separate Excel file (2023 Emerging Researcher First Grant Budget.xlsx.)

Note: Salary is now able to be claimed for the first named investigator.

5.1 Section 4A: Justification of expenses

Justification of research staff

Note: For the Emerging Researcher First Grant, salary can now be claimed for the first named investigator. For full details on other salary costs that can be claimed, please see the Salary sub-below section – 5.5 Section 4E: Research proposal budget.

Use this section to justify the role and FTE of the named investigators and any other research staff listed in Section 4E. Also explain the role of ALL OTHER personnel (named or un-named, funded or not funded by the proposal), who will actively contribute to this research. These may be research assistants, technicians, medical staff, interviewers and support staff or similar, whose names or position titles are listed in the budget under 'research staff' and who have specific FTE involvements. Un-named postdoctoral fellows should be justified but it is recommended that named postdoctoral fellows should be included as named investigators and should provide a CV. Science Assessing Committees may decline funds for roles that are not fully justified or are simply described as a 'training opportunity'. Provide evidence that biostatisticians, data managers, and health economists are integrated into the team as appropriate, e.g. sufficient FTE is allocated for each year of the contract. It is the responsibility of the applicants to ensure that no personnel in this section will exceed 100% FTE of their combined commitments during the term of the contract. The roles of students and casual staff should be justified under 'working expenses'.

Justification of working expenses and casual staff

All items listed under 'materials and research expenses' in the budget should be justified, with costs broken down per item, and full costs for number of units requested. The application review process will consider the appropriateness of the budget and working expenses. If there are exceptional requests for working expenses, ensure that the Assessing Committee will clearly understand why the requested materials, travel, research tools and significant one-line items are necessary for the successful completion of the research. Clearly justify the role of students (must be named) and casual staff so that the Assessing Committee can appreciate how these persons are necessary for the proposed research. It is the responsibility of the applicants to ensure that no students in this section will exceed 100% FTE on their combined commitments with the host institution during the term of the contract. The HRC encourages the inclusion of allowable costs associated with knowledge transfer activities.

Quotes must be provided to support discretionary costs, where available.

List all supporting budget documents in Section 4D (Letters of collaboration/supporting documents list) and upload separately via HRC Gateway.

5.2 Section 4B: Previous/current contracts and awards

List contracts awarded to the first named investigator within the past 5 years

Using the table provided, outline current and previous support from any agency that has been received by **the first named investigator as principal investigator**. Copy the table and repeat for each received grant as required.

For 'nature of support', indicate whether the funding supports salaries only, working expenses only, both salary and working expenses, equipment, a junior research fellow, etc.

If applicable, please detail how this previous/current contract relates to and/or overlaps with the application.

Note: The table and text after the heading of this subsection can be deleted and replaced by an Excel spreadsheet using the layout and required information in the original table.

Previous HRC end of contract reports

The HRC no longer requires, or accepts, previous HRC contract reports to be uploaded as part of the application process.

Please note that the submission of progress and end of contract reports are an HRC contract requirement. For existing HRC contracts, delayed submission without justification will result not only in contract suspension but also will prohibit the submission of new research applications.

5.3 Section 4C: Other support

Other research applications awaiting decision and co-funding

List in this section any relevant research applications pending with other funders that might alter the budget. If applicable, indicate in the spaces provided any overlap (research, resources and personnel) that the listed application might have with this application. **The applicants agree that the HRC may seek clarification details from the other funders if required.**

Co-funding

Provide details if the applicant has approached other funders for co-funding of this research. If applicable, detail the joint funding arrangements.

Applicants should disclose and provide details of any significant relationship to third parties (e.g. commercial sector entities contributing to project costs, equipment, staff joint appointments). A clear description of how the current application relates to those relationships is desirable but assessment of commercial links is NOT part of the HRC peer review process.

Financial and other interest(s)

For the purposes of HRC funding applications, a financial or other interest is anything of economic value or a political/philosophical perspective, including relationships with entities outside of the research host institution. While not an exhaustive list, examples of financial interests include positions such as consultant, director, officer, partner or manager of an entity (whether paid or unpaid); salaries; consulting income; honoraria; gifts; loans and travel payments. Examples of other interests include alignment with special interest groups seeking to advance or promote a particular world view or policy.

A conflict of interest is a situation in which an individual's financial relationships or interests may compromise, or have the appearance of compromising, the individual's professional judgment in conducting or reporting research. In the event that an applicant has identified financial or other interests in a funding application, the applicant should also outline the specific details of their proposed conflict management strategy.

5.4 Section 4D: Letters of collaboration/supporting documents list

List any subcontracts/MOU, letters of collaboration, appendices and any other supporting documents. Please see the sub section 'Subcontracts/Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)' in Section 4E below for further details.

The documents themselves must be uploaded separately into HRC Gateway as PDF files.

A letter of collaboration should outline how the interested party intends to implement the findings of the research upon its completion, or provide material or actual support for the research, **not simply to state that the research is necessary**. Please ensure that any organisation providing a letter of collaboration recognises their intended commitment to the conduct of the proposed research and timeline of their involvement.

5.5 Section 4E: Research proposal budget

The budget spreadsheet in Section 4E can be used for different types of applications. Select 'Emerging Researcher First Grant' from the dropdown list. Further instructions are contained in the Notes tab of the file.

For more information refer to the HRC Rules document, which is available on HRC Gateway.

Budget calculations and spreadsheet

All calculations are GST exclusive and in whole dollar amounts, i.e., no cents or decimals.

The 'salary', 'working expenses' and 'total cost of this research' are components of Section 4E. The spreadsheet automatically calculates totals for each year of costs. Insert more rows into the table if required.

The 'total cost of research' shaded section automatically calculates all of the figures in this box.

Do not enter any details into any shaded areas as these are completed automatically.

Salary

For the Emerging Researcher First Grant, salary can only be claimed for the first named investigator, and for research assistants, research managers, research fellows etc. Salary can also be claimed for other named investigators, only where they are supporting the applicant and/or research in a capacity beyond what would be expected of them as part of any mentoring responsibilities in their employed position (this should be clearly justified). All other academics, professional supervisors or senior researchers should be included as named investigators on a time-only basis.

Any salary request should specify grade and level, FTE and salary; 'time only' or part-funding of salary is permissible.

The budget form does not accept FTE less than 3%.

Note: Overheads will be paid at a negotiated rate for each institution on all eligible contracts.

Do not enter salary associated costs (i.e., amounts requested for employer's contribution to approved superannuation schemes and accident compensation levies) for research staff in this 'salary' section – instead enter them in the 'working expenses' section.

Staff that must **NOT** be entered into the 'salary' section of the budget are subcontracted staff, named Masters and PhD students on stipends and casual staff.

- a) Subcontracted staff are those who are NOT employees of the host institution. The salary and all other expenses for these staff should be broken down into appropriate categories on a detailed subcontract/MOU between the host institution and non-host institution using Section 4F. The total GST-exclusive dollar figure for the subcontract/MOU should be all-inclusive, including overhead calculations. The subcontract/MOU total should then be entered under 'working expenses - subcontracts' for each year.
- b) If funding to provide a stipend for a PhD (\$30,000 per year) or Masters student (\$20,000 per year) is requested, the student must be named. Enter Masters and PhD stipends (for named students only) into 'working expenses – materials and research expenses'.
- c) Casual staff (those persons without an ongoing role or commitment to the research, but providing one-off services to the research on a part-time, hourly or per diem basis, e.g. interviewers) should also be requested under 'working expenses - materials and research expenses'.

Working expenses

Working expenses include 'direct costs' only. The only exception is in the case of subcontracts, as described above. Estimates of costs should be expressed in current prices **exclusive of GST**.

Materials and research expenses

The direct costs of the research include all the disbursements that can be identified, justified and charged to a contract and may include the following:

- Research consumables (these should be itemised at current cost per unit and full cost for number required).
- Other costs **directly** related to the research – telephone calls/communications, mail and freight.
- Computer-related license fees for research-specific software; access to High Performance Computing infrastructure (NeSI).
- Minor research equipment (to a total of \$5,000).
- A proportionate part of new specialised equipment (equipment to be acquired) may be included and **fully** justified on research applications (upload budgetary supportive documents separately via HRC Gateway and list in Section 4D).
- Depreciation on specialised equipment: depreciation and capital costs on existing equipment are included in the overhead rate. If an institution's auditors have certified that specific items of equipment have been excluded from the research rate, then depreciation on the excluded equipment can be included in research applications and justified in the same manner as other direct costs.
- Expenses of research participants.
- Costs associated with knowledge transfer activities.
- Travel costs **directly** related to the conduct of the research. Contract funds may be used to provide assistance with overseas travel provided the HRC is satisfied that such travel is directly relevant to the conduct of the research and that alternative sources of funding are not available. This is not intended to relieve the applicant's host institution of its obligation to assist with the costs of overseas travel by its employees.
- Costs for Masters (\$20,000 pa) or PhD (\$30,000 pa) named students only can be claimed if a description of the student's research project is provided in Section 4A. Funds will be conditional upon the institution arranging a tax-free stipend that satisfies the Inland Revenue and host institution's rules. Ensure that PhD students requested are supported for three years of PhD study, either entirely or partly through this project. **Note:** Students' fees

and thesis costs cannot be claimed.

- Dissemination of research results (fair and reasonable charges associated with the approved publication of the results of HRC-sponsored research in journals, reports, monographs or books may be paid from contract funds. Also, costs incurred from other forms of dissemination, such as meeting with community groups, or conference dissemination can be claimed if reasonable and justified).
- Conference allowance: The maximum allowance for conference attendance is \$1,000 per annum per named investigator **if fully supported at 100% FTE** by the grant and must be fully justified. The allowance cannot be distributed proportionately between grants. This allowance is distinct from the cost to disseminate findings from this proposed research; this cost must also be fully justified. Fares and allowances should be calculated in accordance with the regulations and scales of the host institution.
- Note: If you are intending to ask the HRC's Data Monitoring Core Committee (DMCC) to monitor this study, there is no cost involved in using the HRC's DMCC. However, if the DMCC agrees to monitor the trial, costs for members of the study team (including the study statistician) to attend the meetings (and preparation of biannual statistical reports) will need to be included in the budget for the application. If you have any questions, please contact the secretary to the DMCC, info@hrc.govt.nz.

Subcontracts/Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

Subcontract staff are not employees of the host institution. The salaries for these staff and all other expenses (e.g. working expenses) requested for the subcontract must appear in a detailed subcontract/MOU between the host institution and non-host institution. A MOU should also include overhead calculations for salaries.

Note: The HRC doesn't cover overheads for overseas based organisations. A *pro forma* MOU is available upon request from the HRC. If a subcontract/MOU is greater than \$50,000, all expenses requested should be broken down into the appropriate categories in Section 4F (MOU budget). [Upload the MOUs separately via HRC Gateway \(see Section 4D\).](#)

MOUs must also be provided for 'time only' subcontracted staff. In the event that MOUs are unable to be provided for time only subcontracted staff, it is acceptable to include a support letter with description of the level of involvement and role of these individuals in the application. If the application is successful, copies of MOUs for any time-only individuals not provided in the application may be required at the contracting stage.

Salary associated costs

Amounts requested for employer's contribution to approved superannuation schemes and accident compensation levies for research staff – these are not to be entered in 'salary' but in the 'working expenses' section. The amounts for each year should be entered separately in the budget form and the percentage rates for both ACC and Super should be noted for each individual (and justified in Section 4A where required, i.e. for non-standard rates).

International expenses

The HRC will not contribute to the overhead of the overseas investigators and the total proportion of contract budget allocated to overseas investigators must not exceed 20% for Emerging Researcher First Grants.

Total cost of research

Enter the appropriate overhead rate in the budget. Researchers should seek advice from their host institution Research Office on the costing of their research applications and the overhead rate negotiated with the HRC.

After entering the appropriate overhead rate, the total cost of the research will be automatically calculated. Enter this amount in the online section of the research application.

5.6 Section 4F: MOU budget

When a substantial proportion of the total budget of a research proposal is contained in a subcontract/MOU, the expenditure must be itemised in the same way as the overall research proposal budget (see above). Use Section 4F to provide budget details for all MOU requesting more than \$50,000; add a copy of Section 4F for each subcontractor. The overhead rate used should be

that for the host institution of the subcontracted staff, not that of the main host institution of the applicant.

Note: The HRC does not cover overheads for overseas-based organisations.

The total dollar amount for each year should then be entered under 'working expenses – subcontracts' and a copy of the subcontract/MOU should be uploaded separately in HRC Gateway.

A CV must be provided in Module 5 for all named investigators on MOUs to enable assessing committees to determine whether the investigator's expertise is appropriate and/or necessary. Without this information the assessing committees may decide not to support the budget for the MOU. CVs are not necessary for employees of commercial enterprises providing service for fees.

All subcontracts/MOUs must be listed in Section 4D (Letters of collaboration/supporting documents list). If there are no subcontracts/MOUs for this application, or none requesting more than \$50,000, you may delete or ignore Section 4F.

5.7 Section 4G: FTE summary

List the time involvement of ALL personnel (including those on a subcontract/MOUs) in terms of full time equivalents, e.g. 10% FTE. Give all names (for un-named positions, indicate as 'technician', 'research nurse' and 'postdoctoral fellow', etc.). Half percentages (e.g. 4.5%) are not allowed. Indicate when named investigators are 'time-only' (i.e. **not** receiving salary for their involvement in the research project). Identify all postgraduate students by 'Masters or 'PhD' as well as by their names. Ensure the FTE figures are the same as those in the budget and MOU budget sections (Sections 4E and 4F), as well as in Module 1. Heads of department will be required to agree to provide workload relief for research staff working on HRC contracts (principles of full cost funding).

5.8 Section 4H: List of collaborators (national and international)

Please complete the 'collaborators' section (not named investigators) by providing full name, organisation, and country (the location where the organisation is based, and the collaborators undertake their research).

For **collaboration purpose** select one of the following options: research; commercialisation; knowledge transfer.

For 'support' please indicate the value of any funding for this research provided by the collaborator in New Zealand dollars or list any in-kind support.

6. Module 5: NZ standard CV

Upload a CV for all named investigators (include those on MOU).

Use the NZ Standard CV template with default font from the HRC website. Do not exceed the page limits. The HRC will not accept any other form of CV.

The information provided in the CV **must be the same** as that provided elsewhere in the application and in the investigator's HRC Gateway profile.

CVs may indicate when career breaks have taken place as track record will be assessed relative to opportunity.

7. Module 6: Research classification

Classification of research is for HRC evaluation purposes only. The information is not used in allocating funding. Required details must be entered in HRC Gateway.

7.1 Section 6A: ANZSRC and keywords

Categorise the proposed research using the ANZSRC codes for the Fields of Research (FOR) and Socioeconomic Objective (SEO). Enter the percentage to the nearest 10% for each category to a total of 100%.

Enter keywords that categorise the research.

7.2 Section 6B: Economic benefits

Please provide a brief description of any potential economic benefits you consider may arise from your research. If no direct economic benefits are anticipated, please state this rather than leaving the field blank. The HRC's interpretation of economic benefits is broad and includes:

- contributing to maintaining a healthy and productive population;
- contributing to an efficient and cost-effective health system, and
- value generated from IP and innovation.

7.3 Section 6C: Health issues and mapping category

Health issues

Enter the requested information on HRC Gateway. Applicants need to select the health issue that best describes their research and, if required one secondary health issue.

Mapping category

Enter the requested information on HRC Gateway (select one). Applicants need to select the category that best describes the starting point for their research. The following table provides a description of each category.

Mapping Category	Description
Biomedical	
Gene	Research into the genetic basis of disease, identification of genes involved. Linkage analysis falls here and not under clinical studies.
Cell biology	Analysis of molecular-level interactions. This includes protein-protein interactions, determination of the function of genes involved in diseases, and whole cell studies (e.g. immunological studies, transfections, etc).
Physiology	This includes all physiology and anatomy. Animal models of disease are included in this category, and studies on host-pathogen interactions.
Diagnostics	This includes innovations, and the development/refinement of new or existing diagnostic tools.
Pharmaceuticals /treatments	This includes the development of new pharmaceuticals (drug design and development), as well as new treatments for diseases (e.g. vaccines, other therapies).
Clinical	
Clinical studies	Research involving human subjects. This excludes research in which samples from human subjects are used for fundamental biomedical research, such as genetic linkage analyses.
Clinical trials	Randomised clinical trials, usually randomised controlled clinical trials.
Health services	
Health economics	Research into the cost-effectiveness of treatments/services etc.
Clinical services	This includes primary and secondary care services. Access to and appropriateness of services are also included, and safety of services and compensation. Macro-level analysis of health system changes falls into this area.
Public Health	
Knowledge resources	This includes all epidemiology, underpinning social science (qualitative and quantitative), development of tools and new methodologies, and development of indicators.
Risk factors	Research linking life experiences, behaviours, exposures etc. with health outcomes.
Interventions	Research that includes the design and evaluation of interventions.
At-risk populations	Includes research on specific population groups. These groups may be based on age, ethnicity, occupation, etc. Includes research using diagnostics in a particular group.
Community services	Research around community-run services and community groups, e.g., marae-based healthcare services.

7.4 New Zealand Health Research Prioritisation Framework Domains (Health Delivery and General categories only)

This section is just required to be completed for applications to the Health Delivery Emerging Researcher First Grant and the General Health Delivery Emerging Researcher First Grant.

While this information will not influence the assessment of 2023 Emerging Researcher First Grant applications, it is a good opportunity to think critically about where your research fits into the prioritisation framework in preparation for changes coming up over the next 12 months.

Information for this section is entered at the end of the application Word form.

There are four Domains in the New Zealand Health Research Prioritisation Framework (NZHRPF). Please read the [NZHRPF](#) for more details and identify the primary Domain that your proposed research is most aligned with, and up to one additional secondary Domain.

Domain 1: Healthy people, whānau and communities

Domain 2: People-centred healthcare

Domain 3: Meeting our needs in a changing world

Domain 4: Connected government and systems.

The HRC does not provide advice on choice of Domains, as that decision is best made by the investigator.

Appendix 1: Criteria for assessing and scoring Emerging Researcher First Grant applications

Score criteria: Rangahau Hauora Māori Emerging Researcher First Grant

Applications are scored on a 7-point word ladder considered against each of the following assessment outlines below (listed A-D) for this Research Investment Stream. The 7-point word ladder assists assessing committee scoring according to the descriptors rather than other considerations such as success rates of applications. Assessing committee members may only allocate whole scores.

The criteria are scored using a 7-point scale using the following four criteria, such that the total maximum score is 28.

Score	Criteria descriptor	Criteria	Points	% score
7	Exceptional	Suitability of the applicant	7	40
6	Excellent	Rationale for research	7	20
5	Very good	Design and methods	7	20
4	Good	Research impact	7	20
3	Adequate	Total	28	100
2	Unsatisfactory			
1	Poor			

A. Suitability of the applicant

The applicant assessment, **relative to opportunity**, includes:

- evidence of the applicant’s commitment to establish an independent research career
- the extent to which the research proposal represents an independent research stream
- the applicant’s ability to take overall responsibility for the work to be completed
- the applicant’s plan for developing an independent research programme, stemming from the research proposal
- the quality of the applicant’s track record, based not only on quantity of publications but on the applicant’s PhD, prizes and scholarships, and other academic achievements. Track record is assessed **relative to opportunity**
- the nature and level of support provided by the applicant’s mentors and colleagues.

B. Rationale for research

The research is important, worthwhile and justifiable because it addresses some or all of:

- it addresses a significant health issue that is important for Māori
- the aims, research question and hypotheses will build on existing knowledge, address a knowledge gap, and contribute to the creation of Māori health knowledge (Goal 1)
- the research findings will be original and innovative.

C. Design and methods

The study has been well designed to answer the research questions, because it demonstrates some or all of:

- comprehensive and feasible study design that is achievable within the timeframe
- appropriate study design to address the objectives of the research

- awareness of statistical considerations/technical or population issues/practicalities
- evidence of availability of materials/samples
- Māori health research processes (Goal 3)
- Māori ethics processes (Goal 4)
- partnership with, and responsiveness to the needs of, Māori stakeholders and communities (Goal 6)
- plan for dissemination of results
- patient safety issues well managed.

D. Research impact

In addressing research impact for Emerging Researcher First Grants, applicants should focus on describing the potential benefits arising from the proposed research and the likely pathway to impact. The description of research impact should be considered relative to the scope and context of an Emerging Researcher First Grant.

The proposed research is likely to benefit Māori and New Zealand because:

- Applicants have described a credible pathway for how their research will:
 - result in benefits or opportunities for future research in New Zealand, or
 - influence policy, practice, or health services or technologies in New Zealand, leading to improved health or other social/economic impacts.
- The research team are undertaking steps to maximise the likelihood of impact by:
 - contributing to the creation of Māori health knowledge (Goal 1)
 - contributing to the translation of findings into Māori health gains (Goal 2)
 - incorporating Māori health research processes (Goal 3)
 - incorporating Māori ethics processes (Goal 4)
 - contributing to building a highly skilled Māori health research workforce (Goal 5), and
 - responding to the needs of, and working in partnership with, Māori stakeholders and communities (Goal 6).

Score criteria: Pacific Emerging Researcher First Grant

Applications are scored on a 7-point word ladder considered against each of the following assessment outlines below (listed A-D) for this category. The 7-point word ladder assists assessing committee scoring according to the descriptors rather than other considerations such as success rates of applications. Reviewers may only allocate whole scores.

The criteria are scored using a 7-point scale using the following four criteria, such that the total maximum score is 28.

Score	Criteria descriptor	Criteria	Points	% score
7	Exceptional	Suitability of the applicant	7	40
6	Excellent	Rationale for research	7	20
5	Very good	Design and methods	7	20
4	Good	Research impact	7	20
3	Adequate	Total	28	100
2	Unsatisfactory			
1	Poor			

A. Suitability of the applicant

The applicant assessment, **relative to opportunity**, includes:

- evidence of the applicant's commitment to establish an independent research career
- the extent to which the research proposal represents an independent research stream
- the applicant's ability to take overall responsibility for the work to be completed
- the applicant's plan for developing an independent research programme, stemming from the research proposal
- the quality of the applicant's track record, based not only on quantity of publications but on the applicant's PhD, prizes and scholarships, and other academic achievements (track record is assessed **relative to opportunity**)
- the nature and level of support provided by the applicant's mentors and colleagues.

B. Rationale for research

The research is important, worthwhile and justifiable because it addresses some or all of the following:

- it addresses a significant health issue that is important for Pacific
- the aims, research question and hypotheses will build on existing knowledge, address a knowledge gap, and contribute to the creation of Pacific health knowledge (Priority 1)
- the research findings will be original and innovative.

C. Design and methods

The study has been well-designed to answer the research questions, because it demonstrates some or all of the following:

- comprehensive and feasible study design that is achievable within the timeframe
- appropriate study design to address the objectives of the research
- awareness of statistical considerations/technical or population issues/practicalities
- evidence of availability of materials/samples
- Pacific health research protocols
- partnership with, and responsiveness to the needs of, Pacific stakeholders and

- communities
- plan for dissemination of results
- patient safety issues well managed.

D. Research impact

In addressing research impact for Emerging Researcher First Grants, applicants should focus on describing the potential benefits arising from the proposed research and the likely pathway to impact. The description of research impact should be considered relative to the scope and context of an Emerging Researcher First Grant.

The proposed research is likely to benefit Pacific communities and New Zealand because:

- Applicants have described a credible pathway for how their research will:
 - result in benefits or opportunities for future research in New Zealand, or
 - influence policy, practice, or health services or technologies in New Zealand, leading to improved health or other social/economic impacts.
- The research team are undertaking steps to maximise the likelihood of impact by:
 - enhancing the health and wellbeing of Pacific communities (Priority 1)
 - contributing to the creation of Pacific health knowledge (Priority 2)
 - contributing to the translation of findings into Pacific health gains (Priority 3)
 - building the capacity and capability of the Pacific health research workforce (Priority 4), and
 - incorporating Pacific health research protocols; responding to the needs of, and working in partnership with, Pacific stakeholders and communities.

Score criteria: Health Delivery Emerging Researcher First Grant

Applications are scored on a 7-point word ladder considered against each of the following assessment outlines below (listed A-F) for this category. The 7-point word ladder assists assessing committee scoring according to the descriptors rather than other considerations such as success rates of applications. Assessing committee members may only allocate whole scores.

The criteria are scored using a 7-point scale using the following six criteria, giving a total score of 42 points weighted to 28 points (for consistency across years and comparison across streams).

Score	Criteria descriptor	Criteria	Points	% score
7	Exceptional	Suitability of the applicant	7	32.5
6	Excellent	Rationale for research	7	15
5	Very good	Design and methods	7	15
4	Good	Māori health advancement	7	15
3	Adequate	Research impact	7	15
2	Unsatisfactory	Research uptake	7	7.5
1	Poor	Total (weighted total)	42 (28)	100

A. Suitability of the applicant

The applicant assessment, relative to opportunity, includes:

- evidence of the applicant's commitment to establish an independent research career
- the extent to which the research proposal represents an independent research stream
- the applicant's ability to take overall responsibility for the work to be completed
- the applicant's plan for developing an independent research programme, stemming from the research proposal
- the quality of the applicant's track record, based not only on quantity of publications but on the applicant's PhD, prizes and scholarships, and other academic achievements. Track record is assessed **relative to opportunity**
- the nature and level of support provided by the applicant's mentors and colleagues.

B. Rationale for research

The research is important, worthwhile and justifiable because it addresses some or all of:

- it addresses a significant health issue that is important for health/society
- the aims, research questions and hypotheses build on existing knowledge and address a knowledge gap
- the research findings should be original and innovative.

C. Design and methods

The study has been well designed to answer the research questions, because it demonstrates some or all of:

- comprehensive and feasible study design that is achievable within the timeframe
- appropriate study design to address the objectives of the research
- awareness of statistical considerations/technical or population issues/practicalities
- evidence of availability of materials/samples
- culturally appropriate methodology
- patient safety issues well managed.

D. Māori health advancement

The proposed research is likely to advance Māori health because:

- Applicants have provided a description of how their research could lead to improved Māori health or reductions in health inequity over time (as appropriate to the nature and scope of an Emerging Researcher First Grant).
- The research team are undertaking activities to address Māori health advancement, as appropriate to the nature and scope of the research. This may include, but is not limited to, activities such as:
 - the establishment of meaningful, collaborative, and reciprocal relationships with Māori
 - undertaking research that addresses Māori health need and inequity
 - the formation of appropriate research teams
 - the development of current and future workforce capacity and capability, including upskilling of research team members, and
 - adherence to culturally appropriate research practices and principles (as appropriate to the context of the research).

E. Research impact

In addressing research impact for Emerging Researcher First Grants, applicants should focus on describing the potential benefits arising from the proposed research and the likely pathway to impact. The description of research impact should be considered relative to the scope and context of an Emerging Researcher First Grant.

The proposed research is likely to add value and benefit New Zealand because:

- Applicants have described a credible pathway for how their research will:
- result in benefits or opportunities for future research in New Zealand, or
- influence policy, practice, or health services or technologies in New Zealand, leading to improved health or other social/economic impacts.
- The research team are undertaking steps to maximise the likelihood of impact beyond the productions of knowledge (as appropriate to the context of the research) and have the necessary skills, networks and experience to achieve this.

F. Track record: research uptake

The research is expected to contribute to a primary outcome of improved health service delivery over the short to medium term.

The applicant or team should have:

- expertise, a dissemination plan, networks for knowledge transfer and uptake,
- service-user, clinical, health provider, support worker, or community involvement.

Score criteria: General Emerging Researcher First Grant

Applications are scored on a 7-point word ladder considered against each of the following assessment outlines below (listed A-E) for this category. The 7-point word ladder assists assessing committee scoring according to the descriptors rather than other considerations such as success rates of applications. Assessing committee members may only allocate whole scores.

The criteria are scored using a 7-point scale using the following five criteria, giving a total score of 35 points weighted to 28 points (for consistency across years and comparison across streams).

Score	Criteria descriptor	Criteria	Points	% score
7	Exceptional	Suitability of the applicant	7	36
6	Excellent	Rationale for research	7	16
5	Very good	Design and methods	7	16
4	Good	Māori health advancement	7	16
3	Adequate	Research impact	7	16
2	Unsatisfactory	Total (weighted total)	35 (28)	100
1	Poor			

A. Suitability of the applicant

The applicant assessment, relative to opportunity, includes:

- evidence of the applicant's commitment to establish an independent research career
- the extent to which the research proposal represents an independent research stream
- the applicant's ability to take overall responsibility for the work to be completed
- the applicant's plan for developing an independent research programme, stemming from the research proposal
- the quality of the applicant's track record, based not only on quantity of publications but on the applicant's PhD, prizes and scholarships, and other academic achievements. Track record is assessed **relative to opportunity**
- the nature and level of support provided by the applicant's mentors and colleagues.

B. Rationale for research

The research is important, worthwhile and justifiable because it addresses some or all of:

- it addresses a significant health issue that is important for health/society
- the aims, research questions and hypotheses build on existing knowledge and address a knowledge gap
- the research findings should be original and innovative.

C. Design and methods

The study has been well designed to answer the research questions, because it demonstrates some or all of:

- comprehensive and feasible study design that is achievable within the timeframe
- appropriate study design to address the objectives of the research
- awareness of statistical considerations/technical or population issues/practicalities
- evidence of availability of materials/samples
- culturally appropriate methodology
- patient safety issues well managed.

D. Māori health advancement

The proposed research is likely to advance Māori health because:

- Applicants have provided a description of how their research could lead to improved Māori health or reductions in health inequity over time (as appropriate to the nature and scope of an Emerging Researcher First Grant).
- The research team are undertaking activities to address Māori health advancement, as appropriate to the nature and scope of the research. This may include, but is not limited to, activities such as:
 - the establishment of meaningful, collaborative, and reciprocal relationships with Māori
 - undertaking research that addresses Māori health need and inequity
 - the formation of appropriate research teams
 - the development of current and future workforce capacity and capability, including upskilling of research team members, and
 - adherence to culturally appropriate research practices and principles (as appropriate to the context of the research).

E. Research impact

In addressing research impact for Emerging Researcher First Grants, applicants should focus on describing the potential benefits arising from the proposed research and the likely pathway to impact. The description of research impact should be considered relative to the scope and context of an Emerging Researcher First Grant.

The proposed research is likely to add value and benefit New Zealand because:

- Applicants have described a credible pathway for how their research will:
- result in benefits or opportunities for future research in New Zealand, or
- influence policy, practice, or health services or technologies in New Zealand, leading to improved health or other social/economic impacts.
- The research team are undertaking steps to maximise the likelihood of impact beyond the productions of knowledge (as appropriate to the context of the research) and have the necessary skills, networks and experience to achieve this.

Appendix 2: Assessment process for Emerging Researcher First Grant applications

1. Assessment framework for Emerging Researcher First Grant applications

Proposals submitted to the Health Delivery Emerging Researcher First Grant and the General Emerging Researcher First Grant will be assessed by a multidisciplinary First Grant Assessing Committee(s) (FGAC).

Pacific Emerging Researcher First Grant proposals will be assessed by the Pacific Health Assessing Committee (PacificAC).

Rangahau Hauora Māori Emerging Researcher First Grant proposals will be assessed by the Rangahau Hauora Māori Assessing Committee (RHAC).

Committee members consider each proposal on its own merit. Applications received in the Emerging Researcher First Grant round will not receive external peer review, and therefore no applicant response. Committee members consider each proposal on its own merit and then score the proposal on the relevant criteria for each category (please see Appendix 1 for details).

2. HRC research proposal assessment overview

All research proposals are assessed by a system of peer review, which is briefly outlined in this section and further detailed in later sections:

- assignment of proposals to committee reviewers
- triage of lower-ranking proposals based on pre-scores from the Assessing Committee
- discussion and scoring of proposals by the Assessing Committee
- the Council makes final funding decisions.

3. HRC First Grant Assessing Committees

Assessing committees consist of a chair or two co-chairs and 9-12 members. The chair is a member (or designee) of one of the Statutory Research Committees (i.e. Māori Health Committee, Public Health Research Committee, Biomedical Research Committee) and appointed by that Research Committee. Members represent a mix of New Zealand (and can include international) health researchers, who are appointed for their research expertise to assess the applications received.

Note: Depending on the number of applications received, two committees may be convened to assess the Health Delivery and General applications.

3.1 Committee membership

Committee members assessing the Emerging Researcher First Grant applications are experienced researchers, who have the appropriate expertise relative to the breadth/scope of the research proposals received.

Members are expected to have:

- postgraduate qualifications in a discipline relevant to health research,
- a track record as a health researcher and be a named investigator on a funded research proposal from a relevant funding agency (e.g., the HRC, Cancer Society),
- a track record in policy analysis/advice in an agency/department relevant to health research (e.g., Ministry of Health),
- expertise in assessing Māori health advancement and an understanding of the wider Tiriti context and its application to research, and/or
- expertise in assessing the impact of health research.

In some circumstances, committees could have some members whose expertise and experience are less than that described above, however, all members must be able to carry out the roles and responsibilities of a committee reviewer (CR).

4. Responsibilities of committee members

4.1 General

Assessing committee members are required to declare at the outset any potential conflicts of interest so that the impact of any such conflicts on the assessment process is managed appropriately.

In order to minimise potential conflicts of interest, the following specific HRC guidance for assessing committee membership has been developed:

An assessing committee member should not sit on a committee if they are a first named investigator or a named investigator on an application under consideration by that committee.

Assessing committee members are required to keep all information pertaining to the assessment of research applications confidential.

4.2 Committee reviewer (CR) role

In addition to reading and being able to contribute to the discussion of all of the proposals reviewed by a committee, each committee member is assigned CR responsibilities for some of the applications. The requirements for this role are outlined below.

The CR of an application is required to:

- present an overview of the proposed research to the committee, focusing comments on strengths and weaknesses regarding each score criterion
- write the review summary which outlines the committee's discussion.

The CR member must be able to contribute to the discussion of other proposals reviewed by the committee they are sitting on.

5. Scoring of Emerging Researcher First Grant applications

Committee members are asked to score the research proposal on a 7-point scale at pre-scoring and for meeting scoring as described below.

6. Committee pre-scoring assessment

Committee members (based on their own reading of the applications) may be required to undertake pre-scoring of applications assigned to their committee and allocate scores using the 7-point scale score criteria used at the assessing committee meeting.

The HRC collates the average scores to identify a preliminary ranking. Based on the pre-scores, up to 40% of the applications may be triaged, i.e. not progress to full discussion at the committee meeting, but the committee may rescue some of them prior to the meeting. The remaining applications will be randomised for discussion at the committee meeting.

7. Assessing committee meeting

Assessing committee members are provided with a briefing at the start of the one to two-day meeting. The briefing confirms the procedure for identifying and dealing with conflicts of interest, the meeting process, and the scoring criteria. This provides committee members with the information and guidance they need to be consistent in their approach and to follow process.

8. Time allocated to the discussion of each proposal

The chair(s) is responsible for ensuring that a fair and balanced assessment is reached. General discussion by all members is essential for a balanced committee opinion, not unduly influenced by one committee member and should not be cut short nor unduly extended.

The discussion time allocated to each proposal is between 15-20 minutes:

- declaration of conflicts of interest – 1 minutes
- CR – 4-5 minutes
- general discussion of the proposal –10 minutes
- scoring – 1-2 minutes
- note key points for review summary – 1-2 minutes.

9. Assessment criteria, scoring and recommendation

In the assessing committee meeting, applications are assessed in random order and scored on a 7-point scale for the following criteria. Please see Appendix 1 for details of the scoring criteria for each category.

The committee also takes into consideration:

- the appropriateness of the timeline for the proposed research and likelihood of meeting objectives within the budget
- the appropriateness of the requested % FTE involvement of the applicant and other investigators.

The HRC will provide the assessing committee with information on the consistency of the budget with regards to HRC rules and policy. However, it is the responsibility of the committee to determine whether the budget is appropriate for the proposal.

At the end of the discussion, the proposal is confidentially scored by each committee member.

9.1 Re-ranking procedure

After all applications have been scored, the ranked applications are considered by the assessing committee for possible re-ranking of applications on a case-by-case basis to remedy significant perceived inconsistencies. Applications cannot have points added to the score for the purpose of strengthening the score without re-ranking the application. This procedure will allow any application in the ranked table to move up or down by one position at a time. The re-ranking procedure is managed carefully by the committee chair(s) and the HRC research investment manager to avoid re-litigation of any applications and to mitigate against any bias affecting the process.

- Any member may bring forward an application for re-ranking.
- Conflicts of Interest are notified and managed in the appropriate manner.
- The application under consideration would have its scores modified, after appropriate discussion and agreement, by adding up to 0.5 points to one or two of the scoring criteria of choice to move the application up one place under consideration.
- The new ranking and new adjusted total scores would then be put forward for consideration at the next stage.
- Re-ranking of other applications can be done using an iterative process until a final ranked list is reached.
- Any changes are recorded in the meeting scoresheet and notes.

9.2 Fundable and not fundable line

After scoring and re-ranking discussion, the applications are ranked according to total score.

The committee, noting conflicts of interest, then:

- identifies the proposals assessed as not fundable (NF), by starting at the bottom of the ranked list and going up the list
- identifies the proposals assessed as fundable (F).

The fundable/not fundable line refers to the position in the ranked list of applications below which all applications are of insufficient quality that, irrespective of available budget, they should not be funded.

Note: Once the proposals have been scored and re-ranked following discussion by the committee, no scores are permitted to be further reviewed or adjusted at or after the conclusion of the meeting. Any concerns about the process are identified by the committee and are taken by the chair(s) to the chair of the relevant research committee.

9.3 Funding approval

The FGAC, PacificAC and RHAC results and recommendations are provided to the HRC Council for funding approval.

10. Feedback to applicants

The CR1 writes a review summary of the committee discussion to provide the applicant with a brief, balanced, objective statement of the committee's response to the research proposal.

Review summaries should be constructive and include:

- key strengths of the application
- key areas for improvement and/or further consideration
- other specific comments (e.g. budget, FTE, objectives, Māori health advancement).

Review summaries should not include:

- reference to scores
- identity of committee members.

The committee chair(s) are responsible for approving the content of all review summaries. Once review summaries have been approved, the HRC is responsible for ensuring they are forwarded to the host institution.

11. Additional eligibility requirements

11.1 Eligibility restrictions on publicly funded research

As part of the New Zealand Government's broader response to Russia's continued assault on Ukraine, a new eligibility criterion has been implemented for government research funding.

For proposals to be eligible, they must not benefit a Russian state institution (including but not limited to support for Russian military or security activity) or an organisation outside government that may be perceived as contributing to the war effort.

This is not a broad ban on collaborations with individual Russian researchers. The focus is on ensuring that government funding does not support scientific research collaborations that could further Russia's ability to continue its aggression in Ukraine.

As a Crown Agent, investing in health research for the public good with taxpayer funding, the HRC reserves the right to make ineligible any application for funding that will provide benefit to a state institution or other organisation identified for exclusion by the New Zealand Government.