Te Kāwanatanga o Aotearoa
New Zealand Government

hrc nz Health Research Council of New Zealand
Te Kaunihera Rangahau Hauora o Aotearoa

May 2023

PEER REVIEW MANUAL
for
2024 CAREER DEVELOPMENT AWARDS

Table of Contents

Section 1. Purpose of the Career Development Awards Peer Review Manual

1.1 The Health Research Council of New Zealand (HRC)

The HRC, established under the *Health Research Council Act 1990*, is the Crown entity responsible for the management of the government's investment in public good health research. The Act provides for the appointment of statutory Research Committees to advise the Council on the assignment of funds for health research. Assessing Committees (AC) are appointed by the Research Committees to review health research proposals for funding through a variety of grant types.

The HRC funds a portfolio of health research relevant to Government goals and to the needs of the health sector in Aotearoa New Zealand. The HRC funding of health research occurs primarily through an annual funding round to identify and support high quality research. Funding is also provided through a Connecting for Impact fund, which supports specific research initiatives with other agencies, career development awards, and targeted Māori and Pacific health research, and the HRC's Career Development Awards.

1.2 Te Tiriti o Waitangi

The HRC recognises Te Tiriti o Waitangi as the founding document of Aotearoa New Zealand and is committed to:

- Upholding Te Tiriti o Waitangi and advancing Māori health outcomes.
- Supporting research that upholds Te Tiriti o Waitangi by reflecting Te Tiriti principles (Tino Rangatiratanga, Equity, Active Protection, Options and Partnership) in practice.

As such, we promote and contribute to the advancement of Māori and Māori health in our investment processes.

1.3 Career Development Awards (CDA) programme

The HRC Career Development Award (CDA) programme supports researcher training by providing a range of postgraduate awards to individuals. It also provides several prestigious fellowships for advanced postdoctoral support. Details are available on the HRC website, CDA Guidelines document and summarised here.

1.3.1 General and advanced fellowships

1.3.1.1 Clinical Practitioner Research Fellowship (CPRF)

The CPRF provides an opportunity for a clinician, who has a proven track record of research and currently practising and employed by a healthcare organisation, to undertake a programme of research that aligns with their clinical practice and will enhance healthcare delivery.

1.3.1.2 Clinical Research Training Fellowship (CRTF)

The CRTF provides an opportunity for medical, dental and allied health professionals, who have a **current** clinical role, to undertake a PhD or equivalent qualification, offering a stipend plus university fees for up to three years full-time (or four years part-time).

1.3.1.3 Foxley Fellowship

The Foxley Fellowship provides support for a health sector professional to undertake a research sabbatical at a tertiary institution. The award aims to enhance links between HRC-funded

research and healthcare delivery or health policy. The Fellowship can be held for up to one year full-time or two years part-time.

1.3.1.4 HRC and Girdlers' UK Fellowship

The Fellowship provides two years postdoctoral experience at Green Templeton College and the University of Oxford for a New Zealand citizen whose research programme is relevant to health sciences. The Fellowship now includes a repatriation component of a third year on return to New Zealand. Note that the Girdlers' Fellowship is only offered every two years and is not available in this funding round.

1.3.1.5 Sir Charles Hercus Health Research Fellowship

The Fellowship provides salary support for up to four years for an outstanding researcher whose scientific field has the potential to contribute to both the health and economic goals for the government's investment in research, science and technology.

1.3.2 Māori Health Research Career Development Awards

Details for the assessment of these awards are part of this CDA Peer Review Manual. Further details and specific application forms are published on HRC Gateway (gateway.hrc.govt.nz). Refer to the 2024 Māori Health Research Career Development Award (CDA) Application Guidelines for further information, including applications dates.

1.3.2.1 Master's Scholarships

The Scholarship provides up to $20,000 towards one year of personal support (plus fees and a $1,600 tikanga allowance) for students completing the **research** component of a Master's degree. Note: working expenses are not included.

1.3.2.2 PhD Scholarships

The Scholarship provides three years of personal support of up to $30,000 per annum (plus fees, up to $10,000 in total research working expenses, and a tikanga allowance) for outstanding graduate students in any discipline whose proposed research programme is relevant to health.

1.3.2.3 Postdoctoral Fellowships

Māori Health Research Postdoctoral Fellowships are available to applicants from all disciplines undertaking a research programme that will contribute to improving health outcomes for Māori. The Fellowships are to the value of $100,000 for research-associated costs, plus a salary, which is negotiated through the host institution for up to four years. A conference allowance of $3,000 and $5,000 tikanga allowance can also be claimed.

There are four Māori Postdoctoral Fellowship award types, each focusing on a different area of Māori health research: Erihapeti Rehu-Murchie, Eru Pōmare, Hōhua Tutengaehe and Irihapeti Ramsden. Applicants can apply for a Māori Health Research Postdoctoral Fellowship if their research is in a different area from the four areas outlined, however the proposed research must link to health and demonstrate good health outcomes for Māori.

1.3.2.4 Māori Health Clinical Research Training Fellowship

The Māori Health Clinical Research Training Fellowship provides an opportunity for Māori medical, dental and allied health professionals who have a **current** clinical role to undertake a PhD or equivalent qualification, offering a stipend, university fees, and research costs for up to three years full-time (or four years part-time).

1.3.3 Pacific Health Research Career Development Awards

Details for the assessment of these awards are part of this CDA Peer Review Manual. Further details and specific application forms are published on HRC Gateway (gateway.hrc.govt.nz). Refer to the 2024 Pacific Health Research Career Development Award (CDA) Application Guidelines for further information, including applications dates.

1.3.3.1 Master's Scholarships

The Scholarship provides up to $20,000 towards one year of personal support (plus fees and a $1,000 tufungatika allowance) for students completing the **research** component of a Master's degree. Note: working expenses are not included.

1.3.3.2 PhD Scholarships

The Scholarship provides three years of personal support of up to $30,000 per annum (plus fees, up to $10,000 in total research working expenses, and a tufungatika allowance) for outstanding graduate students in any discipline whose proposed research programme is relevant to health.

1.3.3.3 Postdoctoral Fellowships

Pacific Health Research Postdoctoral Fellowships are available to applicants from all disciplines undertaking a research programme that will contribute to improving health outcomes for Pacific peoples. The Fellowships are to the value of $105,000 for research-associated costs, plus a salary, which is negotiated through the host institution for up to four years.

1.3.3.4 Pacific Clinical Research Training Fellowship (PCRTF)

The PCRTF provides an opportunity for Pacific medical, dental and allied health professionals who have a **current** clinical role to undertake a PhD or equivalent qualification, offering a stipend, university fees, and research costs to a maximum of $20,000 for up to three years full-time (or four years part-time).

1.3.3.5 Sir Thomas Davis Te Patu Kite Rangi Ariki Health Research Fellowship

The Davis Fellowship is available to support emerging researchers who have demonstrated outstanding potential to develop into highly skilled researchers. Applicants must have held a PhD or an equivalent degree for six to ten years on the application date. The Fellowship will contribute towards achieving better health outcomes for Pacific people, families and communities.

1.3.4 Other Māori and Pacific Career Development Awards

There are other awards available in these categories for health research and/or workforce support, including Māori and Pacific Summer Studentships for undergraduates, Pacific Knowledge Translation Grant, Māori Development Grants and the Rangahau Hauora Award. Details for these awards are published on HRC Gateway.

1.4 Purpose of the Career Development Awards Peer Review Manual

The purpose of the CDA Peer Review Manual is to describe for applicants and reviewers the assessment process for HRC Career Development Awards. The roles of reviewers, Committee(s) and HRC staff in the process are fully covered. The scoring system with descriptors is provided in the appendices.

Assessment processes for Programme, Project, Emerging Researcher First Grant and Explorer Grant applications are described in a separate Peer Review Manual.

The processes in this manual will be applied by the appropriate assessing committees. If committee members need clarification or assistance, the HRC will provide additional information.

Applicants are advised to familiarise themselves with the assessment processes described here. Details on the various awards, forms and other information are provided in the CDA Guidelines.

1.5 Acknowledgements

The HRC acknowledges the time and effort of applications to submit an application to the HRC and the valuable contribution committee members and external reviewers make to its assessment processes.

Section 2. Integrity of peer review

2.1 Disclosures and conflicts of interest

A goal in the HRC mission of *"*benefiting New Zealand through health research*"* is to invest in research that meets New Zealand health needs and research that has a strong pathway to impact. Peer review by external reviewers and assessing committees (AC) are part of this process.

The HRC Management of Interest Policy governs Council members, committee members, staff, contractors, and consultants. The policy is further applicable to all AC members and reviewers. A conflict of interest arises when an individual has an interest which conflicts (or might be perceived to conflict) with the interests of the HRC as a Crown Entity, such as situations in which financial or other personal considerations may compromise, or have the appearance of compromising, professional judgement in objectively assessing research proposals. In managing a conflict of interest, it is important to consider actual conflicts and the appearance of conflict.

The HRC provides external reviewers and AC members with guidelines regarding conflicts of interest management, to assist in the identification and declaration of potential conflicts of interest and to help evaluate the potential impact of the conflict on the peer-review process. It is difficult to prescribe a comprehensive set of rules on interest as individuals are best able to judge their duties, links, and potential interest in a particular circumstance. The key question to ask when considering whether an interest might create a conflict is whether or not "the interest creates an incentive to act in a way which may not be in the best interests of the HRC, the research, or the researcher(s)."

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

- Anyone who is a **first named investigator** or a **named investigator** on an application under consideration in that round should not sit on the AC that is assessing their application, but they may sit on or chair another AC.
- A Programme named investigator cannot be a committee reviewer (CR) on a competing Programme application.
- HRC Council members, who chair research committees, cannot serve on an AC.

2.2 Declaration of interest

AC members and reviewers must declare a potential conflict of interest if they:

- are a NI on any application in the funding round
- are from the same immediate department, institution or company as the applicant(s)
- have direct involvement in the research proposal being discussed.
- have collaborated, published or been a co-applicant with the applicant(s), within the last five years
- have been involved in any National Science Challenge-funded studies or associated activities with the applicant (s)
- have been a student or supervisor of the applicant(s) within the past 10 years
- are a close personal friend or relative of the applicant(s)
- have had long-standing scientific or personal differences with the applicant(s)
- are in a position to gain or lose financially from the outcome of the application.
- have direct involvement in a competing application in the current funding round.
- for whatever reason, feel that they cannot provide an objective review of the application.

2.3 Evaluation of interest

External reviewers may exclude themselves from the assessment process when they recognise a potential significant conflict of interest by opting out when initially contacted by an HRC team member, or on accessing preliminary details of the application on the HRC Gateway. When an external reviewer does not recognise or declare a conflict of interest, but the potential conflict is later detected, the level of conflict will be determined and managed according to the guidelines in this section.

Declarations of conflicts of interest for assessing committee members should be made as soon as possible to allow evaluation of the conflict and an appropriate outcome or resolution to be achieved. The HRC and the AC chair are responsible for raising any potential conflict of interest issues, resolving any areas of uncertainty, and working with the AC in making final decisions in managing potential conflicts of interest. Potential conflicts of interest are discussed with the AC as a whole; the member concerned may be asked to leave the meeting during this discussion. Following this discussion, one of the following agreed actions is taken:

Level 1	No action is necessary.
Level 2	The CDAC member may be present due to their unique knowledge of the research area. They may be asked direct questions relating to scientific issues by other committee members, but they will not participate in general discussion, and they will not score the application.
Level 3	The reviewer report must not be considered, or the CDAC member must not be present during discussion and scoring of the research proposal.

All declared conflicts should be reported in the notes or minutes of the relevant meetings. including the action taken.

Where a potential conflict of interest, such as a recent co-authored publication, arises from a person's technical expertise, e.g. biostatistics or other limited involvement, this may be considered a minor conflict if the person was/is acting in a capacity similar to that of a consultant. If the association extends to the person being considered an integral member of the research team, then this is likely to be considered a strong conflict.

In determining conflicts of interest with collaborators, who are not named investigators but contribute in other ways to a proposal, the HRC will consider the declaration in line with our conflict of interest policy. In evaluating the conflict, and determining the appropriate action, the specific involvement of the collaborating individual or organisation will be considered.

An individual who is concerned about another member's potential or actual conflict of interest should raise the issue with the chair or HRC, and measures to alleviate those concerns will be taken.

2.4 Financial interest

For the purposes of HRC processes, a financial interest is anything of economic value, including relationships with entities outside the research host institution. 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.

A financial conflict of interest may compromise, or have the appearance of compromising, an individual's professional judgment in conducting, assessing or reporting research.

Applicants must disclose financial interests arising from the *sponsorship of the research project* when any of the sponsors of the activity undertaken as part of the proposed research project is a non-governmental entity.

2.5 Confidentiality and retention of applications

All participants in HRC assessing committees and peer review processes, in agreeing to take part, are required to keep specific details of application assessment confidential.

2.5.1 Confidentiality

The following guidance for committee members is designed to help maintain confidentiality and protect the integrity of the peer review process:

- Applications and confidential meeting materials must not be shared with anyone who has not been invited by the HRC to participate in the assessing committee. Committee members may seek generic advice from those outside of the peer review process, but the specific content of an application must never be revealed.
- Committee discussions, decisions and scoring for applications must remain confidential at all times. Any comments on applications are restricted to committee discussion and cannot continue during breaks or outside of the meeting.
- Electronic and paper materials must be destroyed at the conclusion of the assessing committee meeting.
- Committee members are encouraged to note their service on an HRC committee in CVs or other material but should not reveal the specific committee's name. The HRC publishes a list of AC members each year, but members are not listed by committee. Members must not disclose the names of other members associated with a specific committee or the names of external reviewers associated with a specific application.

The following guidance for external reviewers is designed to help maintain confidentiality and protect the integrity of the peer review process:

- Applications and confidential links to the HRC Gateway system must not be shared with anyone. External reviewers are expected to provide comments and questions on an application that are focused on the area of the proposal that is most directly aligned with their expertise.
- Generic advice may be sought from those outside of the peer review process, but the specific content of an application must never be revealed.
- External reviewer reports are anonymised for applicant rebuttal, but not for the assessing committee.
- Electronic and paper materials must be destroyed once external reviewers have completed their review.

Any suspected breaches in confidentiality should be immediately reported to the HRC. The HRC will take appropriate steps to investigate and manage any suspected breach.

2.5.2 Retention of Applications

A AC Chair may keep copies of research proposals and Committee meeting notes for a period of three months following the award of new HRC research contracts. This is to ensure that any queries regarding the outcome of funding results can be clarified. The committee reviewer of an application may retain notes to complete appropriate review summaries for applicant feedback. However, all funding round related materials, whether hard copy or electronic, should be destroyed by the start of the next funding round. External reviewers must destroy any copies of a research proposal after their review is completed.

2.6 Minimising bias

In addition to managing conflicts of interest related to individuals, the HRC continually seeks to minimise the impact of unfair and unreasonable bias related to gender, age, ethnicity, disability, or any other grounds prohibited by the Human Rights Act, 1993. In addition, the HRC seeks to minimise the impact of biases more specific to the health and research sectors, such as those related to discipline, methodological choices, or research background. This is not an exhaustive

list; the HRC acknowledges there are numerous biases that can unfairly influence assessment, and that these can intersect and have a cumulative negative impact.

While a peer review process inherently relies on subjective assessment, the HRC aims to minimise the impact of various biases by ensuring that the assessment of each application is informed by experts with a diverse range of perspectives as well as subject matter knowledge.

The HRC actively manages committee composition to minimise potential impacts of bias and has steps in place to reduce the influence of bias during assessing committee meetings. For example, committee members are asked to watch a training video about bias, and this is discussed at the start of each meeting. Committee chairs, supported by HRC staff, are briefed to manage discussions to ensure that the knowledge contributed by each member is respected. The HRC has mechanisms in place to monitor for expression of biases in reviews and discussion, and to intervene to minimise impact and recurrence, which we will continue to improve.

2.7 False or misleading information

Once submitted to the HRC, an application is considered final and no changes will be permitted, although it may be withdrawn. The application is the primary source of information available for assessment. As such it must contain all the information necessary for assessment of the application without the need for further written explanation, or reference to additional documentation, including online resources. All details in the application, particularly concerning any awarded grants, must be current and accurate at the time of application.

If an application contains information that is false or misleading, it may be excluded from any further consideration for funding.

If the HRC believes that omission or inclusion of misleading information is intentional, it may refer to the host institution for the situation to be addressed under the provisions of the organisational code of conduct. The HRC also reserves the right to not consider future applications from the relevant investigators and/or to pursue legal action if deemed appropriate. Examples of false or misleading information in an application include, but are not restricted to:

- Violation of the standard codes of scholarly, professional and ethical conduct (http://www.ssc.govt.nz/integrityandconduct).
- Providing fictitious CVs or biographical sketches, including roles in previous research.
- Omitting advice of publications which have been or could be retracted.
- Falsifying claims in publications records (such as describing a paper as accepted for publication when it has only been submitted).

2.8 Complaints

The HRC has a policy for considering and ruling on allegations of unfairness from an unsuccessful applicant for any HRC research funding. Complaints or requests for review of a funding decision must be submitted in writing through the applicant research office. An applicant may submit a complaint or request for review if they consider their application has been processed unfairly or differently from other like applications, setting out the way in which the applicant feels the application was processed differently, the alleged unfairness and the remedy sought.

Section 3. Career Development Award Assessing Committee (CDAC)

3.1 CDAC membership

CDAC may consist of core members, who are experienced in HRC processes, and expert members, to provide expertise needed for a particular round. Nomination and selection of members is undertaken by the Research Committees, the CDAC Chair(s) and HRC staff to achieve widespread representation. More than one CDAC may be formed depending on the number and nature of applications received.

CDAC consists of the Chair(s) and other committee members, with overall membership dependent on the expertise requirements and the number of applications to be assessed. Members represent a mix of disciplines and are appointed on the basis of their research expertise and ability to effectively assess the applications received in that funding round.

Māori health research award applications are assessed by the Māori Health Committee. Assessments of these align with the CDAC.

Pacific Health research award applications are assessed by the Pacific Health Assessment Committee. Assessments of these align with the CDAC.

Career development awardees or emerging researchers may be invited to sit on HRC assessing committees, including the CDAC.

When awards are partly funded by a third party, the CDAC membership may be augmented by a person(s) representing that third party.

3.2 CDAC expertise

Members are experienced researchers, who have the appropriate expertise relative to the breadth/scope of the research proposals to be assessed by the committee.

Members are expected to have:

- Postgraduate qualifications in a discipline relevant to health research.
- A track record as an active health researcher and be a Named Investigator on a funded research proposal submitted to a relevant funding agency (e.g. HRC, Cancer Society) in the past three years.

All members must be able to carry out the roles and responsibilities of a Committee Reviewer, i.e. lead the discussion on their assigned applications. As such, postgraduate students would not generally be eligible.

To minimise year-to-year scoring variation, some of the members should have previous experience on the CDAC.

3.3 Responsibilities of CDAC members

3.3.1 General

Members are required to declare at the outset any potential conflicts of interest, specific to applications to be assessed by the committee, so that the impact of any such conflicts on the assessment process is managed appropriately (Section 2. Integrity of Peer Review).

To minimise potential conflicts of interest, the following specific HRC guidance for AC membership has been developed:

a AC member should not sit on a committee if they are a first NI or a NI on an application under consideration by that committee.

This means that anyone who is a **first NI** or a **NI** on an application under consideration in that round should not sit on the committee that is reviewing their application, but they may sit on or chair a different committee.

Members are required to keep all information about the assessment of research applications confidential, i.e. they may not discuss outside the HRC specific details about applicants, applications or outcomes (Section 2. Integrity of Peer Review). However, they are allowed to talk about their experience to colleagues in developing proposals.

3.3.2 Chair responsibilities

The HRC supports the appointment of Co-Chairs where there is appropriate expertise, as this helps to spread workload, reduce potential bias and allow for succession planning. Consideration should also be given to limiting the term of an assessing committee Chair, e.g. in line with their Research Committee term. The main responsibilities of the AC Chair, with the HRC Manager, may include the following:

- approve the allocation of applications to be assessed by the AC
- approve and suggest potential committee members, taking into consideration: expertise, conflict of interest, location, gender balance, international balance, turnover of members and Māori and/or Pacific expertise
- approve and suggest committee reviewer assignment of applications
- manage potential conflicts of interest
- attend the Chairs' Zoom meeting (where available)
- ensure that a fair, balanced and **unbiased** assessment is reached
- ensure that all committee members contribute to the discussion
- ensure that committee discussion includes reference to all scoring criteria
- provide a brief Chair feedback report with a consensus view of the committee
- approve review summaries after the meeting.

3.3.3 Committee Reviewer (CR) Roles

3.3.3.1 Introduction

In addition to reading and being able to contribute to the discussion of all proposals reviewed by the CDAC, each committee member may be assigned CR responsibilities for several proposals. Assignment to CR roles is undertaken by the Research Investment Manager in consultation with the CDAC Chairs. This is done considering potential conflicts of interest, expertise and workload.

The CR of an application may be required to:

- recommend external reviewers
- provide a CR report
- present an overview of the proposed research to the committee during the meeting
- ask proposal-specific questions when interviewing applicants
- write a review summary for shortlisted applicant feedback.

3.3.3.2 External Reviewer Selection

Where external peer review forms part of the assessment process, the CR must provide their reviewer recommendations as soon as possible as this stage of the process is extremely time sensitive.

The low success rate for recruiting reviewers means that the CR should identify several alternate reviewers and may be asked to provide additional suggestions to achieve the required number of reports. Applicants may exclude up to two individuals or groups as reviewers.

The HRC Research Investment Manager works to ensure that at least two external reviewer reports are obtained for each proposal, where external review is part of the assessment process.

It is the role of the HRC to coordinate and oversee all communications with the reviewers. Committee members and applicants should not contact reviewers.

External reviewer reports are anonymised for applicant rebuttal, but not for the career development assessing committee.

3.4 CDAC administration

This section summarises the administration of committees. Detailed information is provided to members when they have been accepted into a committee and specific issues may be addressed with the committee administrator or HRC Research Investment Manager.

The CDAC is supported by the HRC Research Investment Manager, who will be responsible for recruitment of the committee members, application assessment processes and communications. All CDAC administration support with respect to travel, accommodation, expense claims, distribution of applications, notes and other documentation is provided by the HRC administrator.

3.4.1 Time commitment

Committee members are assigned CR roles for a subset of applications to be assessed by the committee. In addition, all members must be able to discuss all other applications at the committee meeting. Pre-meeting preparation is an important part of the CDAC process and members must allow sufficient time to read all proposals. The time needed is dependent on the number of applications; approximately 20 is typical.

Generally, a full day is required for the CDAC meeting(s). Arrangements should ensure that members are available for the full meeting period. CDAC meetings are held using Zoom.

The meeting starts with a briefing from the HRC Research Investment Manager. The briefing includes a discussion of procedures for managing conflicts of interest, the CDAC meeting process, and a review of the assessment and scoring criteria for the research proposals. The remainder of the meeting is dedicated to the discussion, including interviews of shortlisted applicants and scoring of research proposals.

3.4.2 Expenses

Fees and other expenses payable to committee members are listed in Appendix 1. Assessing Committee Fees and Expenses.

3.4.3 Review Summary for Applicant Feedback

The CR writes a review summary of the CDAC discussion for each of their assigned shortlisted applications (Appendix 4. Review Summary for Applicants). The intent of this report is to provide brief, balanced and objective statements on key strengths and weaknesses of an application. Scores and reviewer names should not be included. The CDAC Chairs are responsible for approving the content of review summaries.

3.4.4 Meeting review

A review of the committee's effectiveness and functioning is a final responsibility at the end the CDAC meeting. The Chair is asked to provide a short report on their experience and insights into the process, noting issues that would be useful for future rounds (Appendix 2. Assessing Committee Chair's Report). Feedback should be the consensus view of the committee or clearly identify where the view is that of an individual.

The feedback provided by committee members, either at the meeting or later, gives the HRC insight into any concerns or positive features that can be used to improve or maintain a high-quality peer review process.

Section 4. Clinical Practitioner Research Fellowship

4.1 Overview

4.1.1 Objectives

The purpose of the Fellowship is to strengthen healthcare practice and health services by providing the opportunity for experienced clinicians to sustain and expand a programme of research. The Fellowships will also support integration of research into clinical practice, provide a focus for the development of additional research within the healthcare environment, and promote translation of health research into practice. An essential feature is the Fellowship must promote the growth of the individual's research activities, thereby benefiting healthcare in New Zealand, and also provide a focus for additional research within the individual's organisation.

The Fellowship is open to those who already have a significant track record of research. It is expected that applicants will normally have been engaged in postgraduate clinical practice for no more than twenty years. An applicant's research track record should indicate leadership in their field nationally, if not internationally. Applicants must have been working in clinical healthcare and are expected to maintain their clinical practice aligned with the Fellowship, which can only be held on a part-time basis. The Fellowship provides part-time salary support (0.2-0.5 full time equivalent) and some research working expenses, including up to 0.3 FTE salary support for a research assistant/trial manager or similar, for a maximum term of five years. Fellows must be employed for their non-research time by a healthcare organisation to provide clinical care, or public health services, and their research programme must align with their clinical practice.

Applicants must be able to demonstrate they can deliver a strong programme of research relevant to their clinical practice and that their research will enhance clinical care delivery. This will be judged on:

- the track record of research performance
- the quality and international competitiveness of the proposed research
- demonstration of how the proposed research can influence delivery of healthcare in New Zealand, including strategies for knowledge transfer and dissemination of research outcomes
- the nature of the support from the Fellow's host institution
- how the proposed research programme will enhance the research environment of the host institution.

4.1.2 Eligibility

For this Fellowship, clinical practice includes delivery of community and public health services. A broad view will be taken of clinical practice, and so the Fellowship is open to a range of health professionals engaged in delivering clinical care. Applicants must demonstrate that they will be undertaking a significant FTE to clinical care delivery during the Fellowship. The HRC reserves the right not to accept applications from candidates that are not considered a fit with the objectives of the Fellowship.

The requirements are:

- Applicants should be New Zealand citizens or hold New Zealand residency at the time of application.
- At the time of application, applicants must be no more than 20 years out of PhD or postgraduate medical qualifications. Exceptions for time spent outside the research environment will be considered (e.g. time taken for parental leave or illness).
- Applicants must be able to show that concurrent with the Fellowship, they will remain engaged in clinical practice aligned with their research.

- The host institution for the Fellowship must be the employer for the applicant's clinical practice duties.
- The Fellowship can only be held part-time (0.2-0.5 full time equivalent), and the Fellow must be employed, alongside the Fellowship, to provide clinical care to at least the same FTE as the Fellowship.
- The host institution agrees for the Fellow to undertake the specific time commitment of the Fellowship.
- Fellows must be based in New Zealand and undertake both their programme of research and their clinical care responsibilities within New Zealand.
- Previous recipients of this grant are not eligible to re-apply.

4.2 Assessment

The HRC intends that, where appropriate, assessment includes consideration of the productivity of an applicant relative to their opportunities. This can take account of both career disruption (for example, serious illness or parental leave) and specifics of an applicant's employment history (including clinical, teaching and administrative commitments, and time working in sectors such as industry or government that might restrict research outputs).

4.2.1 Before CDAC meeting

Reviewers (external reviewers and the CR) provide comments and ask questions for each of the following criteria:

- Applicant
- Research environment
- Research characteristics

Reviewer reports are available for applicant's comments and rebuttals on the HRC online submission system (HRC Gateway). Reviewer reports and applicant rebuttals are sent to the CDAC before the meeting. Reports may be excluded for a number of reasons (e.g. exceptionally poor quality) or if more than four reports have been received. Applicants have the opportunity to rebut the reviewer comments in a two-page rebuttal (Appendix 5).

External reviewer reports are anonymised for applicant rebuttal, but not for the assessing committee.

Note that the applicant rebuttal (see Appendix 5) is an opportunity for the applicants to respond to the comments or questions raised by the external reviewers. The applicants are advised to address completely all the issues raised by the reviewers, remain objective in addressing issues raised by difficult reviewers and avoid emotional rebuttals. The applicant rebuttal, together with the reviewer reports, will be made available for the CDAC at their meeting.

4.2.2 Scoring criteria

The policies and processes in the CDA Peer Review Manual must be applied by the CDAC. If the CDAC needs clarification or assistance, the HRC will provide additional information, or the matter may be referred to the HRC's Chief Executive or their nominated representative for a decision.

Each application is scored on a 7-point scale for each of the scoring criteria:

Applicant	Research expertise and achievement relevant to the proposal. Clinical experience and achievement relative to opportunity.
Research environment	Suitability and quality of the research environment. Contribution to enhancing the research environment of the host organisation.

Research characteristics	Potential for health gains; rationale for research; research design and methods; and knowledge transfer strategies. Relevance of research programme to applicant's clinical experience and practice.

The 7-point word ladder assists the CDAC scoring according to the descriptors:

Score	*Criteria descriptor*
7	Exceptional
6	Excellent
5	Very good
4	Good
3	Adequate
2	Unsatisfactory
1	Poor

4.2.3 Weighting of scoring criteria

The CDAC will use the 7-point scale, but the applicant score will be given a 50% weighting, research environment 20% and research characteristics 30%.

As scholarships and fellowships are personal awards, the weighting places more emphasis on the candidates. However, applicants should note that HRC awards are highly competitive and that all criteria will be considered.

Criteria	*Points*	*% score*
Applicant	7	50
Research environment	7	20
Research characteristics	7	30
Total score	**21**	**100**

4.3 Pre-meeting

Applications may be pre-scored by CDAC members before the meeting. The HRC Research Investment Manager calculates mean pre-scores and ranks candidates.

The ranking may be used to short-list candidates, who will be invited to take part in a Zoom interview with the CDAC. Order of discussion will be dependent on available interview times.

4.4 At the CDAC meeting

The Assessing Committee meeting format is as follows:

- Declaration of conflicts of interests 1 min
- Committee reviewer comments 4 min
- Group discussion and confirm questions for applicants 5 min
- Interview each of the shortlisted applicants 30 min
- Group discussion 7 min
- Scoring 1 min
- Note review summary points 2 min

Discussion time for each application will be limited to approximately 50 minutes, including the interview. The CDAC Chair must ensure a fair round-table discussion takes place.

Applications will be scored independently and the HRC Research Investment Manager will calculate a ranking for presentation to the CDAC.

4.4.1 Re-ranking procedure

After all applications have been scored, the ranked applications are considered by the CDAC for possible re-ranking of applications on a case-by-case basis to remedy perceived inconsistencies. This procedure will allow any application in the ranked table to move up or down by one position at a time:

- Any CDAC member may bring forward an application for re-ranking.
- Conflicts of interest are notified and managed in the usual way.
- The application under consideration would have its scores modified, after appropriate discussion and agreement, by adding a maximum of +0.5 points to one or two of the scoring criteria of choice to move the application under consideration.

Re-ranking of other applications can be done using an iterative process until a final ranked list is reached.

Note: Once the proposals have been scored following discussion by the CDAC, no scores are permitted to be reviewed or adjusted at the conclusion of the meeting.

4.4.2 Fundable and Not Fundable line

At the end of the meeting, all proposals are ranked according to score. The CDAC then:

- Identifies the proposals assessed as not fundable (NF).
- 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 or are so flawed that, irrespective of available budget, they should not be funded.

4.1 Final outcome

Recommendations from the CDAC are sent to the HRC Council for approval. The number of awards in any year depends on the budget allocation for Career Development Awards. Therefore, it is probable not all of the fundable applicants will be approved.

Applicants and Research Offices will receive notification of the outcome after the Council meeting.

Feedback for applications that were discussed at the committee meeting will be provided in the form of a Review Summary (Appendix 4).

Section 5. Clinical Research Training Fellowship

5.1 Overview

5.1.1 Objectives

Clinical Research Training Fellowships are awarded to suitably qualified and practising health professionals such as medical and dental graduates, psychologists, nurses and other clinical researchers to enable them to undertake specialised or further clinical research training in fields relevant to the goals and objectives of the HRC "to improve human health by promoting and funding health research". A CRTF provides a broad research training that will combine academic course work and/or a thesis-based degree, with on-the-job research experience and training within a multidisciplinary research group. The award is particularly suited to health professionals seeking additional training for a career in a new clinical research discipline within New Zealand. From time to time, the HRC may offer Fellowships in designated priority areas to develop a particular clinical research discipline.

5.1.2 Eligibility

The purpose of this Fellowship is to foster the health research workforce with an emphasis on those with clinical qualifications wanting to undertake research as part of their career. All applicants must meet the following criteria:

- Applicants should be New Zealand citizens or hold New Zealand residency at the time of application.
- Practising medical graduates, dental graduates, psychologists, nurses and other graduates with research ability, background training and expertise in fields relevant to clinical research are eligible to apply.
- Applicants must have a current clinical role as this is the intent of the support.
- All Fellows are required to enrol for an appropriate postgraduate qualification which has a research component, e.g. medical and dental graduates progressing to MD or PhD, or nurses and other health professionals progressing to MHSc, DPH, MPH or PhD. The applicant will need to identify a suitable research training environment and develop a research training programme in consultation with the proposed supervisor and head of the relevant academic department(s).

5.2 Assessment

The HRC intends that, where appropriate, assessment includes consideration of the productivity of an applicant relative to their opportunities. This can take account of both career disruption (for example, serious illness or parental leave) and specifics of an applicant's employment history (including clinical, teaching and administrative commitments, and time working in sectors such as industry or government that might restrict research outputs).

5.2.1 Scoring criteria

The policies and processes in the CDA Peer Review Manual must be applied by the CDAC. If the CDAC needs clarification or assistance, the HRC will provide additional information, or the matter may be referred to the HRC Chief Executive or their representative for a decision.

Each application is scored on a 7-point scale for each of the scoring criteria:

Applicant	The academic record, research experience relative to opportunity and research potential of the applicant.

Supervisory and research environment	The quality of the supervisory and research environment; track record of supervisor(s) and collaborators.
Rationale, design and methods	Potential to advance knowledge in the field; aims and hypotheses are presented; and originality of the approach. Study design; appropriateness of the research methods.
Health significance of research	Assessment of the health issue; advancement of knowledge relevant to health; and contribution to improvements in health and health outcomes.

The 7-point word ladder assists the CDAC scoring according to the descriptors:

Score	*Criteria descriptor*
7	Exceptional
6	Excellent
5	Very good
4	Good
3	Adequate
2	Unsatisfactory
1	Poor

5.2.2 Weighting of scoring criteria

The CDAC will use the 7-point scale, but the applicant score will be given a 40% weighting and the other three criteria will be worth 20% each.

As scholarships and fellowships are personal awards, the weighting places more emphasis on the candidates and their potential development during the period of an award rather than on the research project itself. However, applicants should note that HRC awards are highly competitive and that all criteria will be considered.

Criteria	*Points*	*% score*
Applicant	7	40
Supervisory and research environment	7	20
Rationale, design and methods	7	20
Health significance of research	7	20
Total score	**28**	**100**

5.2.3 Pre-meeting

Applications may be pre-scored by CDAC members before the meeting. The HRC Research Investment Manager calculates mean pre-scores and ranks candidates. The ranking is used as the framework for discussion at the CDAC meeting.

5.2.4 At the CDAC meeting

The Assessing Committee meeting format is as follows:

- Declaration of conflicts of interests 1 min
- Committee reviewer comments 2 min
- Group discussion 7 min
- Scoring 1 min
- Note review summary points 1 min

Applications for Clinical Research Training Fellowships are discussed separately and in rank order. Discussion time for each application will be limited to approximately 12 minutes and will mainly focus on the top applications based on the pre-scores from the CDAC.

Depending on the number of proposals in the category, the time available, and general consensus, the CDAC may exclude low-ranked applications from discussion. Applications may be re-scored independently if required, using the criteria used for pre-meeting scoring. The Research Investment Manager will calculate a final ranking from the new scores and present the ranking to the CDAC. The CDAC will then decide where in the ranking to draw a fundable/not fundable line (Section 5.2.6).

5.2.5 Re-ranking procedure

After all applications have been scored, the ranked applications are considered by the CDAC for possible re-ranking of applications on a case-by-case basis to remedy perceived inconsistencies. This procedure will allow any application in the ranked table to move up or down by one position at a time:

- Any CDAC member may bring forward an application for re-ranking.
- Conflicts of interest are notified and managed in the usual way.
- The application under consideration would have its scores modified, after appropriate discussion and agreement, by adding a maximum of +0.5 points to one or two of the scoring criteria of choice to move the application under consideration.

Re-ranking of other applications can be done using an iterative process until a final ranked list is reached.

Note: Once the proposals have been scored following discussion by CDAC, no scores are permitted to be reviewed or adjusted at the conclusion of the meeting.

5.2.6 Fundable and Not Fundable line

At the end of the meeting, all proposals are ranked according to score. The CDAC then:

- Identifies the proposals assessed as not fundable (NF).
- 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 or are so flawed that, irrespective of available budget, they should not be funded.

5.3 Final outcome

Recommendations from the CDAC are sent to the HRC Council for approval. The number of awards in any year depends on the budget allocation for Career Development Awards. Therefore, it is probable not all of the fundable applicants will be approved.

Applicants and Research Offices will receive notification of the outcome after the Council meeting.

Feedback for applications that were discussed at the committee meeting will be provided in the form of a Review Summary (Appendix 4).

Section 6. Foxley Fellowship

6.1 Overview

6.1.1 Objectives

The Foxley Fellowship will enable an individual with a minimum of five years' experience within the health sector to undertake a research sabbatical within an academic institution. As the primary objective of the Fellowship is to enhance links between HRC-funded academic research and healthcare delivery and/or health policy environment, an ideal position for the recipient would be within an HRC-funded research Project or Programme. The research undertaken by the applicant should be aimed at increasing the use of health research results within the health sector.

6.1.2 Eligibility

The requirements are:

- Applicants should be New Zealand citizens or hold New Zealand residency at the time of application.
- A minimum of 0.2 FTE commitments is required of recipients, and a Fellowship can be held for a maximum of two years part-time. This degree of flexibility will mean that a greater range of applicants might consider the award; for example, a full-time clinician who is unable to negotiate either 0.5 or 1.0 FTE relief from clinical work may be able to hold the Fellowship for 0.2 FTE for two years. Note that each recipient agrees to the stated FTE% contribution and that funding to any recipient from any source will not exceed 100 FTE%.
- Eligible applicants would include health professionals engaged in clinical or non-clinical work, health sector managers and policy analysts. Full-time academics or other professionals not employed in the health sector are not eligible.
- Applicants will require signed acknowledgement from their present employer of their intention to take sabbatical, and confirmation from the employer of reinstatement at the conclusion of the award.
- This Fellowship cannot be used to fund a new or ongoing academic degree study.

6.2 Assessment

The HRC intends that, where appropriate, assessment includes consideration of the productivity of an applicant relative to their opportunities. This can take account of both career disruption (for example, serious illness or parental leave) and specifics of an applicant's employment history (including clinical, teaching and administrative commitments, and time working in sectors such as industry or government that might restrict research outputs).

6.2.1 Scoring criteria

The policies and processes in the CDA Peer Review Manual must be applied by the CDAC. If the CDAC needs clarification or assistance, the HRC will provide additional information, or the matter may be referred to the HRC Chief Executive or their representative for a decision.

Each application is scored on a 7-point scale for each of the scoring criteria:

Applicant	The academic record and research potential of the applicant.
Supervisory and research environment	The quality of the supervisory and research environment; track record of supervisor(s) and collaborators.
Rationale, design and methods	Potential to advance knowledge in the field; aims and hypotheses are presented; and originality of the approach. Study design; appropriateness of the research methods.

Health significance of research	Assessment of the health issue; advancement of knowledge relevant to health; and contribution to improvements in health and health outcomes.

The 7-point word ladder assists the CDAC scoring according to the descriptors:

Score	*Criteria descriptor*
7	Exceptional
6	Excellent
5	Very good
4	Good
3	Adequate
2	Unsatisfactory
1	Poor

6.2.2 Weighting of scoring criteria

The CDAC will use the 7-point scale, but the applicant score will be given a 40% weighting and the other three criteria will be worth 20% each.

As scholarships and fellowships are personal awards, the weighting places more emphasis on the candidates and their potential development during the period of an award rather than on the research project itself. However, applicants should note that HRC awards are highly competitive and that all criteria will be considered.

Criteria	*Points*	*% score*
Applicant	7	40
Supervisory and research environment	7	20
Rationale, design and methods	7	20
Health significance of research	7	20
Total score	**28**	**100**

6.2.3 Pre-meeting

Applications may be pre-scored by CDAC members before the meeting. If so, the HRC Research Investment Manager calculates mean pre-scores and ranks candidates. The ranking is used as the framework for discussion at the CDAC meeting.

6.2.4 At the CDAC meeting

The Assessing Committee meeting format is as follows:

- Declaration of conflicts of interests 1 min
- Committee reviewer comments 2 min
- Group discussion 7 min
- Scoring 1 min
- Note review summary points 1 min

Depending on the number of proposals in the category, the time available, and general consensus, the committee may decide to not discuss all proposals if any are not considered competitive. Applications will be scored independently and the HRC Research Investment Manager will calculate a final ranking for the CDAC.

6.2.5 Re-ranking procedure

After all applications have been scored, the ranked applications are considered by the CDAC for possible re-ranking of applications on a case-by-case basis to remedy perceived inconsistencies.

This procedure will allow any application in the ranked table to move up or down by one position at a time:

- Any CDAC member may bring forward an application for re-ranking.
- Conflicts of interest are notified and managed in the usual way.
- The application under consideration would have its scores modified, after appropriate discussion and agreement, by adding a maximum of +0.5 points to one or two of the scoring criteria of choice to move the application under consideration.

Re-ranking of other applications can be done using an iterative process until a final ranked list is reached.

Note: Once the proposals have been scored following discussion by the CDAC, no scores are permitted to be reviewed or adjusted at the conclusion of the meeting.

6.2.6 Fundable and Not Fundable line

At the end of the meeting, all proposals are ranked according to score. The CDAC then:

- Identifies the proposals assessed as not fundable (NF).
- 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 or are so flawed that, irrespective of available budget, they should not be funded.

6.3 Final outcome

Recommendations from the CDAC are sent to the HRC Council for approval. The number of awards in any year depends on the budget allocation for Career Development Awards. Therefore, it is probable not all of the fundable applicants will be approved.

Applicants and Research Offices will receive notification of the outcome after the Council meeting.

Feedback for applications that were discussed at the committee meeting will be provided in the form of a Review Summary (Appendix 4).

Section 7. HRC and Girdlers' UK Fellowship

7.1 Overview

7.1.1 Objectives

The HRC and Girdlers' UK Fellowship provides two years' advanced research experience at the University of Oxford, with membership at Green Templeton College (www.gtc.ox.ac.uk). The intended programme of research should be considered likely to bring eventual benefit to the health sciences in New Zealand. The Fellowship is co-funded by the Girdlers' Company, London, which traces its foundation back to medieval times as a craftsmen's guild and, as a charitable trust, has had a relationship with New Zealand since 1933. The HRC and Girdlers' UK Fellowship was established in 1986.

Recipients will receive a further year's support from the HRC on returning to New Zealand after their two years at the University of Oxford. The conditions of this support will be determined and approved by Council upon notification of repatriation and proposed location. However, if the recipient does not return to New Zealand on completion of the term at the University of Oxford, the HRC will seek reimbursement of the last year's support.

7.1.2 Eligibility

- Applicants should be New Zealand citizens or hold New Zealand residency at the time of application.
- Applicants must have gained the degree of Doctor of Philosophy or equivalent qualification acceptable to the HRC and the University of Oxford not more than five years prior to the time of application.
- Graduates in medicine should hold a PhD, MD or a College Fellowship qualification with research experience.
- Non-medical graduates must be involved in research relevant to health sciences.
- The proposed research location must be acceptable to Green Templeton College with supervision and support from a College member.

7.2 Assessment

The HRC intends that, where appropriate, assessment includes consideration of the productivity of an applicant relative to their opportunities. This can take account of both career disruption (for example, serious illness or parental leave) and specifics of an applicant's employment history (including clinical, teaching and administrative commitments, and time working in sectors such as industry or government that might restrict research outputs).

7.2.1 Scoring Criteria

The policies and processes in the CDA Peer Review Manual must be applied by the CDAC. If the CDAC needs clarification or assistance, the HRC will provide additional information, or the matter may be referred to the HRC Chief Executive or their representative for a decision.

Each application is scored on a 7-point scale for each of the scoring criteria:

Applicant	The academic record, research experience relative to opportunity and research potential of the applicant.
Supervisory and research environment	The quality of the supervisory and research environment; track record of supervisor(s) and collaborators.
Rationale, design and methods	Potential to advance knowledge in the field; aims and hypotheses are presented; and originality of the approach. Study design; appropriateness of the research methods.

Health significance of research	Assessment of the health issue; advancement of knowledge relevant to health; and contribution to improvements in health and health outcomes.

The 7-point word ladder assists the CDAC scoring according to the descriptors:

Score	*Criteria descriptor*
7	Exceptional
6	Excellent
5	Very good
4	Good
3	Adequate
2	Unsatisfactory
1	Poor

7.2.2 Weighting of scoring criteria

The CDAC will use the 7-point scale, but the applicant score will be given a 40% weighting and the other three criteria will be worth 20% each.

As scholarships and fellowships are personal awards, the weighting places more emphasis on the candidates and their potential development during the period of an award rather than on the research project itself. However, applicants should note that HRC awards are highly competitive and that all criteria will be considered.

Criteria	*Points*	*% score*
Applicant	7	40
Supervisory and research environment	7	20
Rationale, design and methods	7	20
Health significance of research	7	20
Total Score	**28**	**100**

7.2.3 Pre-meeting

Applications may be pre-scored by CDAC members before the meeting. If so, the HRC Research Investment Manager calculates mean pre-scores and ranks candidates. The ranking is used as the framework for discussion at the CDAC meeting. This is not be necessary if the number of applicants is small.

In agreement with the Girdlers' Company with respect to the selection of a suitable Fellow, the HRC will obtain two external reviewer reports from appropriate reviewers (including past Girdlers' Fellows). The HRC will provide applications to the Girdlers' Company to provide an assessment of the suitability of the applicants.

7.2.4 At the CDAC meeting

The Assessing Committee meeting format is as follows:

- Declaration of conflicts of interests 1 min
- Committee reviewer comments 3 min
- Group discussion 4 min
- Scoring 1 min
- Note review summary points 1 min

Depending on the number of proposals in the category, the time available, and general consensus, the CDAC may decide to not discuss all proposals if any are not considered competitive. Applications will be scored independently and the HRC Research Investment Manager will calculate a final ranking for the CDAC.

7.2.5 Re-ranking procedure

After all applications have been scored, the ranked applications are considered by the CDAC for possible re-ranking of applications on a case-by-case basis to remedy perceived inconsistencies. This procedure will allow any application in the ranked table to move up or down by one position at a time:

- Any CDAC member may bring forward an application for re-ranking.
- Conflicts of interest are notified and managed in the usual way.
- The application under consideration would have its scores modified, after appropriate discussion and agreement, by adding a maximum of +0.5 points to one or two of the scoring criteria of choice to move the application under consideration.

Re-ranking of other applications can be done using an iterative process until a final ranked list is reached.

Note: Once the proposals have been scored following discussion by the CDAC, no scores are permitted to be reviewed or adjusted at the conclusion of the meeting.

7.2.6 Fundable and Not Fundable line

At the end of the meeting, all proposals are ranked according to score. The CDAC then:

- Identifies the proposals assessed as not fundable (NF).
- 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 or are so flawed that, irrespective of available budget, they should not be funded.

7.3 Final outcome

Recommendations from the CDAC are sent to the HRC Council for approval. The number of awards in any year depends on the budget allocation for Career Development Awards. Therefore, it is probable not all of the fundable applicants will be approved.

Applicants and Research Offices will receive notification of the outcome after the Council meeting.

Feedback for applications that were discussed at the committee meeting will be provided in the form of a Review Summary (Appendix 4).

Section 8. Sir Charles Hercus Health Research Fellowship

8.1 Overview

8.1.1 Objectives

The HRC has established this Fellowship as a contribution to building New Zealand's future capability to conduct world-class research. The Fellowship will provide support for normally four years for a researcher whose scientific field has the potential to contribute to both the health and economic goals for the government's investment in research, science and technology.

The Fellowship is intended to support emerging scientists who have demonstrated outstanding potential to develop into highly skilled researchers able to initiate new avenues of investigation. Successful candidates are likely to have published papers in their chosen area in leading journals and should be able to demonstrate their ability to carry out independent research. HRC assessors place more emphasis on the candidate and their potential development during the period of an award than on the research project itself. However, HRC awards are highly competitive and all criteria are considered to ensure that the intended research project is worthy of support.

8.1.2 Eligibility

- Applicants should be New Zealand citizens or hold New Zealand residency at the time of application.
- Applicants must have held a PhD or an equivalent degree for six to 10 years on the application date. Exceptions for time spent outside the research environment will be considered (e.g. time taken for parental leave or illness). The applicant's track record is assessed relative to opportunity.
- Applicants who have been awarded more than one HRC Project grant (or equivalent support in value/term) as First Named Investigator and academic staff with positions at or above the level of Associate Professor are not eligible.
- Researchers already in full-time, permanent employment are not eligible. The Fellowship is to target untenured applicants for career development support.

- Usually successful applicants will be involved full-time in research for four years. The HRC will, however, consider applicants wishing to undertake part-time research. In this case, applicants must be involved in research for a minimum of 0.5 FTE, and the maximum duration of the Fellowship can potentially be negotiated with the HRC on a case-by-case basis.

8.2 Assessment

The HRC intends that, where appropriate, assessment includes consideration of the productivity of an applicant relative to their opportunities. This can take account of both career disruption (for example, serious illness or parental leave) and specifics of an applicant's employment history (including clinical, teaching and administrative commitments, and time working in sectors such as industry or government that might restrict research outputs).

8.2.1 Before CDAC meeting

Applications may be pre-scored by the committee to triage applications before external review, ie, in this case not all applications would receive external review and provide a rebuttal.

Reviewers (external reviewers and the CR) provide comments and ask questions for each of the following criteria:

- Applicant
- Research environment
- Research characteristics

Reviewer reports are available for applicant's comments and rebuttals on the HRC online submission system (HRC Gateway). Reviewer reports and applicant rebuttals are sent to the CDAC prior to the meeting. The HRC aims to provide three-to-four reviewer reports for each application. Reports may be excluded for a number of reasons (e.g. exceptionally poor quality) or if more than four reports have been received. Applicants have the opportunity to rebut the reviewer comments in a two-page rebuttal (Appendix 5).

External reviewer reports are anonymised for applicant rebuttal, but not for the assessing committee.

Note that the applicant rebuttal (see Appendix 5) is an opportunity for the applicants to respond to the comments or questions raised by the external reviewers. The applicants are advised to address completely all the issues raised by the reviewers, remain objective in addressing issues raised by difficult reviewers and avoid emotional rebuttals. The applicant rebuttal, together with the reviewer reports, will be made available for the CDAC at their meeting.

8.2.2 Scoring criteria

The policies and processes in the CDA Peer Review Manual must be applied by the CDAC. If the CDAC needs clarification or assistance, the HRC will provide additional information, or the matter may be referred to the HRC Chief Executive or their representative for a decision.

Each application is scored on a 7-point scale for each of the scoring criteria:

Applicant	Value of service to New Zealand academic and research community; Research experience and achievement relative to opportunity; Potential for development.
Research environment	Suitability and quality of research environment; Potential for training; Potential for collaboration.
Research characteristics	Potential for health gains; Potential for economic gains; Design and methods.

The 7-point word ladder assists the CDAC scoring according to the descriptors:

Score	*Criteria descriptor*
7	Exceptional
6	Excellent
5	Very good
4	Good
3	Adequate
2	Unsatisfactory
1	Poor

8.2.3 Weighting of scoring criteria

The CDAC will use the 7-point scale, but the applicant score will be given a 60% weighting, research environment 20% and research characteristics 20%.

As scholarships and fellowships are personal awards, the weighting places more emphasis on the candidates. However, applicants should note that HRC awards are highly competitive and that all criteria will be considered.

Criteria	*Points*	*% score*
Applicant	7	60
Research environment	7	20
Research characteristics	7	20
Total score	**21**	**100**

8.2.4 Pre-meeting

Applications are pre-scored by CDAC members before the meeting. The HRC Research Investment Manager calculates mean pre-scores and ranks candidates.

The ranking is used to select candidates for a shortlist, who will be asked to take part in a Zoom interview with CDAC. Order of discussion will be dependent on available interview times.

8.2.5 At the CDAC meeting

The format of Assessing Committee meeting led by the Chairs as follows:

- Declaration of conflicts of interests 1 min
- CR to provide overview and external reviewers' feedback 4 min
- Allocation of pre-set questions and any additional questions for applicants 5 min
- Chair to welcome applicants, outline the process and interview applicants 30 min
- Group discussion 7 min
- Scoring 1 min
- Note review summary points 2 min

Discussion time for each application will be limited to approximately 50 minutes, including the interview. The CDAC Chair must ensure a fair round-table discussion takes place.

Applications will be scored independently and the HRC Research Investment Manager will calculate a final ranking from the new scores and present the ranking to the CDAC.

8.2.6 Re-ranking procedure

After all applications have been scored, the ranked applications are considered by the CDAC for possible re-ranking of applications on a case-by-case basis to remedy perceived inconsistencies. This procedure will allow any application in the ranked table to move up or down by one position at a time:

- Any CDAC member may bring forward an application for re-ranking.
- Conflicts of interest are notified and managed in the usual way.
- The application under consideration would have its scores modified, after appropriate discussion and agreement, by adding a maximum of +0.5 points to one or two of the scoring criteria of choice to move the application under consideration.

Re-ranking of other applications can be done using an iterative process until a final ranked list is reached.

Note: Once the proposals have been scored following discussion by the CDAC, no scores are permitted to be reviewed or adjusted at the conclusion of the meeting.

8.2.7 Fundable and Not Fundable line

At the end of the meeting, all proposals are ranked according to score. The CDAC then:

- Identifies the proposals assessed as not fundable (NF).
- 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 or are so flawed that, irrespective of available budget, they should not be funded.

8.3 Final outcome

Recommendations from the CDAC are sent to the HRC Council for approval. The number of awards in any year depends on the budget allocation for Career Development Awards. Therefore, it is probable not all of the fundable applicants will be approved.

Applicants and Research Offices will receive notification of the outcome after the Council meeting.

Feedback for applications that were discussed at the committee meeting will be provided in the form of a Review Summary (Appendix 4).

Section 9. Māori Health Research Master's Scholarship

9.1 Overview

9.1.1 Objectives

The Māori Health Research Master's Scholarship is intended to provide 1 year of personal support for students completing the research component of a Masters degree. Applicants eligible to apply may come from any discipline, as long as the proposed research links to health and good health outcomes for Māori. The applicant must be enrolled in the final year and undertaking the research component of their Masters degree that contributes to the HRC's mission of "*benefiting New Zealand through health research*".

9.1.2 Eligibility

The requirements are:

- Applicants should be New Zealand citizens or hold New Zealand residency at the time of application and be of Māori descent.
- Usually successful applicants will be enrolled full-time for a Master's degree. The HRC will however consider other applications from students enrolled part-time on their individual merit.
- The Māori Health Research Master's Scholarship will not be granted for a period longer than the equivalent of one year full-time, or a maximum of two years part-time. Please note that if you are employed and undertaking study part-time, you may not be entitled to the full scholarship total amount.
- During the year of the Māori Health Research Master's Scholarship, the student's only activity must be the conduct of research and the preparation of a thesis or dissertation.
- The research will take place over a full academic year. Students undertaking courses involving completion of papers only are not eligible for the award.
- Applicants who have not yet enrolled for their proposed course of study but are intending to do so, may also apply for a Māori Health Research Master's Scholarship, and in this case, any award will be conditional on the applicant's successful enrolment.

9.2 Assessment

The HRC intends that, where appropriate, assessment includes consideration of the productivity of an applicant relative to their opportunities. This can take account of both career disruption (for example, serious illness or parental leave) and specifics of an applicant's employment history (including clinical, teaching and administrative commitments, and time working in sectors such as industry or government that might restrict research outputs).

9.2.1 Scoring criteria

The policies and processes in the CDA Peer Review Manual must be applied by the CDAC. If the CDAC needs clarification or assistance, the HRC will provide additional information, or the matter may be referred to the HRC Chief Executive or their representative for a decision.

Each application is scored on a 7-point scale for each of the scoring criteria:

Applicant/ability	Experience relative to opportunity, achievement, ability to complete.
Māori health significance *Māori community links*	Research advances knowledge, is a Māori health priority. Actively involved/demonstrates high level of commitment.
Design and methodology *Supervision*	Is appropriate, incorporating relevant methods. Has the necessary skills, knowledge and qualifications to guide the project and applicant.

The 7-point word ladder assists the CDAC scoring according to the descriptors:

Score	*Criteria descriptor*
7	Exceptional
6	Excellent
5	Very good
4	Good
3	Adequate
2	Unsatisfactory
1	Poor

9.2.2 Weighting of scoring criteria

As scholarships and fellowships are personal awards, the weighting places more emphasis on the candidates. However, applicants should note that HRC awards are highly competitive and that all criteria will be considered.

9.2.3 Pre-meeting

Applications ***may be*** pre-scored by CDAC members before the meeting. The HRC Research Manager calculates mean pre-scores and ranks candidates.

9.2.4 At the CDAC meeting

The Assessing Committee meets to:

- Discuss the merits of the applicants and their research proposals.
- Score assessment criteria.
- Reach consensus on the applicants to be recommended for funding.

Discussion time for each application will be limited to a maximum of 20 minutes. The CDAC Chair must ensure a fair round-table discussion takes place.

Applications will be re-scored independently and the HRC Research Manager will calculate a final ranking from the new scores and present the ranking to the CDAC.

9.2.5 Re-ranking procedure

After all applications have been scored, the ranked applications are considered by the CDAC for possible re-ranking of applications on a case-by-case basis to remedy perceived inconsistencies. This procedure will allow any application in the ranked table to move up or down by one position at a time:

- Any CDAC member may bring forward an application for re-ranking.
- Conflicts of interest are notified and managed in the usual way.
- The application under consideration would have its scores modified, after appropriate discussion and agreement, by adding a maximum of +0.5 points to one or two of the scoring criteria of choice to move the application under consideration.

Re-ranking of other applications can be done using an iterative process until a final ranked list is reached.

Note: Once the proposals have been scored following discussion by the CDAC, no scores are permitted to be reviewed or adjusted at the conclusion of the meeting.

9.2.6 Fundable and Not Fundable line

At the end of the meeting, all proposals are ranked according to score. The CDAC then:

- Identifies the proposals assessed as not fundable (NF).
- 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 or are so flawed that, irrespective of available budget, they should not be funded.

9.3 Final outcome

Recommendations from the CDAC are sent to the HRC Council for approval. The number of awards in any year depends on the budget allocation for Career Development Awards. Therefore, it is probable not all of the fundable applicants will be approved.

Applicants and Research Offices will receive notification of the outcome after the Council meeting.

Feedback to the shortlisted applicants from CDAC will be provided in the form of a Review Summary (Appendix 4).

Section 10. Māori Health Research PhD Scholarship

10.1 Overview

10.1.1 Objectives

PhD scholarships in Māori health research are intended to provide three years of personal support for students undertaking a PhD. Applicants eligible to apply may come from any discipline but must be enrolled for a PhD in a research field relevant to the HRC mission of "*benefiting New Zealand through health research*".

10.1.2 Eligibility

The requirements are:

- Applicants should be New Zealand citizens or hold New Zealand residency at the time of application and be of Māori descent.
- Usually, applicants will be enrolled full-time for a research-focused degree at the doctoral level, usually a Doctor of Philosophy in a New Zealand University. The HRC will, however, consider other applications from students enrolled in other research-focused doctoral degrees or enrolled part-time on their individual merit. Please note, programmes of study where the primary focus is a clinical practice qualification rather than advancing the individual's research skills do not meet the PhD grant requirements.
- The PhD scholarship will not be granted for a period longer than the equivalent of three years full-time.
- Applicants who have not yet enrolled for their proposed course of study but are intending to do so, may apply for a PhD scholarship. In this case, any award will be conditional on the applicant's successful enrolment.

10.2 Assessment

The HRC intends that, where appropriate, assessment includes consideration of the productivity of an applicant relative to their opportunities. This can take account of both career disruption (for example, serious illness or parental leave) and specifics of an applicant's employment history (including clinical, teaching and administrative commitments, and time working in sectors such as industry or government that might restrict research outputs).

10.2.1 Scoring criteria

The policies and processes in the CDA Peer Review Manual must be applied by the CDAC. If the CDAC needs clarification or assistance, the HRC will provide additional information, or the matter may be referred to the HRC Chief Executive or their representative for a decision.

Each application is scored on a 7-point scale for each of the scoring criteria:

Applicant/ability	Experience relative to opportunity, achievement, ability to complete.
Māori health significance *Māori community links*	Research advances knowledge is a Māori health priority. Actively involved/demonstrates high level of commitment.
Design and methodology *Supervision*	Is appropriate, incorporating relevant methods. Has the necessary skills, knowledge and qualifications to guide the project and applicant.

The 7-point word ladder assists the CDAC scoring according to the descriptors:

Score	*Criteria descriptor*
7	Exceptional
6	Excellent
5	Very good
4	Good
3	Adequate
2	Unsatisfactory
1	Poor

10.2.2 Weighting of scoring criteria

As scholarships and fellowships are personal awards, the weighting places more emphasis on the candidates. However, applicants should note that HRC awards are highly competitive and that all criteria will be considered.

10.2.3 Pre-meeting

Applications ***may be*** pre-scored by CDAC members before the meeting. The HRC Research Manager calculates mean pre-scores and ranks candidates.

10.2.4 At the CDAC meeting

The Assessing Committee meets to:

- Discuss the merits of the applicants and their research proposals.
- Score assessment criteria.
- Reach consensus on the applicants to be recommended for funding.

Discussion time for each application will be limited to a maximum of 20 minutes. The CDAC Chair must ensure a fair round-table discussion takes place.

Applications will be re-scored independently and the HRC Project Manager will calculate a final ranking from the new scores and present the ranking to the CDAC.

10.2.5 Re-ranking procedure

After all applications have been scored, the ranked applications are considered by the CDAC for possible re-ranking of applications on a case-by-case basis to remedy perceived inconsistencies. This procedure will allow any application in the ranked table to move up or down by one position at a time:

- Any CDAC member may bring forward an application for re-ranking.
- Conflicts of interest are notified and managed in the usual way.
- The application under consideration would have its scores modified, after appropriate discussion and agreement, by adding a maximum of +0.5 points to one or two of the scoring criteria of choice to move the application under consideration.

Re-ranking of other applications can be done using an iterative process until a final ranked list is reached.

Note: Once the proposals have been scored following discussion by the CDAC, no scores are permitted to be reviewed or adjusted at the conclusion of the meeting.

10.2.6 Fundable and Not Fundable line

At the end of the meeting, all proposals are ranked according to score. The CDAC then:

- Identifies the proposals assessed as not fundable (NF).
- 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 or are so flawed that, irrespective of available budget, they should not be funded.

10.3 Final outcome

Recommendations from the CDAC are sent to the HRC Council for approval. The number of awards in any year depends on the budget allocation for Career Development Awards. Therefore, it is probable not all of the fundable applicants will be approved.

Applicants and Research Offices will receive notification of the outcome after the Council meeting.

Feedback to the shortlisted applicants from CDAC will be provided in the form of a Review Summary (Appendix 4).

Section 11. Māori Health Research Postdoctoral Fellowship

11.1 Overview

11.1.1 Objectives

All Postdoctoral Fellowships offered in Māori health research are intended for the support of outstanding graduates who have recently completed a degree at doctoral level and who propose to conduct research in scientific fields of relevance to the HRC mission of "benefiting New Zealand through health research". Their purpose is to provide support for up to four years for researchers to gain further experience in their chosen fields and for them to become established as an independent researcher. Where appropriate, the Fellowship could include a period of up to two years of training that is undertaken overseas.

Postdoctoral Fellowships are available to applicants from all disciplines. There are four Named Postdoctoral Fellowship category types, each focusing on a different area of Māori health research. Information on the Name Postdoctoral Fellowships are available in the 2024 Māori Health Research Career Development Award (CDA) Application Guidelines. Applicants can still apply for a Māori Health Research Postdoctoral Fellowship if their research is in a different area than the four outlined, however the proposed research must link to health and demonstrate good health outcomes for Māori.

11.1.2 Eligibility

The requirements are:

- Applicants should be New Zealand citizens or hold New Zealand residency at the time of application and be of Māori descent.
- Applicants must hold the degree of Doctor of Philosophy or an equivalent degree. Although applications will be received from persons who have not received results of their thesis examination, the award and commencement of the Fellowship will be conditional on awarding of the degree. The thesis must be submitted for examination at the time of application. Written confirmation will be requested.
- Applicants should not normally have had more than five years' postdoctoral experience.
- Applications for Postdoctoral Fellowships in Māori health are open to individuals with a proven track record of research in the area of Māori health development.

11.2 Assessment

The HRC intends that, where appropriate, assessment includes consideration of the productivity of an applicant relative to their opportunities. This can take account of both career disruption (for example, serious illness or parental leave) and specifics of an applicant's employment history (including clinical, teaching and administrative commitments, and time working in sectors such as industry or government that might restrict research outputs).

11.2.1 Scoring criteria

The policies and processes in the CDA Peer Review Manual must be applied by the CDAC. If the CDAC needs clarification or assistance, the HRC Secretariat will provide additional information, or the matter may be referred to the HRC Chief Executive or their representative for a decision.

Each application is scored on a 7-point scale for each of the scoring criteria:

Applicant/ability	Experience relative to opportunity, achievement, ability to complete.
Māori health significance *Māori community links* *Health background and potential*	Research advances knowledge, is a Māori health priority. Actively involved/demonstrates high level of commitment Comprehensive knowledge of health and research sector.
Design and methodology *Career development and support*	Is appropriate, incorporating relevant methods. Applicant is extremely well supported by appropriate well qualified and/experienced supervisor/mentor. Applicant based in a highly supportive environment.

The 7-point word ladder assists the CDAC scoring according to the descriptors:

Score	*Criteria descriptor*
7	Exceptional
6	Excellent
5	Very good
4	Good
3	Adequate
2	Unsatisfactory
1	Poor

11.2.2 Weighting of scoring criteria

As scholarships and fellowships are personal awards, the weighting places more emphasis on the candidates. However, applicants should note that HRC awards are highly competitive and that all criteria will be considered.

11.2.3 Pre-meeting

Applications ***may be*** pre-scored by CDAC members before the meeting. The HRC Research Manager calculates mean pre-scores and ranks candidates.

11.2.4 At the CDAC meeting

The Assessing Committee meets to:

- Discuss the merits of the applicants and their research proposals.
- Score assessment criteria.
- Reach consensus on the applicants to be recommended for funding.

Discussion time for each application will be limited to approximately 30 minutes. The CDAC Chair must ensure a fair round-table discussion takes place.

Applications will be re-scored independently and the HRC Research Manager will calculate a final ranking from the new scores and present the ranking to the CDAC.

11.2.5 Re-ranking procedure

After all applications have been scored, the ranked applications are considered by the CDAC for possible re-ranking of applications on a case-by-case basis to remedy perceived inconsistencies. This procedure will allow any application in the ranked table to move up or down by one position at a time:

- Any CDAC member may bring forward an application for re-ranking.
- Conflicts of interest are notified and managed in the usual way.
- The application under consideration would have its scores modified, after appropriate discussion and agreement, by adding a maximum of +0.5 points to one or two of the scoring criteria of choice to move the application under consideration.

Re-ranking of other applications can be done using an iterative process until a final ranked list is reached.

Note: Once the proposals have been scored following discussion by the CDAC, no scores are permitted to be reviewed or adjusted at the conclusion of the meeting.

11.2.6 Fundable and Not Fundable line

At the end of the meeting, all proposals are ranked according to score. The CDAC then:

- Identifies the proposals assessed as not fundable (NF).
- 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 or are so flawed that, irrespective of available budget, they should not be funded.

11.3 Final outcome

Recommendations from the CDAC are sent to the HRC Council for approval. The number of awards in any year depends on the budget allocation for Career Development Awards. Therefore, it is probable not all of the fundable applicants will be approved.

Applicants and Research Offices will receive notification of the outcome after the Council meeting.

Feedback to the shortlisted applicants from CDAC will be provided in the form of a Review Summary (Appendix 4).

Section 12. Māori Health Clinical Research Training Fellowship

12.1 Description of Māori Health Clinical Research Training Fellowship

The Māori Health Clinical Research Training Fellowship is awarded to suitably qualified health professionals such as medical and dental graduates, psychologists, nurses and other clinical researchers to enable them to undertake specialised or further clinical research training in fields relevant to the goals and objectives of the HRC "to improve human health by promoting and funding health research". A Māori Health Clinical Research Training Fellowship provides a broad research training that will combine academic course work and/or a thesis-based degree, with on-the-job research experience and training within a multidisciplinary research group. The award is particularly suited to Māori health professionals seeking additional training for a career in a new clinical research discipline within New Zealand. From time to time the HRC may, in addition, offer Fellowships in designated priority areas to develop a particular clinical research discipline.

12.2 Value

The Fellowship provides up to $80,000 per annum for stipend and university fees, and research costs of $20,000 for a three-year full-time tenure for a maximum value of $260,000. Shorter terms will be valued at a pro rata value. A four-year part-time Fellowship is permitted at the maximum value of $260,000. In addition to the fellow's stipend, university fees, and research costs, successful applicants for a Māori Health Clinical Research Training Fellowship may apply for a tikanga allowance of $5,000 over the tenure of the fellowship.

The value of the stipend on the recipient's qualifications and research experience and will be set by the university. Fellowship funds may not be used to contribute to any type of cost that is prohibited in the HRC "Rules for Permissible Use of Research Funding and Operation of Contracts", academic supervision costs, fees for examinations or subscriptions to professional colleges. Note that each recipient agrees to the stated FTE% contribution and that funding to any recipient from any source will not exceed 100 FTE%.

12.3 Eligibility

The requirements are:

- Applicants must be of Māori decent.
- Applicants should be New Zealand citizens or hold New Zealand residency at the time of application.
- Practising medical graduates, dental graduates, psychologists, nurses and other graduates with research ability, background training and expertise in fields relevant to clinical research are eligible to apply.
- Applicants must have a current clinical role as this is the intent of the support.
- All Fellows are required to enrol for an appropriate postgraduate qualification which has a research component e.g. medical and dental graduates progressing to MD or PhD, or nurses and other health professionals progressing to MHSc, DPH, MPH or PhD. The applicant will need to identify a suitable research training environment and develop a research training programme in consultation with the proposed supervisor and head of the relevant academic department(s). *Please note, programmes of study where the primary focus is a clinical practice qualification rather than advancing the individual's research skills do not meet the Māori Health Clinical Research Training Fellowship requirements.*
- Applicants, who have not yet enrolled for their proposed course of study but are intending to do so, may apply for a Māori Health Clinical Research Training Fellowship. In this case any award will be conditional on the applicant's successful enrolment.

12.4 Conditions of tenure

- The Māori Health Clinical Research Training Fellowship may be held for a minimum duration of twelve months and for a maximum duration of three years full-time or four

years part-time. Fellowships are renewed annually on the basis of a satisfactory progress report.

- The Māori Health Clinical Research Training Fellowships are tenable within New Zealand universities, hospitals or other research institutions approved by Council. The department and supervisor must be approved by the HRC. Rotation of training under more than one supervisor may be approved.
- Awarded contracts will be administered through the host institution. Fellows are employees of the host institution, and the general conditions of the appointment are those of that institution.
- Fellows may undertake limited clinical and teaching duties relevant to their research to a maximum of 400 hours in a calendar year. They may receive remuneration for such duties. Except in relation to approved limited clinical and teaching duties, Fellows may not receive remuneration for other work without the HRC's permission.
- Other forms of awards may not be held in conjunction with a Māori Health Clinical Research Training Fellowship without the permission of the HRC.
- Fellowships are subject to the terms and conditions of the HRC's research contracts and the *HRC Rules: Permissible use of research funding and operation of contracts*.
- Tenure of the Fellowship terminates on the date stated in the contract or on the date of the oral examination (whichever comes first).

12.5 Application review process

- Applications for the Māori Health Clinical Fellowship will be assigned to the Māori Health Career Development Award Assessment Committee.
- As scholarships and fellowships are personal awards, HRC assessors will place equal emphasis on the applicant's potential development during the period of an award and the research project itself. Applicants should note that HRC awards are highly competitive and that all criteria will be considered to assure assessors that the intended programme is worthy of support.

12.6 Assessment

The HRC intends that, where appropriate, assessment includes consideration of the productivity of an applicant relative to their opportunities. This can take account of both career disruption (for example, serious illness or parental leave) and specifics of an applicant's employment history (including clinical, teaching and administrative commitments, and time working in sectors such as industry or government that might restrict research outputs).

The following assessing criteria are used to guide committee members in the assessment of applications. Within each area anchor points are provided for scores of 7, 4 and 1.

12.6.1 Scoring criteria

The policies and processes in the CDA Peer Review Manual must be applied by CDAC. If the CDAC needs clarification or assistance, the HRC will provide additional information, or the matter may be referred to the HRC Chief Executive or their representative for a decision.

Each application is scored on a 7-point scale for each of the scoring criteria:

Applicant/ability	Experience relative to opportunity, achievement, ability to complete.
Māori health significance *Māori community links*	Research advances knowledge, is a Māori health priority. Actively involved/demonstrates high level of commitment.
Design and methodology *Supervision*	Is appropriate, incorporating relevant methods. Has the necessary skills, knowledge and qualifications to guide the project and applicant.

The 7-point word ladder assists the CDAC scoring according to the descriptors:

Score	*Criteria descriptor*
7	Exceptional
6	Excellent
5	Very good
4	Good
3	Adequate
2	Unsatisfactory
1	Poor

12.6.2 Weighting of scoring criteria

The CDAC will use the 7-point scale and the scoring criteria are equally weighted at 20% each.

As scholarships and fellowships are personal awards, HRC assessors will place more emphasis on the applicants and their potential development during the period of an award rather than on the research project itself. However, applicants should note that HRC awards are highly competitive and that all criteria will be considered.

12.6.3 Pre-meeting

Applications ***may be*** pre-scored by CDAC members before the meeting. The HRC Research Manager calculates mean pre-scores and ranks candidates.

12.6.4 At the CDAC meeting

The Assessing Committee meets to:

- Discuss the merits of the applicants and their research proposals.
- Score assessment criteria.
- Reach consensus on the applicants to be recommended for funding.

Discussion time for each application will be limited to approximately 30 minutes. The CDAC Chair must ensure a fair round-table discussion takes place.

Applications will be re-scored independently and the HRC Research Manager will calculate a final ranking from the new scores and present the ranking to the CDAC.

12.6.5 Re-ranking procedure

After all applications have been scored, the ranked applications are considered by the CDAC for possible re-ranking of applications on a case-by-case basis to remedy perceived inconsistencies. This procedure will allow any application in the ranked table to move up or down by one position at a time:

- Any CDAC member may bring forward an application for re-ranking.
- Conflicts of interest are notified and managed in the usual way.
- The application under consideration would have its scores modified, after appropriate discussion and agreement, by adding a maximum of +0.5 points to one or two of the scoring criteria of choice to move the application under consideration.

Re-ranking of other applications can be done using an iterative process until a final ranked list is reached.

Note: Once the proposals have been scored following discussion by CDAC, no scores are permitted to be reviewed or adjusted at the conclusion of the meeting.

12.6.6 Fundable and Not Fundable line

At the end of the meeting, all proposals are ranked according to score. The CDAC then:

- Identifies the proposals assessed as not fundable (NF).
- 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 or are so flawed that, irrespective of available budget, they should not be funded.

12.7 Final outcome

Recommendations from the CDAC are sent to the HRC Council for approval. The number of awards in any year depends on the budget allocation for Career Development Awards. Therefore, it is probable not all of the fundable applicants will be approved.

Applicants and Research Offices will receive notification of the outcome after the Council meeting.

Feedback to the shortlisted applicants from CDAC will be provided in the form of a Review Summary (Appendix 4).

Section 13. Pacific Health Research Master's Scholarship

13.1 Overview

13.1.1 Objectives

The Pacific Health Research Master's Scholarship is intended to provide 1 year of personal support for students completing the **research component** of a Masters degree. Applicants eligible to apply may come from any discipline, as long as the proposed research links to health and good health outcomes for Pacific. The applicant must be enrolled in the **final year** and undertaking the research component of their Masters degree that contributes to the HRC's mission of "*benefiting New Zealand through health research*".

13.1.2 Eligibility

The requirements are:

- Applicants must be of indigenous Pacific descent.
- Applicants should be New Zealand citizens or hold New Zealand residency at the time of application.
- Usually successful applicants will be enrolled full-time for a Master's degree. The HRC will, however, consider other applications from students enrolled part-time on their individual merit.
- The Pacific Health Research Master's Scholarship will not be granted for a period longer than the equivalent of one-year full-time, or a maximum of two years part-time.
- During the year of the Pacific Health Research Master's Scholarship, the student's only activity must be the conduct of research and the preparation of a thesis or dissertation. The research will take place over a full academic year. Students undertaking courses involving completion of papers only are not eligible for the award.
- Applicants who have not yet enrolled for their proposed course of study but are intending to do so, may also apply for a Pacific Health Research Masters Scholarship, and in this case, any award will be conditional on the applicant's successful enrolment.

13.2 Assessment

The HRC intends that, where appropriate, assessment includes consideration of the productivity of an applicant relative to their opportunities. This can take account of both career disruption (for example, serious illness or parental leave) and specifics of an applicant's employment history (including clinical, teaching and administrative commitments, and time working in sectors such as industry or government that might restrict research outputs).

13.2.1 Scoring criteria

The policies and processes in the CDA Peer Review Manual must be applied by the CDAC. If the CDAC needs clarification or assistance, the HRC will provide additional information, or the matter may be referred to the HRC Chief Executive or their representative for a decision.

Each application is scored on a 7-point scale for each of the scoring criteria:

Applicant/ability	Experience relative to opportunity, achievement, ability to complete
Pacific health significance *Community links, background and potential*	Research advances knowledge, is a Pacific health priority. Actively involved/demonstrates high level of commitment. Comprehensive knowledge of health and research sector
Design and methodology *Supervision*	Is appropriate, incorporating relevant methods. Has the necessary skills, knowledge and qualifications to guide the project and applicant.

The 7-point word ladder assists the CDAC scoring according to the descriptors:

Score	*Criteria descriptor*
7	Exceptional
6	Excellent
5	Very good
4	Good
3	Adequate
2	Unsatisfactory
1	Poor

13.2.2 Weighting of scoring criteria

As scholarships and fellowships are personal awards, the weighting places more emphasis on the candidates. However, applicants should note that HRC awards are highly competitive and that all criteria will be considered.

13.2.3 Pre-meeting

Applications ***may be*** pre-scored by CDAC members before the meeting. The HRC Research Manager calculates mean pre-scores and ranks candidates.

13.2.4 At the CDAC meeting

The Assessing Committee meets to:

- Discuss the merits of the applicants and their research proposals.
- Score assessment criteria.
- Reach consensus on the applicants to be recommended for funding.

Discussion time for each application will be limited to approximately 15 minutes. The CDAC Chair must ensure a fair round-table discussion takes place.

Applications will be re-scored independently and the HRC Research Manager will calculate a final ranking from the new scores and present the ranking to the CDAC.

13.2.5 Re-ranking procedure

After all applications have been scored, the ranked applications are considered by the CDAC for possible re-ranking of applications on a case-by-case basis to remedy perceived inconsistencies. This procedure will allow any application in the ranked table to move up or down by one position at a time:

- Any CDAC member may bring forward an application for re-ranking.
- Conflicts of interest are notified and managed in the usual way.
- The application under consideration would have its scores modified, after appropriate discussion and agreement, by adding a maximum of +0.5 points to one or two of the scoring criteria of choice to move the application under consideration.

Re-ranking of other applications can be done using an iterative process until a final ranked list is reached.

Note: Once the proposals have been scored following discussion by the CDAC, no scores are permitted to be reviewed or adjusted at the conclusion of the meeting.

13.2.6 Fundable and Not Fundable line

At the end of the meeting, all proposals are ranked according to score. The CDAC then:

- Identifies the proposals assessed as not fundable (NF).
- 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 or are so flawed that, irrespective of available budget, they should not be funded.

13.3 Final outcome

Recommendations from the CDAC are sent to the HRC Council for approval. The number of awards in any year depends on the budget allocation for Career Development Awards. Therefore, it is probable not all of the fundable applicants will be approved.

Applicants and Research Offices will receive notification of the outcome after the Council meeting.

Feedback to the shortlisted applicants from CDAC will be provided in the form of a Review Summary (Appendix 4).

Section 14. Pacific Health Research PhD Scholarship

14.1 Overview

14.1.1 Objectives

PhD scholarships in Pacific health research are intended to provide three years of personal support for students undertaking a PhD. Applicants eligible to apply may come from any discipline but must be enrolled for a PhD in a research field relevant to the HRC mission of "benefiting New Zealand through health research".

14.1.2 Eligibility

The requirements are:

- Applicants must be of indigenous Pacific descent.
- Applicants should be New Zealand citizens or hold New Zealand residency at the time of application.
- Usually applicants will be enrolled full-time for a research-focused degree at the doctoral level, usually a Doctor of Philosophy in a New Zealand University. The HRC will, however, consider other applications from students enrolled in other research-focused doctoral degrees or enrolled part-time on their individual merit. Please note, programmes of study where the primary focus is a clinical practice qualification rather than advancing the individual's research skills do not meet the PhD grant requirements.
- The PhD scholarship will not be granted for a period longer than the equivalent of three years full-time.
- Applicants who have not yet enrolled for their proposed course of study but are intending to do so, may apply for a PhD scholarship. In this case, any award will be conditional on the applicant's successful enrolment.

14.2 Assessment

The HRC intends that, where appropriate, assessment includes consideration of the productivity of an applicant relative to their opportunities. This can take account of both career disruption (for example, serious illness or parental leave) and specifics of an applicant's employment history (including clinical, teaching and administrative commitments, and time working in sectors such as industry or government that might restrict research outputs).

14.2.1 Scoring criteria

The policies and processes in the CDA Peer Review Manual must be applied by the CDAC. If the CDAC needs clarification or assistance, the HRC will provide additional information, or the matter may be referred to the HRC Chief Executive or their representative for a decision.

Each application is scored on a 7-point scale for each of the scoring criteria:

Applicant/ability	Experience relative to opportunity, achievement, ability to complete.
Pacific health significance *Community links, background and potential*	Research advances knowledge, is a Pacific health priority. Actively involved/demonstrates high level of commitment Comprehensive knowledge of health and research sector.
Design and methodology *Supervision*	Is appropriate, incorporating relevant methods. Has the necessary skills, knowledge and qualifications to guide the project and applicant.

The 7-point word ladder assists the CDAC scoring according to the descriptors:

Score	*Criteria descriptor*
7	Exceptional
6	Excellent
5	Very good
4	Good
3	Adequate
2	Unsatisfactory
1	Poor

14.2.2 Weighting of scoring criteria

As scholarships and fellowships are personal awards, the weighting places more emphasis on the candidates. However, applicants should note that HRC awards are highly competitive and that all criteria will be considered.

14.2.3 Pre-meeting

Applications ***may be*** pre-scored by CDAC members before the meeting. The HRC Research Manager calculates mean pre-scores and ranks candidates.

14.2.4 At the CDAC meeting

The Assessing Committee meets to:

- Discuss the merits of the applicants and their research proposals.
- Score assessment criteria.
- Reach consensus on the applicants to be recommended for funding.

Discussion time for each application will be limited to approximately 20 minutes. The CDAC Chair must ensure a fair round-table discussion takes place.

Applications will be re-scored independently and the HRC Research Manager will calculate a final ranking from the new scores and present the ranking to the CDAC.

14.2.5 Re-ranking procedure

After all applications have been scored, the ranked applications are considered by the CDAC for possible re-ranking of applications on a case-by-case basis to remedy perceived inconsistencies. This procedure will allow any application in the ranked table to move up or down by one position at a time:

- Any CDAC member may bring forward an application for re-ranking.
- Conflicts of interest are notified and managed in the usual way.
- The application under consideration would have its scores modified, after appropriate discussion and agreement, by adding a maximum of +0.5 points to one or two of the scoring criteria of choice to move the application under consideration.

Re-ranking of other applications can be done using an iterative process until a final ranked list is reached.

Note: Once the proposals have been scored following discussion by the CDAC, no scores are permitted to be reviewed or adjusted at the conclusion of the meeting.

14.2.6 Fundable and Not Fundable line

At the end of the meeting, all proposals are ranked according to score. The CDAC then:

- Identifies the proposals assessed as not fundable (NF).
- 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 or are so flawed that, irrespective of available budget, they should not be funded.

14.3 Final outcome

Recommendations from the CDAC are sent to the HRC Council for approval. The number of awards in any year depends on the budget allocation for Career Development Awards. Therefore, it is probable not all of the fundable applicants will be approved.

Applicants and Research Offices will receive notification of the outcome after the Council meeting.

Feedback to the shortlisted applicants from CDAC will be provided in the form of a Review Summary (Appendix 4).

Section 15. Pacific Health Research Postdoctoral Fellowships

15.1 Overview

15.1.1 Objectives

All Postdoctoral Fellowships offered in Pacific health research are intended for the support of outstanding graduates who have recently completed a degree at doctoral level and who propose to conduct research in scientific fields of relevance to the HRC mission of "benefiting New Zealand through health research". Their purpose is to provide support for up to four years for researchers to gain further experience in their chosen fields and for them to become established as an independent researcher. Where appropriate, the Fellowship could include a period of up to two years of training that is undertaken overseas.

Postdoctoral Fellowships are available to applicants from all disciplines. Applicants can still apply for a Pacific Health Research Postdoctoral Fellowship if their research is in a different area than the four outlined, however the proposed research must link to health and demonstrate good health outcomes for Pacific.

15.1.2 Eligibility

The requirements are:

- Applicants must be of indigenous Pacific descent.
- Applicants should be New Zealand citizens or hold New Zealand residency at the time of application.
- Applicants must hold the degree of Doctor of Philosophy or an equivalent degree. Although applications will be received from persons who have not received results of their thesis examination, the award and commencement of the Fellowship will be conditional on awarding of the degree. The thesis must be submitted for examination at the time of application. Written confirmation will be requested.
- Applicants should not have more than five years postdoctoral experience.
- Applications for Postdoctoral Fellowships in Pacific health are open to individuals with a proven track record of research in the area of Pacific health development.

15.2 Assessment

The HRC intends that, where appropriate, assessment includes consideration of the productivity of an applicant relative to their opportunities. This can take account of both career disruption (for example, serious illness or parental leave) and specifics of an applicant's employment history (including clinical, teaching and administrative commitments, and time working in sectors such as industry or government that might restrict research outputs).

15.2.1 Scoring criteria

The policies and processes in the CDA Peer Review Manual must be applied by the CDAC. If the CDAC needs clarification or assistance, the HRC will provide additional information, or the matter may be referred to the HRC Chief Executive or their nominated representative for a decision.

Each application is scored on a 7-point scale for each of the scoring criteria:

Applicant/ability	Experience relative to opportunity, achievement, ability to complete.
Pacific health significance *Pacific community links, background and potential*	Research advances knowledge, is a Pacific health priority. Actively involved/demonstrates high level of commitment. Comprehensive knowledge of health and research sector.

Design and methodology	Is appropriate, incorporating relevant methods.
Career development and support	Applicant is extremely well supported by appropriate well qualified and/experienced supervisor/mentor. Applicant is based in a highly supportive environment.

The 7-point word ladder assists the CDAC scoring according to the descriptors:

Score	*Criteria descriptor*
7	Exceptional
6	Excellent
5	Very good
4	Good
3	Adequate
2	Unsatisfactory
1	Poor

15.2.2 Weighting of scoring criteria

As scholarships and fellowships are personal awards, the weighting places more emphasis on the candidates. However, applicants should note that HRC awards are highly competitive and that all criteria will be considered.

15.2.3 Pre-meeting

Applications ***may be*** pre-scored by CDAC members before the meeting. The HRC Research Manager calculates mean pre-scores and ranks candidates.

15.2.4 At the CDAC meeting

The Assessing Committee meets to:

- Discuss the merits of the applicants and their research proposals.
- Score assessment criteria.
- Reach consensus on the applicants to be recommended for funding.

Discussion time for each application will be limited to approximately 20 minutes. The CDAC Chair must ensure a fair round-table discussion takes place.

Applications will be re-scored independently and the HRC Research Manager will calculate a final ranking from the new scores and present the ranking to CDAC.

15.2.5 Re-ranking procedure

After all applications have been scored, the ranked applications are considered by the CDAC for possible re-ranking of applications on a case-by-case basis to remedy perceived inconsistencies. This procedure will allow any application in the ranked table to move up or down by one position at a time:

- Any CDAC member may bring forward an application for re-ranking.
- Conflicts of interest are notified and managed in the usual way.
- The application under consideration would have its scores modified, after appropriate discussion and agreement, by adding a maximum of +0.5 points to one or two of the scoring criteria of choice to move the application under consideration.

Re-ranking of other applications can be done using an iterative process until a final ranked list is reached.

Note: Once the proposals have been scored following discussion by the CDAC, no scores are permitted to be reviewed or adjusted at the conclusion of the meeting.

15.2.6 Fundable and Not Fundable line

At the end of the meeting, all proposals are ranked according to score. The CDAC then:

- Identifies the proposals assessed as not fundable (NF).
- 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 or are so flawed that, irrespective of available budget, they should not be funded.

15.3 Final outcome

Recommendations from the CDAC are sent to the HRC Council for approval. The number of awards in any year depends on the budget allocation for Career Development Awards. Therefore, it is probable not all of the fundable applicants will be approved.

Applicants and Research Offices will receive notification of the outcome after the Council meeting.

Feedback to the shortlisted applicants from CDAC will be provided in the form of a Review Summary (Appendix 4).

Section 16. Pacific Clinical Research Training Fellowship

16.1 Description of Pacific Clinical Research Training Fellowship

The Pacific Clinical Research Training Fellowship is awarded to suitably qualified health professionals such as medical and dental graduates, psychologists, nurses and other clinical researchers to enable them to undertake specialised or further clinical research training in fields relevant to the goals and objectives of the HRC "to improve human health by promoting and funding health research". A Pacific Clinical Research Training Fellowship provides a broad research training that will combine academic course work and/or a thesis-based degree, with on-the-job research experience and training within a multidisciplinary research group. The award is particularly suited to Pacific health professionals seeking additional training for a career in a new clinical research discipline within New Zealand. From time to time the HRC may, in addition, offer Fellowships in designated priority areas to develop a particular clinical research discipline.

16.2 Value

The Fellowship provides up to $80,000 per annum for stipend and university fees, and research costs of $20,000 for a three-year full-time tenure for a maximum value of $260,000. Shorter terms will be valued at a pro rata value. A four-year part-time Fellowship is permitted at the maximum value of $260,000.

The value of the stipend on the recipient's qualifications and research experience and will be set by the university. Fellowship funds may not be used to contribute to any type of cost that is prohibited in the HRC "Rules for Permissible Use of Research Funding and Operation of Contracts", academic supervision costs, fees for examinations or subscriptions to professional colleges. Note that each recipient agrees to the stated FTE% contribution and that funding to any recipient from any source will not exceed 100 FTE%.

16.3 Eligibility

The requirements are:

- Applicants must be of indigenous Pacific descent.
- Applicants should be New Zealand citizens or hold New Zealand residency at the time of application.
- Practising medical graduates, dental graduates, psychologists, nurses and other graduates with research ability, background training and expertise in fields relevant to clinical research are eligible to apply.
- Applicants must have a current clinical role as this is the intent of the support.
- All Fellows are required to enrol for an appropriate postgraduate qualification which has a research component e.g. medical and dental graduates progressing to MD or PhD, or nurses and other health professionals progressing to MHSc, DPH, MPH or PhD. The applicant will need to identify a suitable research training environment and develop a research training programme in consultation with the proposed supervisor and head of the relevant academic department(s).

16.4 Conditions of tenure

- The Pacific Clinical Research Training Fellowship may be held for a minimum duration of twelve months and for a maximum duration of three years full-time or four years part-time. Fellowships are renewed annually on the basis of a satisfactory progress report.
- The Pacific Clinical Research Training Fellowships are tenable within New Zealand universities, hospitals or other research institutions approved by Council. The department and supervisor must be approved by the HRC.
- Awarded contracts will be administered through the host institution. Fellows are employees of the host institution, and the general conditions of the appointment are those of that institution.

- Fellows may undertake limited clinical and teaching duties relevant to their research to a maximum of 400 hours in a calendar year. They may receive remuneration for such duties. Except in relation to approved limited clinical and teaching duties, Fellows may not receive remuneration for other work without the HRC's permission.
- Other forms of awards may not be held in conjunction with a Pacific Clinical Research Training Fellowship without the permission of the HRC.
- Fellowships are subject to the terms and conditions of the HRC's research contracts and the *HRC Rules: Permissible use of research funding and operation of contracts*.
- Tenure of the Fellowship terminates on the date stated in the contract or on the date of the oral examination (whichever comes first).

16.5 Application review process

- Applications for the Pacific Clinical Fellowship will be assigned to the Pacific Health Career Development Award Assessment Committee.
- As scholarships and fellowships are personal awards, HRC assessors will place equal emphasis on the applicant's potential development during the period of an award and the research project itself. Applicants should note that HRC awards are highly competitive and that all criteria will be considered to assure assessors that the intended programme is worthy of support.

16.6 Assessment

The HRC intends that, where appropriate, assessment includes consideration of the productivity of an applicant relative to their opportunities. This can take account of both career disruption (for example, serious illness or parental leave) and specifics of an applicant's employment history (including clinical, teaching and administrative commitments, and time working in sectors such as industry or government that might restrict research outputs).

The following assessing criteria are used to guide committee members in the assessment of applications. Within each area anchor points are provided for scores of 7, 4 and 1.

16.6.1 Scoring criteria

The policies and processes in the CDA Peer Review Manual must be applied by CDAC. If the CDAC needs clarification or assistance, the HRC will provide additional information, or the matter may be referred to the HRC Chief Executive or their representative for a decision.

Each application is scored on a 7-point scale for each of the scoring criteria:

Person characteristics	The academic record, research experience relative to opportunity and research potential of the applicant.
Supervisory and research environment	The quality of the supervisory and research environment; track record of supervisor(s) and collaborators.
Rationale, design and methods	Potential to advance knowledge in the field; aims and hypotheses are presented; and originality of the approach. Study design; appropriateness of the research methods.
Pacific health significance	Assessment of the Pacific health issue; advancement of knowledge relevant to Pacific health; and contribution to improvements in Pacific health and Pacific health outcomes.

The 7-point word ladder assists the CDAC scoring according to the descriptors:

Score	*Criteria descriptor*
7	Exceptional
6	Excellent
5	Very good
4	Good
3	Adequate
2	Unsatisfactory
1	Poor

16.6.2 Weighting of scoring criteria

As scholarships and fellowships are personal awards, the weighting places more emphasis on the candidates. However, applicants should note that HRC awards are highly competitive and that all criteria will be considered.

16.6.3 Pre-meeting

Applications ***may be*** pre-scored by CDAC members before the meeting. The HRC Research Manager calculates mean pre-scores and ranks candidates.

16.6.4 At the CDAC meeting

The Assessing Committee meets to:

- Discuss the merits of the applicants and their research proposals.
- Score assessment criteria.
- Reach consensus on the applicants to be recommended for funding.

Discussion time for each application will be limited to approximately 30 minutes. The CDAC Chair must ensure a fair round-table discussion takes place.

Applications will be re-scored independently and the HRC Research Manager will calculate a final ranking from the new scores and present the ranking to the CDAC.

16.6.5 Re-ranking procedure

After all applications have been scored, the ranked applications are considered by the CDAC for possible re-ranking of applications on a case-by-case basis to remedy perceived inconsistencies. This procedure will allow any application in the ranked table to move up or down by one position at a time:

- Any CDAC member may bring forward an application for re-ranking.
- Conflicts of interest are notified and managed in the usual way.
- The application under consideration would have its scores modified, after appropriate discussion and agreement, by adding a maximum of +0.5 points to one or two of the scoring criteria of choice to move the application under consideration.

Re-ranking of other applications can be done using an iterative process until a final ranked list is reached.

Note: Once the proposals have been scored following discussion by CDAC, no scores are permitted to be reviewed or adjusted at the conclusion of the meeting.

16.6.6 Fundable and Not Fundable line

At the end of the meeting, all proposals are ranked according to score. The CDAC then:

- Identifies the proposals assessed as not fundable (NF).
- 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 or are so flawed that, irrespective of available budget, they should not be funded.

16.7 Final outcome

Recommendations from the CDAC are sent to the HRC Council for approval. The number of awards in any year depends on the budget allocation for Career Development Awards. Therefore, it is probable not all of the fundable applicants will be approved.

Applicants and Research Offices will receive notification of the outcome after the Council meeting.

Feedback to the shortlisted applicants from CDAC will be provided in the form of a Review Summary (Appendix 4).

Section 17. Sir Thomas Davis Te Patu Kite Rangi Ariki Research Fellowship

17.1 Overview

17.1.1 Objectives

The Davis Fellowship has been established to support high-quality Pacific health research in priority areas that will contribute towards achieving better health outcomes for Pacific people, families and communities. The Fellowship will provide support for up to three years for a researcher whose field has the potential to contribute to both the health and economic goals for the government's investment in research, science and technology.

The Fellowship is intended to support emerging Pacific researchers who have demonstrated outstanding potential to develop into highly skilled researchers able to initiate new avenues of investigation. Successful candidates are likely to have published papers in their chosen area in journals and should be able to demonstrate their ability to carry out independent research. HRC assessors will look to place more emphasis on the candidate and their potential development during the period of an award than on the research project itself. However, applicants should note that HRC Pacific awards are highly competitive and that all criteria will be considered to assure assessors that the intended research project is worthy of support.

17.2 Eligibility

The requirements are:

- Applicants must be of indigenous Pacific descent.
- Applicants should be New Zealand citizens or hold New Zealand residency at the time of application.
- Applicants must have held a PhD or an equivalent degree for a minimum of six years but no more than ten years. The applicant's track record is assessed relative to opportunity.
- Applicants who have been awarded more than one HRC Project as First Named Investigator, or equivalent support (value/term) are not eligible.
- Usually successful applicants will be involved full-time in research. The HRC will, however, consider applicants wishing to undertake part-time research. In this case, applicants must be involved in research for a minimum of 0.5 FTE and the maximum duration of the Research Fellowship will remain at three years.

17.3 Assessment

The HRC intends that, where appropriate, assessment includes consideration of the productivity of an applicant relative to their opportunities. This can take account of both career disruption (for example, serious illness or parental leave) and specifics of an applicant's employment history (including clinical, teaching and administrative commitments, and time working in sectors such as industry or government that might restrict research outputs).

17.3.1 Scoring criteria

The following assessing criteria are used to guide committee members in the assessment of application's applicants during the interview. Each application is scored on a 7-point scale for each of the scoring criteria:

Suitability of applicant	Evidence of commitment to establish an independent research career; Research experience and achievement relative to opportunity; Potential for development.
Rationale for research	Potential for health gains in the Pacific community; Significance of health issue; Potential to advance knowledge and address important gap; Originality of the approach.

Design and methods	Appropriateness of research design and methods; Validity of the proposed analyses; Feasibility of attaining statistical power; Patient safety issues well managed.
Research impact	Advance one or more of the investment stream's goals; Contribution to increased knowledge, health, social and or economic gains; Importance of potential outcomes; Pathway for knowledge transfer.

The 7-point word ladder assists scoring according to the descriptors:

Score	*Criteria descriptor*
7	Exceptional
6	Excellent
5	Very good
4	Good
3	Adequate
2	Unsatisfactory
1	Poor

17.3.2 Weighting of scoring criteria

The Pacific CDAC will use the 7-point scale, but the Suitability of applicant score will be given a 40% weighting and the other three criteria will be worth 20%.

As scholarships and fellowships are personal awards, the weighting places more emphasis on the candidates. However, applicants should note that HRC awards are highly competitive and that all criteria will be considered.

Criteria	*Points*	*% score*
Suitability of the Applicant	7	40
Rationale for Research	7	20
Design and Methods	7	20
Research Impact	7	20
Total score	**28**	**100**

17.3.3 Pre-meeting

Applications may be pre-scored by CDAC members before the meeting. The HRC Research Investment Manager calculates mean pre-scores and ranks candidates.

17.3.4 At the CDAC meeting

The Assessing Committee meets to:

- Discuss the merits of the applicants and their research proposals
- Score assessment criteria
- Reach consensus on the applicants to be recommended for funding.

The Assessing Committee meeting format is as follows:

- Declaration of conflicts of interests 1 min
- Committee reviewer comments 3 min
- Group discussion and confirm questions for applicants 5 min
- Interview the applicant 25 min
- Group discussion 5 min
- Scoring 1 min
- Note review summary points 2 min

Discussion time for each application will be limited to approximately 42 minutes including the interview. The CDAC Chair must ensure a fair round-table discussion takes place.

Applications will be re-scored independently and the HRC Research Manager will calculate a final ranking from the new scores and present the ranking to the CDAC.

17.3.5 Re-ranking Procedure

After all applications have been scored, the ranked applications are considered by the CDAC for possible re-ranking of applications on a case-by-case basis to remedy perceived inconsistencies. This procedure will allow any application in the ranked table to move up or down by one position at a time:

- Any CDAC member may bring forward an application for re-ranking.
- Conflicts of Interest are notified and managed in the usual way.
- The application under consideration would have its scores modified, after appropriate discussion and agreement, by adding a maximum of +0.5 points to one or two of the scoring criteria of choice to move the application under consideration.

Re-ranking of other applications can be done using an iterative process until a final ranked list is reached.

Note: Once the proposals have been scored following discussion by CDAC, no scores are permitted to be reviewed or adjusted at the conclusion of the meeting.

17.3.6 Fundable and Not Fundable Line

At the end of the meeting, all proposals are ranked according to scores. The CDAC then:

Identifies the proposals assessed as not fundable (NF).
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 or are so flawed that, irrespective of available budget, they should not be funded.
- Final Outcomes
- Recommendations from CDAC are sent to the HRC Council for approval. The number of awards in any year depends on the budget allocation for Career Development Awards. Therefore, it is probable not all of the fundable applicants will be approved.

Applicants and Research Offices will receive notification of the outcome after the Council meeting.

Feedback to the short-listed applicants from CDAC will be provided in the form of a Review Summary (Appendix 4).

Section 18. HRC Council funding decisions

The Council makes funding decisions for all applications for all grant types. Funding recommendations are prepared by HRC staff for Council consideration, following completion of the assessment process for all applications to that grant round. Information provided to Council includes scores and committee recommendations, assessment process, budget availability, and any other relevant information requested by Council.

Council member conflicts of interest in relation to applications or applicants is managed as described in this manual for those involved in the peer review process.

Section 19. Contact details

Health Research Council of New Zealand
PO Box 5541, Victoria Street West,
Auckland 1142
Level 1 South Tower, 110 Symonds Street, Grafton,
Auckland 1010
Telephone: +64 9 303 5200

Email: info@hrc.govt.nz
Websites: www.hrc.govt.nz
https://gateway.hrc.govt.nz

Contact us
If you have any questions about the HRC or would like to know more about our funding process contact details are found here: www.hrc.govt.nz/contact-us

Section 20. Version information

This section provides a document history only.

Title	**2024 Career Development Awards Peer Review Manual**
Version/Issue Date/Status	**May 2023**
Supersedes Version/Issued on	**May 2023**
Description of changes	Dates; minor edits, Girdlers' not available
Prepared by	**Research Investment Manager**
Approved by	**Head of Research Investments and Contracts**
File name	**2024 Career Development Awards Peer Review Manual.pdf**

Appendix 1: Assessing Committee fees and expenses

Fee Schedule

CDAC (1-day meeting)		
	Committee Chair	Committee Member
Meeting fee (*per diem* x 1 days)	$270	$200
Meeting preparation fee (reviewer reports, search for reviewers and pre-scoring as required, review summaries)	$400	$400
Total	**$670**	**$600**

Expenses
Please note that fees will be paid upon full completion of committee commitments.

An expense claim form is provided to members. Members should keep an accurate account of expenses and submit receipts with the claim.

Printing costs
Printed copies of applications will not be distributed to all committees. However, some committee members may wish to have hard copies to work with. In that case, printing costs may be claimed as an expense.

Appendix 2: Assessing Committee chair's report

Committee name	
Chair	
Date(s)	
Research Investment Manager	
PH/BM/Clin/MH/Pacific	

Please provide brief comments or bullet points in the following sections. This confidential information will be forwarded to the HRC statutory committees and used for the continuous improvement of HRC processes.

1. Administration and communications

2. Committee membership, expertise and working relationship

3. Integrity of the process

- Management of COIs
- Maintaining confidentiality
- Mitigating against bias

4. Assessment of applications

- Assessment of Māori health advancement
- Virtual meeting environment
- Key recommendations

5. Comments about HRC Gateway

6. Other comments

Appendix 3: Abbreviations

BMAC	Biomedical/clinical Assessing Committee
BRC	Biomedical Research Committee
CDAC	Career Development Assessing Committee
CR, CR1, CR2	Assessing Committee reviewer
CV	Curriculum vitae
EOI	Expression of Interest
F/NF	Fundable/Not Fundable
FA	Full application
FGAC	Emerging Researcher First Grant Assessing Committee
FSAC	Feasibility Study Assessing Committee
GAC	Grant Approval Committee
HRC	Health Research Council of New Zealand
MHAC	Māori Health Assessing Committee
MHR	Māori health reviewer for Programme Assessing Committee
MHC	Māori Health Committee
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NZHD	New Zealand Health Delivery Research Investment Stream
PAC	Programme Assessing Committee
PHRC	Public Health Research Committee
PacificRC	Pacific Health Research Committee
RHM	Rangahau Hauora Māori Research Investment Stream
RIS	Research Investment Stream
AC	Assessing Committee

Appendix 4: Review summary for applicants with an interview

Review summary

Name of award			
Applicant surname		**HRC Reference**	
Title of application			
Host			

Note to committee reviewer: Please give careful consideration to the information and wording provided below as it will be useful for both successful applicants (in helping to shape their research) and for unsuccessful applicants (in preparing future research applications). Comments should be clearly worded, reflect the committee's discussion, and ideally be no more than one page or 6-8 bullet points total. Please delete this text before you submit the completed form to the HRC.

With regard to the criteria for assessing and scoring the application:

1. Provide no more than three key strengths and three main weaknesses or issues identified by the Assessing Committee as important enough to influence the scoring of this application.

Key strengths

Main weaknesses or issues

2. Additional comments including overall impression, writing of application, performance during interview, Māori Health Advancement and budget, etc.

Review summary for applicants with no interview

Review summary

Name of award			
Applicant surname		**HRC Reference**	
Title of application			
Host			

Note to committee reviewer: Please give careful consideration to the information and wording provided below as it will be useful for both successful applicants (in helping to shape their research) and for unsuccessful applicants (in preparing future research applications). Comments should be clearly worded, reflect the committee's discussion, and ideally be no more than one page or 6-8 bullet points total. Please delete this text before you submit the completed form to the HRC.

With regard to the criteria for assessing and scoring the application:

1. Provide no more than three key strengths and three main weaknesses or issues identified by the Assessing Committee as important enough to influence the scoring of this application.

Key strengths

Main weaknesses or issues

2. Additional comments including overall impression, writing of application, Māori Health Advancement, and budget, etc.

Appendix 5: Applicant rebuttal or comments template

Applicant surname		**HRC Reference #**	
Funding round		**Due Date**	
Title of research			

Instructions (delete after reading): All applications have a 2-page limit. The page limit includes references. Do not change the default margins and font (size 11) although you should use bold and underlining for emphasis. Try to leave spaces to improve legibility. Ensure to address all the issues raised by the reviewers, remain objective and avoid emotion in your rebuttals.

Appendix 6: Glossary of Māori terms

Ahua	Feeling
Ao	World
Aroha	Love
Ataahua	Beautiful
Hauora	Health
He aha te mea	What is this thing
Hiamoe	Sleepy
Hinengaro	Mental
Hoki	Also
Hui	Gathering
Iwi	Tribe
Kaha	Strong
Kai	Food
Kaimahi	Workers
Kaitiakitanga	Guardianship
Kaiwhakahaere	Organisers
Kanohi ki te kanohi	Face to face
Karakia	Prayer
Karanga	Call
Katoa	All
Kaumatua	Elder
Kaupapa	Topic
Kaupapa Māori	Māori research ideology
Kawa	Protocol
Kawakawa	Pepper tree, *Macropiper excelsum*
Koe	You
Koha	Gift
Korero	Talk
Koutou	All of you
Kuia	Elderly lady
Mahana	Warm
Maioha	Heartfelt
Mana	Prestige
Mana tangata	Self-determination
Mana whenua	Local tribe
Marama	Moon
Matakite	Spiritual insight and gifts
Mātauranga	Education
Mātou	Us
Mema	Member
Mihi/mihimihi	To greet
Mutunga Kore	Never ending
Nui	Great
Oranga	Well-being
Ō tātou	Ours
Pono	True
Pōwhiri	Welcome ceremony
Pūkenga	Abilities and skills
Rangahau	Research
Rangatahi	Youth
Rangatira	Chiefly
Rawa	Really
Reo	Language
Rongoā	Traditional Māori medicine
Rōpū	Group

Tangata whenua	Local people
Te	The
Te Hau Kāinga	The home of origin
Teina	Younger relationship
Tēnei	This
Tika	Right
Tikanga Māori	Māori customs
Tinana	Physical
Tino rangatiratanga	Māori control and sovereignty
Tohunga	Priest
Tuakana	Elder relationship
Tuakiri-ā-Māori	Māori cultural identity
Tupapa	Foundation
Uara tau	Guiding values
Wahakura	Flax woven baby basket
Wāhine hapū	Pregnant women
Waiata	Song
Wairua	Spiritual
Wānanga	Forum
Whānau	Family
Whānau, Hapū, Iwi	Family, Sub-tribe, Tribe
Whānau Ora	Family wellbeing
Whaikōrero	Formal speech
Whakapapa	Genealogy
Whakarauora	Survivor
Whakarongo	Listen
Whakaruruhau	Safety
Whakawhānaungatanga	Collaborative family relationships
Whare Tapa Wha	Four-sided house, Māori model of health encompassing taha tinana, taha wairua, taha hinengaro and taha whānau
Whenua	Land