



## Scientific Review Panel - scoring system

For each proposal, the SRP guided by the Panel Chair will reach a numerical score (0-6), taking into account external reviewer reports, their own judgment and SRP discussions. This score will be used to help rank proposals and may be made known to applicants. Where a consensus cannot be achieved this will be recorded in the minutes. The SRP members will be invited to make comments for the Board of Trustees consideration.

### Score of 6 Exceptional - Fundable

- **Project design** Exceptional, near flawless; at the leading edge of autism research with a clear plan that is innovative, achievable, and community informed at all stages
- **Value for money** A highly effective and efficient use of funds that maximises potential work, engagement and outputs
- **Importance** Novel and highly likely to make an exceptional contribution to knowledge with important implications for policy, practice, or public or academic understanding
- **Outputs and impact** Likely to be highly productive, with outputs that achieve a very high level of impact for autistic people and community members

### Score of 5 Excellent - Fundable

- **Project design** Excellent, demonstrates innovation within a UK context, with a strong plan that is ambitious, achievable, and with a large degree of community input
- **Value for money** An efficient and effective use of funds that will achieve a high level of output within the project's scope
- **Importance** Novel and likely to make an important contribution to knowledge, with implications for policy, practice, or public or academic understanding
- **Outputs and impact** Likely to be highly productive, with outputs that will have impact for autistic people and community members

### Score of 4 Very good - Potentially Fundable

- **Project design** Very good, with some innovation and a plan that is purposeful, practical, and community informed
- **Value for money** An efficient and effective use of funds relevant to the project's scope and importance
- **Importance** Likely to make important contributions to knowledge, with potential implications for policy, practice, or public or academic understanding
- **Outputs and impact** Likely to be productive, with outputs that should have a modest impact for autistic people and community members

### Score of 3 Satisfactory Potentially - Fundable

- **Project design** Satisfactory; a plan that is ethical, practical and achievable, and that contains some degree of community involvement
- **Value for money** An acceptable use of funds relevant to the project's scope and importance
- **Importance** Reasonably important contributions to knowledge which may have implications for policy, practice, or public or academic understanding
- **Outputs and impact** Productive though with a small expectation of impact for autistic people and community members



**Score of 2 Fair/some weaknesses** - Not fundable

- **Project design** A plan that is likely achievable though lacking innovation, rigour, and with minimal to no community involvement
- **Value for money** Though resources are mostly justified, some doubt as to whether funds will enable project goals and objectives
- **Importance** A topic or focus that has relevance, though with limited implications for policy, practice, or public or academic understanding
- **Outputs and impact** Fairly low expectation of output and success, and with insubstantial impact for autistic people and their allies

**Score of 1 Poor** - Not fundable

- **Project design** Poor design with clear flaws, potential serious ethical concerns and with no community involvement
- **Value for money** An oversight on the scope and importance of the project, leading to little justification for the amount of resources requested
- **Importance** A topic or focus that has little relevance and minimal implications for policy, practice, or public or academic understanding
- **Outputs and impact** Unlikely to generate new knowledge and without any clear impact for autistic people and their allies