



NHMRC Special Initiative in Mental Health Guidelines

Opening date:	25-Mar-2020
Closing date and time:	20-May-2020 5:00 pm (ACT local time)
Commonwealth policy entity:	National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC)
Enquiries:	Applicants requiring further assistance should direct enquiries to their Administering Institution's Research Administration Officer. Research Administration Officers can contact NHMRC's Research Help Centre for further advice: Phone: 1800 500 983 (+61 2 6217 9451 for international callers) Email: help@nhmrc.gov.au NHMRC will not respond to any enquiries submitted after 13-May-2020 1:00 pm (ACT Local Time). Note: NHMRC's Research Help Centre aims to provide a reply to all requests for general assistance within two working days. This timeframe may be delayed during peak periods or for more detailed requests for assistance.
Date guidelines released:	December 2019
Type of grant opportunity:	Targeted competitive

Contents

1	NHMR	RC Special Initiative in Mental Health (SIMH) processes	4
	1.1	Introduction	5
		1.1.1 About NHMRC	5
2	About	t the grant program	5
	2.1	NHMRC structural priorities	6
3	Grant	amount and grant period	6
	3.1	Grants available	6
	3.2	Grant period	
4	Eligib	ility criteria	6
	4.1	Who is eligible to apply for a grant?	7
		4.1.1 Chief Investigators and Associate Investigators	
	4.2	Multiple applications/grants	8
		4.2.1 Limits on the number of SIMH applications	8
	4.3	Exclusion of applications	8
5	What	the grant money can be used for	8
	5.1	Eligible grant activities and expenditure	8
		5.1.1 Salary support	9
	5.2	Funding to support overseas grant activities and researchers	9
	5.3	What the grant money cannot be used for	9
	5.4	Duplicate funding	9
6	The as	ssessment criteria	9
	6.1	Health research involving Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People	12
7	How t	o apply	13
	7.1	Overview and timing of grant opportunity processes	13
	7.2	Application Extensions	14
	7.3	Minimum data requirements	14
	7.4	Application requirements	14
	7.5	Attachments to the application	15
	7.6	Consumer and community participation	15
	7.7	Joint (consortia) applications	15
	7.8	Certification and submission	15
		7.8.1 CIA certification	15
		7.8.2 Administering Institution certification	16
	7.9	Retracted publications	17
	7.10	Withdrawal of applications	17
	7.11	Questions during the application process	17
8	The g	rant selection process	17
	8.1	Assessment of grant applications	17

		8.1.1	Who will assess applications?	17
		8.1.2	SIMH assessment process	18
	8.2	Who w	ill approve grants?	18
9	Notific	cation of	application outcomes	18
10	Succe	essful gra	ant application	18
	10.1	Informa	ation required from grantees	18
	10.2	Approv	als and licences	18
	10.3	NHMR	C Funding Agreement	19
		10.3.1	Responsible and ethical conduct of research	19
	10.4	NHMR	C policies	19
	10.5	Payme	nts	19
	10.6	Susper	nsion of grants	19
	10.7	Tax im	plications	19
11	Annou	uncemen	nt of grants	20
12	How N	NHMRC r	monitors grant activity	20
	12.1	Variatio	ons	20
	12.2	Reporti	ing	20
			Financial reports	
		12.2.2	Non-financial reports	20
		12.2.3	NHMRC National Institute for Dementia Research	20
	12.3	Evalua	tion of the SIMH scheme	21
	12.4	Open A	Access Policy	21
13	Probit	•		
	13.1	Compla	aints process	21
	13.2	Privacy	y: confidentiality and protection of personal information	21
	13.3		om of information	
15	Gloss	ary		23
Δn	nendix	B SIMH	Category Descriptors	26

1 NHMRC Special Initiative in Mental Health (SIMH) processes

NHMRC's Special Initiative in Mental Health (SIMH) is designed to achieve Australian Government objectives

The SIMH scheme is a component of the Portfolio Budget Statements

Program 1.1: Health and Medical Research, which contributes to Outcome 1: Improved health and medical knowledge.



The grant opportunity opens

NHMRC publishes the grant guidelines on GrantConnect



Applicants complete and submit a grant application

Applicants must complete the application form and address all of the eligibility criteria to be considered for a grant.



Applications verified and assessed

Applications are verified against eligibility criteria and applicants are notified if not eligible. Peer reviewers assess applications against the assessment criteria including an overall consideration of value with money through the following process:

Step 1: Initial Peer review

Step 2: Applicant response (rebuttal)

Step 3: Applicant interview and final peer review.



Grant decisions are made

NHMRC's CEO seeks approval of funding recommendations from the Minister for Health.



NHMRC notifies applicants of the outcome



Applicant's Administering Institution accepts the NHMRC Grant Schedule(s) setting out the research activity



Delivery of grant

Grantees undertake the grant activity as set out in the schedule to the grant funding agreement.

NHMRC manages the grant through the relevant Administering Institution.



Evaluation of the SIMH scheme

NHMRC undertakes periodic evaluations of the performance and administration of its funding schemes to determine strengths and to identify where improvements can be made.

1.1 Introduction

These guidelines contain information for the NHMRC Special Initiative in Mental Health (SIMH) grant opportunity.

Applicants must read these guidelines before filling out an application.

This document sets out:

- the purpose of the grant scheme/grant opportunity
- the eligibility and assessment criteria
- how grant applications are considered and selected
- how grantees are notified and receive grant payments
- how grantees will be monitored and evaluated
- responsibilities and expectations in relation to the opportunity.

GrantConnect (<u>www.grants.gov.au</u>) is the authoritative source of information on this grant opportunity. Any alterations or addenda to these Guidelines will be published on GrantConnect.

The SIMH grant opportunity will be undertaken according to the *Commonwealth Grants Rules and Guidelines 2017* (CGRGs), available from the <u>Department of Finance website</u>.

1.1.1 About NHMRC

NHMRC is the Australian Government's key entity for managing investment in, and integrity of, health and medical research. NHMRC works with stakeholders to plan and design the grant program according to the *National Health and Medical Research Council Act 1992* (NHMRC Act) and the CGRGs.

NHMRC awards grants through several research funding schemes to advance health and medical knowledge and to improve the health status of all Australians. NHMRC invests in the highest quality research and researchers, as determined through peer review, across the four pillars of health and medical research: basic science, clinical medicine and science, public health and health services research.

2 About the grant program

Mental health is a strategic priority of NHMRC. Over the last two years, NHMRC has been working with the mental health research community to understand the current spread of investments in mental health, key areas of research need and how a strategic investment by the NHMRC would be best placed. As well, NHMRC has consulted with key mental health policy and funding bodies to explore opportunities for this strategic investment to complement other initiatives.

In September 2017, NHMRC established the Mental Health Research Advisory Committee (MHRAC), drawn from the health and medical research sector, to advise on priorities in this area. From the advice of MHRAC a stakeholder workshop was convened to refine the parameters for a NHMRC special initiative in mental health research.

The SIMH will support a multidisciplinary and nationally focussed team to establish a national centre for innovation in mental health care as a collaborative network across Australia (involving key institutions, existing national networks in mental health, and other relevant bodies). The SIMH will undertake innovative, high quality implementation research into improved health outcomes and outlooks for people living with mental illness. The centre will operate as a virtual network across Australia, coordinated by a single institution acting as an administrative hub. The centre will include

flagship programs to focus the network's activities on each of the identified research themes. Flagships, which may be based at participating institutions, should be open to a broad membership of researchers, health care services, carers and consumers in mental health to facilitate innovative service delivery across Australia.

The objectives of the SIMH are to:

- focus (at least initially) on the following outcome areas (core research themes):
 - improving experience of care through more effective and innovative models of care and health system redesign, and
 - reducing early mortality through evidence-based strategies for addressing physical, behavioural, psychological and other determinants
- foster innovative, multidisciplinary approaches to mental health by bringing together a
 diverse range of stakeholders with lived experience and professional expertise to define
 the issues, provide evidence for solutions, deliver improved health outcomes and outlooks
 for people living with mental illness, and
- engage and develop the next generation of mental health research leaders.

The intended outcomes of the SIMH are:

- long term partnerships between research, health care and service delivery to translate research findings into improved outcomes
- · developing and extending widespread collaborative networks in Australia, and
- building and developing mental health research capacity.

2.1 NHMRC structural priorities

NHMRC's <u>Corporate Plan</u> outlines strategic priorities and major health issues for the period covered by the Plan, including how NHMRC will address these issues, and a national strategy for medical research and public health research. Each year, NHMRC identifies structural priorities for funding to deliver against its strategic priorities.

Information on NHMRC's structural priorities is outlined in Appendix A.

3 Grant amount and grant period

3.1 Grants available

NHMRC has allocated a total of up to \$10 million to support a single collaborative research project.

3.2 Grant period

The SIMH grant opportunity will be awarded for a five (5) year term.

4 Eligibility criteria

Applications will only be accepted from NHMRC-approved Administering Institutions. A list of NHMRC-approved Administering Institutions is available on NHMRC's website.

The Chief Investigator A (CIA) and Administering Institution must ensure applications meet all eligibility requirements, as set out in these guidelines, at the time of submission and for the duration

of peer review. Applications that do not meet these eligibility requirements may be ineligible and may be excluded from further consideration.

An eligibility ruling may be made by NHMRC at any stage following the close of applications, including during peer review. Where an eligibility ruling is being considered, NHMRC may request further information in order to assess whether the eligibility requirement has been met.

Decisions are made based on current policies and considerations specific to this grant opportunity. Decisions made in relation to previous grant opportunities or other NHMRC funding schemes will not be regarded as precedents and will not be considered when assessing compliance with the requirements of this grant opportunity.

Administering Institutions will be notified in writing of ineligible applications and are responsible for advising applicants.

Grant offers may be withdrawn if eligibility criteria to accept a grant are not met. Action may also be taken over the life of a grant if eligibility criteria to continue holding a grant are not met.

NHMRC staff will not make eligibility rulings before an application is submitted.

4.1 Who is eligible to apply for a grant?

4.1.1 Chief Investigators and Associate Investigators

NHMRC anticipates that there may be more than the Grant Management System's maximum of ten (10) CIs applying, in order to achieve the wide aims of this opportunity. Accordingly, for the Office of NHMRC to manage the single, multidisciplinary, nationally focused team through this call, NHMRC requires that one (1) CI be nominated the Chief Investigator A (CIA) and that this person be responsible for submitting details of their team into the Grant Management System using the following method:

- 1. CIA only is to be added to A-RT: Research Team and Commitment.
- 2. All other CIs are to be listed in the Grant Proposal.

Chief Investigator 'A'

At the time of acceptance and for the duration of the grant the CIA must be an Australian or New Zealand citizen, or a permanent resident of Australia. The CIA must also be based in Australia for at least 80% of the funding period, or 50% of the funding period if CIA is an NHMRC or MRFF Emerging Leadership Fellow.

Chief Investigators

The role and contribution of each CI must be described in the Grant Proposal. CIs are expected to remain active on the Research Activity as outlined in the Grant Proposal for the duration of the grant. There is no restriction on who or how many people may be named as a CI on an application.

Associate Investigators

An Associate Investigator (AI) is defined as an investigator who provides some intellectual and/or practical input into the research and whose participation may warrant inclusion of their name on any outputs (e.g. publications).

There is no restriction on who may be named as an AI on an application. However, a maximum number of ten (10) applies.

4.2 Multiple applications/grants

Applicants applying as a CI may apply for, and hold, other NHMRC scheme grants (subject to any limits set for holding grants in other NHMRC funding schemes).

4.2.1 Limits on the number of SIMH applications

Applicants can only apply as Chief Investigator A (CIA) on one application.

Applicants who wish to apply as a CI on a second application can do so ensuring that they are listed as CIA on one application only. It is the responsibility of all CIs to ensure that this condition is adhered to prior to submission of an application. All applications with duplicate CIAs will be automatically ineligible and removed from the assessment process.

NHMRC intends to fund a single, multidisciplinary, nationally focussed grant through the processes outlined in these Funding Rules.

4.3 Exclusion of applications

An application may be excluded from further consideration if:

- it contravenes an eligibility rule or other requirement as set out in the Grant Guidelines
- it, or any CI named on the application, contravenes an applicable law or code
- it is inconsistent with the objectives of the NHMRC Act and/or the purposes of the Medical Research Endowment Account (MREA), and
- any CI named on the application is the subject of a decision by NHMRC's CEO or Delegate that any application they make to NHMRC, for specified funding schemes, will be excluded from consideration for a period of time, whether or not they otherwise meet the eligibility requirements. Such decisions will generally reflect consequential action taken by NHMRC in response to a finding of research misconduct or a breach of the <u>Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research</u>, or a Probity Event. See the Code for a definition of 'research misconduct' and the NHMRC Policy on Misconduct related to NHMRC Funding available from NHMRC's website.

Such exclusion may take place at any time following CIA and Administering Institution certification of the application.

If a decision to exclude an application from further consideration is made, NHMRC will provide its decision and the reason(s) for the decision to the Administering Institution's Research Administration Officer (RAO) in writing. The Administering Institution's RAO is responsible for advising applicants of the decision in writing. Decisions to exclude an application may be reviewable by NHMRC's Commissioner of Complaints.

5 What the grant money can be used for

5.1 Eligible grant activities and expenditure

Funding provided by NHMRC for a Research Activity must be spent on costs directly incurred in that Research Activity that satisfy the principles and requirements outlined in the *Direct Research Costs Guidelines* on the NHMRC website.

This grant will provide substantial, long term, flexible funding to an integrated group of researchers.

5.1.1 Salary support

The SIMH grant is not intended to provide salary support for Cls.

Individuals cannot draw a salary from the SIMH grant if they are a named Associate Investigator.

5.2 Funding to support overseas grant activities and researchers

SIMH funds are for research cost expenditure in Australia. Funding may be used to support specific grant activities to be undertaken overseas, including salary support for overseas based research support staff, if the overseas grant activity is critical to the successful completion of the project, and the equipment/resources required for the grant activity are not available in Australia.

See *Direct Research Costs Guidelines* on the <u>NHMRC website</u> for further guidance on the expenditure of funding for a Research Activity.

5.3 What the grant money cannot be used for

NHMRC will not fund activities that are already funded on an ongoing basis by other Australian, state or local government programs that commenced prior to the grant agreement being finalised.

5.4 Duplicate funding

NHMRC may compare the research proposed in grant applications with grants previously funded, currently funded, and funded by other agencies (e.g. Australian Research Council or Department of Health) and published research. NHMRC will not fund research that it considers duplicates research previously or currently being funded.

Where NHMRC believes that an applicant has submitted similar research proposals to NHMRC and has been successful with more than one application, the applicant may be required to provide NHMRC with a written report clearly identifying the difference between the research aims of the research activities. If NHMRC subsequently does not consider the research activities to be sufficiently different, the applicant will be required to decline or relinquish one of the grants.

NHMRC may disclose applicants' personal information to overseas entities, Australian, State/Territory or local government agencies, organisations or individuals where necessary to assess an application or to administer a grant. See NHMRC's Privacy Policy and the *Privacy: confidentiality and protection of personal information* section of these guidelines for further information.

6 The assessment criteria

Applications for the SIMH grant are assessed by peers against the assessment criteria listed below using the category descriptors at <u>Appendix B</u> as a guide.

- Generate new knowledge that leads to improved health outcomes (20%)
- Promote effective transfer of research outcomes into health policy and/or practice (20%)
- Develop the mental health and medical research workforce by providing opportunities to advance the training of new researchers, particularly those with a capacity for independent research and future leadership roles (20%)
- Facilitate collaboration (20%)
- Record of Research and Translation Achievement relative to opportunity (20%)

Criterion One

Generate new knowledge that leads to improved mental health outcomes (20%)

- clarity of research objectives and theoretical concepts
- strengths and weaknesses of the research design(s), or the appropriateness and robustness of the proposed methodology/ies or appropriateness of the broader strategy of the research program of the centre
- feasibility of the proposed research
- extent to which the aims and concepts of the research are innovative or pioneering on an international level
- likelihood that significant new findings will be produced and substantially advance knowledge in the field.

Criterion Two

Promote effective transfer of research outcomes into mental health policy and/or practice (20%)

- the involvement of end-users and the wider community in the planning, implementation and uptake of the research program
- the quality of the plan for research translation
- plans for promoting the centre's activities to the wider community, including where appropriate, by commercialisation

Criterion Three

Develop the mental health and medical research workforce by providing opportunities to advance the training of new researchers, particularly those with a capacity for independent research and future leadership roles (20%)

- strategy to generate new researcher capability, mentoring and encouragement of further career development
- clarity of measures for integrating new researchers into the teams including mentoring strategies.

Criterion Four

Facilitate collaboration (20%)

Teams are required to outline past and/or proposed collaborative arrangements within the applicant team, and address the means whereby the collaborators will ensure the cohesive running of the research during its funding period, including but not limited to:

- articulating a clear and robust governance structure that will oversee the management of the collaborative arrangements and the research
- · likely effectiveness of working collaborations and intellectual exchange
- fostering and development of long term relationships with mental health researchers, policy makers, clinicians, those involved in mental health service delivery and the wider community
- integration and cohesiveness of the team.

Criterion Five

Record of Research and Translation Achievement - relative to opportunity (20%)

Record of Achievement is considered in terms of whether the previous research experience of applicants demonstrates that the team is capable of achieving the proposed program of research and/or has the appropriate mix of research skills and experience to deliver the proposed program of research.

Record of Achievement may encompass the national and international standing of the applicants based upon their research achievements, relative to opportunity, including but not limited to:

- research outputs most recent significant publications; publications that illustrate
 innovation and significance to past accomplishments; impact or outcome of previous
 research achievements, including effects on health care practices or policy; awards or
 honours in recognition of achievements
- contribution to discipline or area invitations to speak at international meetings, editorial
 appointments, specialist and high level health policy committee appointments
- other research-related achievements, such as influence on clinical/health policy or practice, or provision of influential advice to health authorities and government
- impacts on health via the broad dissemination of research outcomes, e.g. via mainstream media, the community or industry involvement.

To achieve the objectives of the SIMH, the applicants should take into consideration the above assessment criteria and clearly indicate:

- how the centre will be established as a national network across jurisdictions, institutions, existing research centres and delivery services
- how the proposed structure of the centre (e.g. programs and sites) will support outcomes in the identified areas, including but not limited to specific conditions or symptoms
- how clinical, health services and public health research with a translation/implementation focus would account for a majority of the centre's work
- how the co-design and development of projects are undertaken with a diverse range of stakeholders, drawing on the expert knowledge of researchers, policy makers, health statisticians/economists, clinicians, service providers and community organisations as appropriate, as well as the lived experience of consumers and carers
- the involvement of researchers at various career stages and mentorship opportunities, including interdisciplinary mentorship, to build workforce capacity
- how health outcomes will be formally measured and evaluated over time to demonstrate the impact and changes resulting from the implementation of the proposed programs
- sustainability and financial viability beyond the initial funding of five years, and
- a clear and robust governance structure that oversees management of the SIMH; this
 might include, but is not restricted to, steering committees, scientific advisory groups,
 ethics advisory boards and national, regional and local coordinators.

Applications will not be considered that:

- do not have an adequate plan for sustainability for the centre and of outcomes arising from the centre beyond the funding period provided through the SIMH grant.
- do not have a national reach with the intended outcomes
- propose research that duplicates current investments.

Applications are assessed relative to opportunity, taking into consideration any career disruptions, where applicable (see <u>Appendix C</u>).

It is recognised that Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander applicants often make additional valuable contributions to policy development, clinical/public health leadership and/or service delivery, community activities and linkages, and are often representatives on key committees. If applicable, these contributions will be considered when assessing research output and track record.

6.1 Health research involving Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People

Applicants proposing to undertake research which specifically relates to the health of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, or which includes distinct Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations, biological samples or data, should be aware of, and must refer to, the following documents in formulating their proposal:

- NHMRC Roadmap 3: A strategic framework for improving Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health through research
- Ethical conduct in research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples and communities: Guidelines for researchers and stakeholders, and
- <u>Keeping Research on Track II</u> (a companion document on how the values and principles
 outlined in the <u>Ethical conduct in research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander</u>
 <u>Peoples and communities: Guidelines for researchers and stakeholders</u> can be put into
 practice in research).

To qualify as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health research, at least 20% of the research effort and/or capacity building must relate to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health.

Qualifying applications must address NHMRC's *Indigenous Research Excellence Criteria* as follows:

- Community engagement the proposal demonstrates how the research and potential
 outcomes are a priority for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities with relevant
 community engagement by individuals, communities and/or organisations in
 conceptualisation, development and approval, data collection and management, analysis,
 report writing and dissemination of results.
- Benefit the potential health benefit of the project is demonstrated by addressing an
 important health issue for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. This benefit can
 have a single focus or affect several areas, such as knowledge, finance and policy or
 quality of life. The benefit may be direct and immediate, or it can be indirect, gradual and
 considered.
- Sustainability and transferability the proposal demonstrates how the results of the
 project have the potential to lead to achievable and effective contributions to health gain
 for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, beyond the life of the project. This may
 be through sustainability in the project setting and/or transferability to other settings such
 as evidence-based practice and/or policy. In considering this issue the proposal should
 address the relationship between costs and benefits.
- Building capability the proposal demonstrates how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, communities and researchers will develop relevant capabilities through partnerships and participation in the project.

These applications will be assigned to peer reviewers with specific expertise in Indigenous health research. The peer reviewer(s) will consider how well the application addresses the *Indigenous Research Excellence Criteria*, which will be taken into consideration when scoring against the assessment criteria outlined in section 6 (as relevant).

7 How to apply

7.1 Overview and timing of grant opportunity processes

25-Mar-2020	Applications open in NHMRC's granting system
5:00 pm (ACT Local Time)	
29-Apr-2020	Minimum data due in NHMRC's granting system
5:00 pm (ACT Local Time)	
20-May-2020	Applications close in NHMRC's granting system
July 2020	Anticipated initial peer review
August 2020	Applicants submit an Applicant Response (rebuttal) to Peer Reviewer Report
September 2020	Anticipated applicant interview and peer review period
November 2020*	Anticipated notification of outcomes

^{*}Date is indicative and subject to change.

NHMRC will deliver the SIMH by opening a research call for a single large multidisciplinary consortium of research institutions, consumers, carers and end-users to develop a research program plan for assessment by an expert international and national peer review panel.

NHMRC anticipates that there may be more than the granting system's maximum of ten (10) CIs applying, in order to achieve the wide aims of this opportunity. Accordingly, for the Office of NHMRC to manage the single, multidisciplinary, nationally focused team through this call, NHMRC requires that one CI be nominated the Chief Investigator A (CIA) and that this person be responsible for submitting details of their team into the granting system.

Applications must be submitted electronically using NHMRC's granting system unless otherwise advised by NHMRC.

Electronic submission requires Administering Institutions and the CIA to register for an account in NHMRC's granting system. Applicants who are not registered can submit a new user request via the login page of NHMRC's granting system.

Applicants should refer to NHMRC's granting system Training Program on <u>NHMRC's website</u> for detailed user instructions, or contact their RAO or NHMRC's Research Help Centre for further assistance.

Late applications will not be accepted.

7.2 Application Extensions

Requests for application extensions will be considered on a case by case basis and must be submitted by email to help@nhmrc.gov.au on or before the scheme close date and time. Requests will only be considered for:

- unforeseen circumstances, e.g. natural calamities such as bushfires, floods or hurricanes, or
- exceptional circumstances that affect multiple researchers, e.g. power and/or internet network outages, or
- where an applicant, or a member of their immediate family¹, is incapacitated due to an
 unforeseen medical emergency, such as life-threatening injury, accident or death.

Extensions, if granted, will be for a maximum of seven calendar days. This is to ensure that subsequent peer review processes and approval of funding recommendations are not delayed, especially as eligibility decisions for some NHMRC schemes depend on an applicant's success with other schemes.

Requests for extension submitted after the scheme close date and time will not be considered.

7.3 Minimum data requirements

Minimum data must be entered in NHMRC's granting system by the specified due date to allow NHMRC to start identifying suitable peer reviewers. <u>Applications that fail to satisfy this requirement will not be accepted</u>. Applicants must complete the required fields with correct information. Using placeholder text such as "text", "synopsis" or "xx" etc. is not acceptable as minimum data.

Minimum data fields for SIMH are outlined within NHMRC's granting system.

Failure to meet this deadline will result in the application not proceeding.

RAOs are not required to certify applications for the purpose of minimum data. Applications should only be certified once complete and ready for submission.

7.4 Application requirements

The application should contain all information necessary for assessment without the need for further written or oral explanation or reference to additional documentation. Further information on what can and cannot be included in the application is provided in the Guide to Applicants at Appendix D.

All details included must be current at the time of submission, as this information is relied on during assessment.

Applications must comply with all content and formatting requirements. Incomplete or non-compliant applications may be assessed as ineligible.

Additional requirements and guidance in relation to each component of the application are outlined at <u>Appendix D</u>.

¹ Immediate family comprises a spouse, child, parent or sibling. It includes de facto, step and adoptive relations (e.g. de facto, step or adopted children).

7.5 Attachments to the application

NHMRC requires the following documents with your application:

a grant proposal

You must attach supporting documentation to the application in line with the instructions provided in NHMRC's granting system or <u>Appendix D</u>. You should only attach requested documents. NHMRC will not consider information in attachments that it does not request.

7.6 Consumer and community participation

The Statement on Consumer and Community Involvement in Health and Medical Research (the Statement) has been developed because of the important contribution consumers make to health and medical research. The Consumers Health Forum of Australia Ltd and NHMRC worked in partnership with consumers and researchers to develop the Statement.

Researchers are encouraged to consider the benefits of actively engaging consumers in their proposed research. Further information on the Consumer Health Forum and the Statement is available on NHMRC's website.

7.7 Joint (consortia) applications

The CIA's Administering Institution will be the coordinating administrative hub for the virtual network. The CIA and Administering Institution must ensure their application meets all eligibility requirements, as set out in these guidelines, at the time of submission and for the duration of peer review. Applications that do not meet these eligibility requirements may be ineligible and may be excluded from further consideration.

There are no restrictions on the number of research institutions, existing national networks, and delivery services included in the consortium. It is expected that the network will include number of jurisdictions across the states and territories.

7.8 Certification and submission

Once complete, applications must be electronically certified and then submitted to NHMRC through the RAO of an NHMRC-approved Administering Institution using NHMRC's granting system.

Certification is required firstly by the CIA and then by the Administering Institution RAO by the specified due date or the application will be ineligible and excluded from further consideration.

Once submitted to NHMRC, the application is considered final and no changes can be made.

7.8.1 CIA certification

The CIA must provide the RAO with evidence that the application is complete and that all CIs have agreed to it, i.e. through written evidence such as email. Such written evidence should be retained by the Administering Institution and must be provided to NHMRC if requested.

The following assurances, acknowledgements and undertakings are required of the CIA prior to submitting an application:

- All required information has been provided and is complete, current and correct, and all eligibility and other application requirements have been met.
- All personnel contributing to the Research Activity have familiarised themselves with the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, the National Statement on

Ethical Conduct in Human Research, the Australian Code for the Care and Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes and other relevant NHMRC policies concerning the conduct of research, and agree to conduct themselves in accordance with those policies.

- All CIs and Als have provided written agreement to be named on the application, to
 participate in the manner described in the application and to the use of their personal
 information as described in the NHMRC Privacy Policy.
- All CIs have provided written agreement for the final application to be certified.
- The application may be excluded from consideration if found to be in breach of any requirements.

And if funded,

- The research will be carried out in strict accordance with the conditions governing NHMRC grants at the time of award. Conditions may change during the course of the grant, for example, reporting obligations may change. CIA will need to meet new/changed conditions.
- The reported outcomes of the research may be used for internal NHMRC quality evaluations/reviews.
- Grant offers may be withdrawn and action taken over the life of the grant, if eligibility criteria to accept and/or continue holding a grant are not met.

7.8.2 Administering Institution certification

The following assurances, acknowledgements and undertakings are required of the Administering Institution prior to submitting an application:

- Reasonable efforts have been made to ensure the application is complete and correct and complies with all eligibility and other application requirements.
- CIA is an Australian or New Zealand citizen or permanent resident at the time of accepting the successful grant.
- CIA will be based in Australia for at least 80% of the Funding Period, or 50% of the Funding Period if CIA is an NHMRC or MRFF Emerging Leadership Fellow.
- The appropriate facilities and salary support will be available for the Funding Period.
- Approval of the Research Activity by relevant institutional committees and approval bodies, particularly for ethics and biosafety, will be sought and obtained prior to the commencement of the research, or the parts of the research that require their approval.
- Arrangements for the management of the grant have been agreed between all institutions associated with the application.
- The application is being submitted with the full authority of, and on behalf of, the
 Administering Institution, noting that under section 136.1 of the Commonwealth Criminal
 Code Act 1995, it is an offence to provide false or misleading information to a
 Commonwealth body in an application for a benefit. This includes submission of an
 application by those not authorised by the Institution to submit applications for funding to
 NHMRC.
- Written evidence of consent has been obtained from all CIs and AIs and provided to the RAO.

Administering Institutions must ensure that the RAO role is authorised to certify and submit applications.

7.9 Retracted publications

If a publication relevant to an application is retracted after the application has been submitted, the applicant must promptly notify their RAO. The RAO must advise NHMRC at the earliest opportunity of the retraction by email (help@nhmrc.gov.au) with an explanation of the reasons for the retraction.

In addition, where the publication forms part of the applicant's track record, the applicant must immediately record that information in their Profile & CV in NHMRC's granting system.

If an application is largely dependent on the results of a retracted publication, the applicant should also consider withdrawing the application. If, under these circumstances, an applicant chooses not to withdraw the application, the RAO must advise NHMRC in writing (to help@nhmrc.gov.au), clearly outlining the reasons for not withdrawing the application.

7.10 Withdrawal of applications

Applications may be withdrawn at any time by written notice from the Administering Institution's RAO to NHMRC.

An application may be 'marked for deletion' by the applicant in NHMRC's granting system before the close of the round. This authorises NHMRC to delete the application once the round has closed. The application will not be deleted while the funding round remains open for application submission.

7.11 Questions during the application process

Applicants requiring further assistance should direct enquiries to their Administering Institution's RAO. RAOs can contact NHMRC's Research Help Centre for further advice.

NHMRC's Research Help Centre

P: 1800 500 983 (+61 2 6217 9451 for international callers)

E: help@nhmrc.gov.au.

Refer to the Research Help Centre webpage for opening hours.

8 The grant selection process

8.1 Assessment of grant applications

NHMRC considers applications through a targeted competitive grant process. Applications are required to meet eligibility requirements as set out in these guidelines and are assessed against the assessment criteria (see Section 6) by independent peer reviewers.

8.1.1 Who will assess applications?

NHMRC's peer review process is designed to provide a rigorous, fair, transparent and consistent assessment of the merits of each application to ensure that only the highest quality, value with money research is recommended for funding.

Applicants must not seek to identify or make contact about their application with anyone who is directly engaged with its assessment, in keeping with NHMRC's principles of impartial and independent peer review. Seeking to influence the process or outcomes of peer review constitutes

a breach of the <u>Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research</u> and may result in the application being excluded from consideration.

8.1.2 SIMH assessment process

The outcome of this review will be discussed and used to create an assessor report by a panel of peer reviewers. Applicants will be contacted by email and will have an opportunity to respond by lodgement of a written response. The panel of peer reviewers will meet via videoconference to interview all applications. Applications will then be discussed by the panel of peer reviewers. The overall scores from the panel assessment will be used to produce a rank ordered list of applications, on which funding recommendations will be based.

Further information on the assessment process is on the <u>NHMRC website</u> and in the SIMH Peer Review Guidelines.

8.2 Who will approve grants?

In accordance with paragraph 7(1)(c) of the NHMRC Act, NHMRC's CEO makes recommendations on expenditure from the MREA to the Minister with portfolio responsibility for NHMRC.

9 Notification of application outcomes

NHMRC will advise applicants and their nominated Administering Institution's RAO of the outcome of the application as early as possible, following the approval of the grant. This could be sooner if an application has been assessed as uncompetitive or excluded for other reasons.

NHMRC may advise applicants and their Administering Institution's RAO of the outcome under embargo. An embargo is the prohibition of publicising information or news provided by NHMRC until a certain date or until certain conditions have been met. NHMRC's website provides further information on what can and cannot happen where information on a grant is released under embargo.

10 Successful grant application

The CIAs whose application is approved for funding will have access to a letter of offer through NHMRC's granting system. The Administering Institution responsible for administering the approved application will also have access to the letter of offer and to the Schedule to the Funding Agreement. The Administering Institution is responsible for accepting the Schedule through the online signing/acceptance process within NHMRC's granting system.

NHMRC's CEO or delegate may withdraw or vary an offer of a grant if they consider that it is reasonably necessary to protect Commonwealth revenue.

10.1 Information required from grantees

The Grantee may be required to supply additional information about their Research Activity before payments commence. This will be stated in the letter of offer.

10.2 Approvals and licences

Where relevant, particularly in relation to ethics and biosafety, NHMRC-funded Research Activities must be referred for approval to the relevant institutional committees and approval bodies. For further information see NHMRC's website.

10.3 NHMRC Funding Agreement

All grants are offered in accordance with the Funding Agreement (with any conditions specified in Schedules and these Grant Guidelines), which is a legal agreement between NHMRC and the Administering Institution. In accepting the Schedules, the Administering Institution is agreeing to the conditions contained in the Funding Agreement and the Schedule.

Details of the Funding Agreement can be found on NHMRC's website under Funding Agreement and Deeds of Agreement. A grant will not commence, nor grant funds be paid, until:

- the Funding Agreement between NHMRC and the Administering Institution is in place, and
- the appropriate Schedule to the Funding Agreement is accepted by the Responsible Officer or their delegate and is accepted and executed by NHMRC.

10.3.1 Responsible and ethical conduct of research

NHMRC expects the highest levels of research conduct and integrity to be observed in the research that it funds. Administering Institutions and CIAs are bound by the conditions of the Funding Agreement. NHMRC funded research must be conducted in accordance with the *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research*. Further information about the Code can be found on NHMRC's website.

10.4 NHMRC policies

Administering Institutions and CIAs are bound by the conditions of the Funding Agreement. It is the responsibility of Administering Institutions and CIs to be aware of, and comply with, all relevant legislation and policies relating to the conduct of the Research Activity.

For further information on the expectations of Administering Institutions and CIs, see NHMRC's website.

10.5 Payments

Payments will commence once all outstanding obligations (e.g. conditions, eligibility rules or data requirements specified in the Schedule to the Funding Agreement, relevant grant guidelines or letter of offer) have been met by the CIA and the Administering Institution.

10.6 Suspension of grants

NHMRC funding may be suspended for a variety of reasons including, but not limited to, requests made by the CIA. Variations will generally only be granted if allowed in the grant guidelines and the NHMRC *Grantee Variation Policy* available on the NHMRC website.

Funding may also be suspended by NHMRC when it is reasonable to consider there has been a failure to comply with a Policy or Guideline, or on the basis of a Probity Event or an investigation of alleged research misconduct, as set out in the Funding Agreement.

10.7 Tax implications

All amounts referred to in these Grant Guidelines are exclusive of GST, unless stated otherwise.

Administering Institutions are responsible for all financial and taxation matters associated with the grant.

11 Announcement of grants

Grant outcomes are publicly listed on the <u>GrantConnect website</u> within 21 calendar days after the date of effect as required by the CGRGs.

12 How NHMRC monitors grant activity

12.1 Variations

A variation is a change (including a delay) to a grant. There are specific circumstances under which grantees should report and seek approval of a variation to an NHMRC grant (including the Research Activity) relative to the peer reviewed application. Requests must comply with the grant guidelines and the NHMRC *Grantee Variation Policy*. Requests to vary the terms of a grant should be made to NHMRC via the Grantee Variation portal in NHMRC's granting system. For information on grant variations see NHMRC's *Grantee Variation Policy* available on the NHMRC website.

Grant variations cannot be used as a means to meet NHMRC eligibility requirements.

12.2 Reporting

Administering Institutions are required to report to NHMRC on the progress of the grant and the use of grant funds. Where an institution fails to submit reports (financial or otherwise) as required, NHMRC may take action under the provisions of the Funding Agreement. Failure to report within timeframes may affect eligibility to receive future funding.

12.2.1 Financial reports

Annual financial reports are required in a form prescribed by NHMRC. At the completion of the grant or upon transfer to a new Administering Institution, a financial acquittal is also required. Refer to NHMRC's website for details of format and timing.

12.2.2 Non-financial reports

The Funding Agreement requires the CIA to prepare reports for each Research Activity. Scientific reporting requirements can be found on NHMRC's website. While having outstanding obligations from previous NHMRC grants does not disqualify applicants from applying for other NHMRC grants, it is a condition of funding that outstanding obligations from previous NHMRC grants, including submission of a Final Report, have been met prior to acceptance of a new grant.

Information included in the Final Report may be publicly released. Use of this information may include publication on <u>NHMRC's website</u>, publicity (including release to the media) and the promotion of research achievements.

All information provided to NHMRC in reports may be used for internal reporting and reporting to government. This information may also be used by NHMRC when reviewing or evaluating funded research projects or funding schemes, or designing future schemes.

12.2.3 NHMRC National Institute for Dementia Research

Grantees undertaking research related to dementia must contribute their expertise to the NHMRC National Institute for Dementia Research, which is responsible for strategically expanding, coordinating and translating the national dementia research effort. The NHMRC National Institute for Dementia Research is drawing on the expertise of researchers and other dementia stakeholders via a membership model to drive Australia's dementia research and translation effort, and work together to maximise the impact of research.

Additional reporting on NHMRC funded dementia research will also be sought from Administering Institutions as required to inform the Institute's work plan and subsequent research activities.

12.3 Evaluation of the SIMH scheme

NHMRC undertakes periodic evaluations of the performance and administration of its grant opportunities to determine their effectiveness and to identify where improvements can be made.

12.4 Open Access Policy

NHMRC supports the sharing of outputs from NHMRC funded research including publications and data. The aims of NHMRC's *Open Access Policy* are to mandate the open access sharing of publications and encourage innovative open access to research data. This policy also requires that patents resulting from NHMRC funding be made findable through listing in SourceIP. NHMRC's *Open Access Policy* is available on NHMRC's website.

Combined, these approaches will help to increase reuse of data, improve research integrity and contribute to a stronger knowledge economy. Open access will also assist with reporting and demonstration of research achievement, improve track record assessment processes for the long term and contribute to better collaborations.

All recipients of NHMRC grants must comply with all elements of NHMRC's *Open Access Policy* as a condition of funding.

13 Probity

13.1 Complaints process

Applicants or grantees seeking to lodge a formal complaint about an NHMRC process related to funding should do so via the Administering Institution's RAO, in writing, within 28 days of the relevant NHMRC decision or action.

Each complaint is to be directed to the Complaints Team at: complaints@nhmrc.gov.au. NHMRC will not review the merits of a funding decision, but it will investigate complaints about the administrative process followed to reach a funding decision. Refer to NHMRC's Complaints Policy and the Commissioner of Complaints webpage for further information.

Applicants or grantees may complain to the Commonwealth Ombudsman if they do not agree with the way NHMRC has handled their complaint. The Ombudsman will not usually look into a complaint unless the matter has first been raised directly with NHMRC.

The Commonwealth Ombudsman can be contacted on:

Phone (Toll free): 1300 362 072

Email: ombudsman@ombudsman.gov.au

Website: www.ombudsman.gov.au

13.2 Privacy: confidentiality and protection of personal information

NHMRC treats applicants' personal information in accordance with the Australian Privacy Principles, and the *Privacy Act 1988*. The <u>NHMRC Privacy Policy</u> details the types of personal or sensitive information that may be collected by NHMRC and how it will be handled. Applicants should familiarise themselves with the NHMRC Privacy Policy before providing personal information to NHMRC.

Information which may properly be regarded as confidential information is to be specifically identified as such by applicants and grantees and will be received by NHMRC on the basis of a mutual understanding of confidentiality.

NHMRC may reveal confidential information to:

- the peer review committee and other Commonwealth employees and contractors to help NHMRC manage the grant scheme effectively
- employees and contractors of NHMRC to research, assess, monitor and analyse schemes and activities
- employees and contractors of other Commonwealth agencies for any purposes, including government administration, research or service delivery
- other Commonwealth, State, Territory or local government agencies in reports and consultations
- NHMRC approved Administering Institutions' Research Administration Offices
- the Auditor-General, Ombudsman or Privacy Commissioner
- the responsible Minister or Parliamentary Secretary, and
- a House or a Committee of the Australian Parliament.

13.3 Freedom of information

NHMRC as a Commonwealth agency is subject to the *Freedom of Information Act 1982* and is committed to meeting the Australian Government's transparency and accountability requirements. Freedom of Information laws facilitate the general public's access to documents held by national government agencies, including application and funding documentation relating to NHMRC researchers. This right of access is limited where documents, or parts of documents, are exempt under the provisions of the *Freedom of Information Act 1982*.

Researchers should familiarise themselves with NHMRC's Freedom of Information procedures before submitting an application. Further information on the *Freedom of Information Act 1982*, NHMRC's Freedom of Information application process and relevant contacts can be found on the NHMRC website.

14 Consultation

NHMRC established MHRAC to advise the CEO on priorities in mental health research. Following recommendations from MHRAC a stakeholder workshop was held to refine the parameters for a NHMRC special initiative in mental health research. Outcomes from this workshop have been used to develop these grant guidelines.

NHMRC has engaged with the National Mental Health Commission (NMHC), the Million Minds Mission Advisory Panel, and the Department of Health on how best to identify potential partners and pathways for developing this grant opportunity and to ensure complementarity with the Medical Research Future Fund investments under the Million Minds Mission. NHMRC has also consulted with the Mental Health Principal Committee and Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council about jurisdictional support for this grant opportunity.

The SIMH is aligned with the work led by the NMHC to develop a research strategy for the mental health sector and the Fifth National Mental Health and Suicide Prevention Plan.

15 Glossary

Term	Definition		
assessment criteria	The specified principles or standards against which applications will be judged. These criteria are used to assess the merits of proposals and, in the case of a competitive granting opportunity, to determine applicant rankings.		
date of effect	This will depend on the particular grant. It can be the date the schedule to a grant agreement is executed or the announcement of the grant, whichever is later.		
eligibility criteria	The principles, standards or rules that a grant applicant must meet to qualify for consideration of a grant.		
Commonwealth Grants Rules and Guidelines 2017 (CGRGs)	The CGRGs establish the overarching Commonwealth grants policy framework and the expectations for all non-corporate Commonwealth entities in relation to grants administration.		
final year	The final 12 calendar months of a grant.		
Funding Agreement	For NHMRC MREA grants, the grant agreement is the NHMRC Funding Agreement and the Schedule to the Funding Agreement.		
grant	A grant is an arrangement for the provision of financial assistance by the Commonwealth or on behalf of the Commonwealth:		
COBFC	 under which relevant money, or other consolidated revenue funds, is to be paid to a recipient other than the Commonwealth which is intended to assist the recipient achieve its goals which is intended to help address one or more of the Australian Government's policy objectives under which the recipient may be required to act in accordance with specified terms or conditions. 		
grant activity	Is the project /tasks /services that the grantee is required to undertake with the grant money. It is described in the schedule to the NHMRC Funding Agreement.		

Term	Definition
GrantConnect	GrantConnect is the Australian Government's whole-of-government grants information system, which centralises the publication and reporting of Commonwealth grants in accordance with the CGRGs. It is available at www.grants.gov.au.
	Non-corporate Commonwealth entities must publish on GrantConnect to meet the grant publishing requirements under the CGRGs.
	Where information is published in more than one location, and there are inconsistencies, GrantConnect is the authoritative, auditable information source.
grant opportunity	A notice published on GrantConnect advertising the availability of Commonwealth grants.
grant program	Is a group of one or more grant opportunities under a single entity Portfolio Budget Statement Program. This is referred to as a scheme in this document.
Grantee	An individual/organisation that has been awarded a grant.
Medical Research Endowment Account (MREA)	The purpose of the MREA is to provide assistance to Federal and State Government Departments, institutions, universities and/or persons engaged in medical research.
Medical Research Future Fund (MRFF)	The MRFF was established on 26 August 2015 by the Medical Research Future Fund Act 2015 (MRFF Act). Refer to the Department of Health website: https://beta.health.gov.au/initiatives-and-programs/medical-research-future-fund .
NHMRC's granting system	NHMRC's electronic grants management solution for grant application, assessment and administration.
Peer reviewers	Individuals (peers) with appropriate knowledge and expertise who review grant applications.
Portfolio Budget Statement (PBS) Program	Described within the entity's PBS, PBS programs each link to a single outcome and provide transparency for funding decisions. These high level PBS programs often comprise a number of lower level, more publicly recognised programs, some of which will be Grant Programs (schemes). A PBS Program may have more than one Grant Program (scheme) associated with it, and each of these may have one or more grant opportunities.

Term	Definition
Probity Event	Any event or occurrence which:
	 has a material adverse effect on the integrity, character or honesty of the Administering Institution, a Participating Institution or Personnel involved in a Research Activity; or relates to the Administering Institution, a Participating Institution or Personnel involved in a Research Activity and has a material adverse effect on the public interest or public confidence in the Administering Institution, Participating Institution or Research Activity.
Schedule	The contract template used by NHMRC to form part of the Funding Agreement. The schedule sets out the research activity and is signed by NHMRC and the CIA's Administering Institution.
value with money	Value with money in this document refers to 'value with relevant money' which is a term used in the CGRGs and is a judgement that the grant proposal represents an efficient, effective, economical and ethical use of public resources, as determined from a variety of considerations.
	When administering a grant opportunity, an official should consider the relevant financial and non-financial costs and benefits of each proposal including, but not limited to: the quality of the project proposal and activities
	 fitness for purpose of the proposal in contributing to government objectives
	 that the absence of a grant is likely to prevent the grantee's and government's outcomes being achieved the potential grantee's relevant experience and performance history.

Appendix B. SIMH Category Descriptors

The following category descriptors, which are equally weighted, are used as a guide to score an application against each of the Assessment Criteria. While the category descriptors provide peer reviewers with some benchmarks for appropriately scoring each application, it is not essential that all descriptors relating to a given score are met. The category descriptors are a guide to a "best fit" outcome. Peer reviewers will consistently refer to these category descriptors to ensure thorough, equitable and transparent assessment of applications.

Assessing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Contributions

It is recognised that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander applicants often make additional valuable contributions to policy development, clinical/public health leadership and/or service delivery, community activities and linkages, and are often representatives on key committees. If applicable, these contributions should be considered when assessing research output and track record.

Category	Generate new knowledge that leads to improved mental health outcomes	Promote effective transfer of research outcomes into mental health policy and/or practice	Develop the mental health and medical research workforce	Facilitate collaboration	Record of research and translation achievement – relative to opportunity
7 Outstanding	The flagship programs: • have objectives that are well-defined, highly coherent and strongly developed • are exemplary in design • are state of the art in concept • will be the subject of invited plenary presentations at international meetings, often with relevance across several fields • are highly innovative and introduce advances in concept • are highly feasible.	 The flagship programs: address one or more issues of utmost importance to mental health have a high degree of involvement of end-users and the wider community in the planning, implementation and uptake of research will translate into fundamental outcomes in the science and/or practice of clinical medicine, health services or public health, or fundamental changes in mental health policy the published research will be highly influential in the promotion of change in mental health policy and/or practice. 	The centre and its flagship programs: • include a strong strategy to generate new researcher capability, mentoring and career development • include impressive measures for integrating new researchers into teams.	The centre and its flagship programs: • have a clear and robust governance structure to support collaboration and outcomes • will be highly effective in promoting working collaborations, including facilitating intellectual exchange and co-design with a diverse range of stakeholders • have very strong relationships with other researchers, end-users and the wider community • have a very high degree of team integration and cohesiveness.	Relative to opportunity, the applicants: • are generally the most outstanding translation-oriented researchers, policy makers, clinicians and/or professionals involved in mental health service delivery in the country • have very strong records of research, policy, clinical practice or service delivery achievements • have strong international reputations and/or are highly recognised locally for their contributions, including for promoting knowledge translation • hold leadership positions in highly regarded scientific, professional or community organisations.

Category	Generate new knowledge that leads to improved mental health outcomes	Promote effective transfer of research outcomes into mental health policy and/or practice	Develop the mental health and medical research workforce	Facilitate collaboration	Record of research and translation achievement – relative to opportunity
6 Excellent	The flagship programs: are clear in intent and are logical have an excellent design are appropriate for the experience level of the applicant team could be the subject of invited plenary presentations at international and national meetings are innovative and introduce some advances in concept are highly feasible.	The flagship programs: • address one or more issues of major importance to mental health • have extensive involvement of end-users and the wider community in various aspects of the research • the published research should be very influential in the promotion of change in mental health policy and/or practice.	The centre and its flagship programs: • include a well-articulated strategy to generate new researcher capability, mentoring and career development • include well-articulated measures for integrating new researchers into teams.	The centre and its flagship programs: • have a clear governance structure to support collaboration and outcomes • will be effective in promoting working collaborations including facilitating intellectual exchange and co-design with a range of stakeholders • have strong relationships with other researchers and the wider community • have a high degree of team integration and cohesiveness.	Relative to opportunity, the applicants: • have a record of translation-oriented achievements that place them in the top 10–20% of peers/cohort • have a growing international reputation or are well recognised locally for their contributions in relevant areas, including for promoting knowledge translation • have established a position of leadership, or are emerging leaders, in their field • hold leadership positions in well regarded scientific, professional or community organisations.
5 Very Good	The flagship programs: • have clear objectives • any reservations regarding study design are minor • can be the subject of invited plenary presentations at national specialty meetings • contain innovative ideas • will likely be successfully achieved.	The flagship programs: • address an issue of considerable importance to mental health • will have relatively extensive involvement of end-users and the wider community • the published research will be influential in the promotion of change in mental health policy and/or practice.	The centre and its flagship programs: • include a persuasive strategy to generate new researcher capability, mentoring and career development • include articulated measures for integrating new researchers into teams.	The centre and its flagship programs: • have a governance structure to support collaboration and/or outcomes • will be reasonably effective in promoting working collaborations including intellectual exchange and working with stakeholders • have good relationships with other researchers, endusers and the wider community • have good team integration and cohesiveness.	Relative to opportunity, the applicants: • have a record of translation-oriented achievements, that place them well above average for their peers/cohort • have a growing national reputation and/or are well recognised locally for their contributions, including for promoting knowledge translation.

Category	Generate new knowledge that leads to improved mental health outcomes	Promote effective transfer of research outcomes into mental health policy and/or practice	Develop the mental health and medical research workforce	Facilitate collaboration	Record of research and translation achievement – relative to opportunity
4 Good	The flagship programs: • are sound in terms of their objectives • may have some novel aspects, while others underpin or extend existing knowledge • but have several areas of minor concern in the experimental design and/or feasibility.	The flagship programs: • address an issue of some importance to mental health • have some involvement of endusers and the wider community • the published research may be influential in the promotion of change in mental health policy and/or practice.	The centre and its flagship programs: include a strategy that should generate new researcher capability, mentoring and career development include articulated measures that should integrate new researchers into teams.	The centre and its flagship programs: • have a governance structure to support collaboration • will have some effectiveness in promoting working collaborations and intellectual exchange • have positive relationships with other researchers, endusers and the wider community • have a degree of team integration and cohesiveness.	Relative to opportunity: • the applicants have a solid record of translation-oriented achievements • one or more of the CIs has an existing or emerging national reputation, albeit in a niche area • the applicants have made contributions to mental health, including knowledge translation.
3 Marginal	The flagship programs: • are satisfactory in terms of their objectives, but may not be successful with all of them • contains some study design problems or flaws • have a number of areas of significant concern • have relatively little novelty or innovation.	The flagship programs: • address an issue of some concern to mental health • have little involvement of endusers and the wider community • published research is unlikely to be influential in the promotion of change in mental health policy and/or practice.	The centre and flagship programs: • include a weak strategy to generate new researcher capability, mentoring and career development • include few measures to integrate new researchers into teams.	The centre and flagship programs: • have a weak or unclear governance structure • may be effective in promoting working collaborations and intellectual exchange • have some viable relationships with other researchers, end-users and the wider community, although weak • have minimal team integration and cohesiveness.	Relative to opportunity, the applicants: • have a moderate record of translation-oriented achievements • lack some areas of expertise that will be required to successfully complete the programs • have limited track records in mental health research, policy or practice, including limited involvement in knowledge translation.

Category	Generate new knowledge that leads to improved mental health outcomes	Promote effective transfer of research outcomes into mental health policy and/or practice	Develop the mental health and medical research workforce	Facilitate collaboration	Record of research and translation achievement – relative to opportunity
2 Unsatisfactory	The flagship programs: • provide elements of research which will at best, only incrementally advance current knowledge • contain a study design which is inadequate in a number of areas • are not innovative or significant • contain a research plan which does not seem to be feasible in several areas.	 The flagship programs: address an issue of only marginal concern to mental health only follow behind previously well documented and studied concepts or previously well used approaches published research is unlikely to be influential in the promotion of change in mental health policy and/or practice there are concerns about successful completion virtually no involvement of endusers and the wider community. 	The centre and flagship programs: • do not articulate a viable strategy to generate new researcher capability, mentoring and career development • have few viable measures to integrate new researchers into teams.	The centre and flagship programs: • do not articulate a governance structure • raise doubts about their effectiveness in promoting working collaborations and intellectual exchange • have little evidence of relationships with other researchers, end-users and the wider community • have little or no evidence of team integration and cohesiveness.	Relative to opportunity, the applicants: • have a weak record of translation-oriented achievements • have major gaps in relevant expertise required to successfully complete the programs • have track records which are not significantly translation-oriented.
1 Poor	The flagship programs: • will not advance current knowledge in the field • contain a study design which is inappropriate in most areas • are not innovative or significant • raise major concerns about the feasibility of the research plan.	The flagship programs: • do not address an issue of concern to mental health • successful completion is unlikely • published research will not be influential in the promotion of change in mental health policy and/or practice • no involvement of end- users and the wider community.	The centre and flagship programs: are unlikely to generate new researcher capability, mentoring and career development have few if any measures to integrate new researchers into teams.	The centre and flagship programs: • have no evidence of a governance structure • will be unlikely to promote working collaborations and intellectual exchange • have no evidence of relationships with other researchers, end-users and the wider community • have no evidence of team integration and cohesiveness.	Relative to opportunity, the applicants: • are not productive in a research translation sense to any significant extent in relevant fields • do not have the expertise or capacity to successfully complete more than a small fraction of the programs • do not have relevant translation-oriented track records in mental health.