

CRIMINOLOGY RESEARCH COUNCIL

Panel Assessment Form [FOR COMPLETION BY PANEL MEMBERS ONLY]

Application no.	
Applicants	
Project title	
Funding sought	<i>(excl GST)</i>

Nature of involvement of panel member with applicant, if any?

--

	Not applicable	Not yet applied for but required	Applied for and awaiting approval	Granted	Granted subject to conditions
Ethics approval					
External agency permission to conduct research					
Other funding					

Scoring: (1 Least Favourable) – (5 Most Favourable)

	Panel Member 1	Panel Member 2
Overall Assessment	Score: Comments:	Score: Comments:
Policy Significance	Score: Comments:	Score: Comments:
National Significance	Score: Comments:	Score: Comments:
Research Methodology	Score: Comments:	Score: Comments:
Costing / budget issues	Score: Comments:	Score: Comments:
Research personnel	Score: Comments:	Score: Comments:

Total Score	** / 30 (**%)	** / 30 (**%)
--------------------	---------------	---------------

CRC Adviser's Summary and Assessment

Total Panel Members' Scores: ** / 60 (**%)

Policy considerations:

- contribution to knowledge of crime trends which could be used for planning and resource allocation by government agencies;
- examination of an under-researched topic;
- relevance to a current or emerging serious criminal justice issue;
- benefit in developing new policies or procedures for dealing with the crime problem in question;
- benefit in devising crime reduction strategies;
- assistance in developing police policies or practices;
- benefit in devising legislative reform proposals;
- support and assistance in the development of existing work by government agencies;
- ability to inform training activities for criminal justice personnel;
- assistance to victim support activities or services;
- assistance in offender support activities or services; or their
- contribution to statistical data holdings.

Final Recommendation:

1. Appropriate for funding - very highly recommended
2. Appropriate for funding - highly recommended
3. Appropriate for funding - average standard
4. Inappropriate for funding by CRC - due to topic or focus, but not quality
5. Inappropriate for funding - due to poor standard of application
6. Revise and re-submit application
7. Topic worthy of funding as a consultancy but not as a funded application

Comments

--