Sir James Dunn Animal Welfare Centre
ATLANTIC VETERINARY COLLEGE • UPEI

SJDAWC Grant Program Evaluation Criteria

	Outstanding	Strong	Moderate	Insufficient (not fundable)
Relevance to animal welfare	Proposal includes outcomes that are directly relevant to animal welfare	Proposal includes outcomes that are relevant to animal welfare	Proposal includes outcomes that are indirectly related to animal welfare	Proposal is missing outcomes that are relevant to animal welfare
	Proposed project is likely to lead to significant advances in the area	Proposed project is likely to lead to important advances in the area	Proposed project will have some impact on the topic area	Proposed project will have minimal impact on the topic area
	The animal welfare problem being addressed is timely, severe and significant	The animal welfare problem being addressed is timely and/or significant	The animal welfare problem being addressed is important	The importance of the animal welfare problem being addressed is not clear
Merit of proposal	Long-term goal(s) and short-term objective(s) are clearly described and attainable	Long-term goal(s) and short-term objective(s) are described and attainable	Long-term goal(s) and short-term objective(s) are described but may not be attainable	Long-term goal(s) and short-term objective(s) are not clearly described and/or likely not attainable
	The animal welfare methodology is clearly defined and appropriate	The animal welfare methodology is defined and appropriate	The animal welfare methodology is partially described and/or may not be appropriate	The animal welfare methodology is not clearly described and/or is not appropriate
	Plans for dissemination are explained in detail, project is likely to result in more than one peer-reviewed publication	Plans for dissemination are explained, project is likely to result in at least one peer-reviewed publication	Plans for dissemination are explained, project is likely to result in published material	Plans for dissemination not well explained, project unlikely to result in any published material
Expertise of team	The investigator and co-investigators have the expertise to successfully carry out the project	The investigator and co-investigators might have the expertise to successfully carry out the project	The investigator and co-investigators would benefit from additional expertise on the team for this project	The proposal is missing vital expertise on the team

I. Relevance to animal welfare

1. The relevance of the outcomes to animal welfare
    - Does the proposal have an outcome(s) relevant to animal welfare?
    - What is the likelihood that the proposed project would result in improved animal welfare?
2. The potential impact of the project
    - Do the outcomes of the project have the potential to create an important impact in the area of study?
3. The severity of the animal welfare problem
    - What is the type and degree of suffering, duration of harm, numbers of animals affected, and capacity of the animals to suffer?
    - Does the proposed work minimise the likely suffering or harm caused to the animals due to the project's design?

II. Merit of proposal

1. Clarity and feasibility of the proposals goals and objectives
    - Are the goals and objectives clearly stated, easy to understand, and directly aligned with proposed methodology?
    - What is the probability of achieving stated objectives within proposed time frame?
    - Does the study team have the appropriate facilities, equipment, and personnel to carry out the project?
    - Is the budget realistic and appropriate?
2. Clarity and appropriateness of the methodology
    - Are the proposed methods clearly stated and aligned with the project objectives?
    - Do the methods include an animal welfare-related outcome(s)?
3. Potential for results of project to be disseminated
    - Do applicants clearly describe a plan for dissemination?
    - Does the research proposal include plans for at least one peer-reviewed manuscript?
    - Does service proposal include plans for dissemination as manuscript or other published material?

III. Expertise of team

1. Expertise of the study team
    - Do the investigators and co-investigators have the expertise to complete the project?
    - Is any expertise missing from the study team?

Note: If any of the criteria are evaluated as insufficient then the project is not fundable