

Avant Doctor in Training Research Scholarship Program 2018

Evaluation Criteria*

Dimension	Weighting	Evaluation Criteria			
Higher degree	5	PhD (or previously completed PhD) 5	Masters or equivalent 3	Other 1	No higher degree 0
Esteem	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> International conference or speaking presentations and/or relevant prizes or awards Several examples of leadership roles in relevant organisations 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local conference or speaking presentations and/or relevant prizes or awards Some examples of leadership roles in relevant organisations 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single conference or speaking presentation and/or relevant prizes or awards Single examples of leadership roles in relevant organisations 5	No conference or speaking presentations, prizes, awards or leadership examples 0
Previous quality projects or research outputs	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several examples of quality experience or scholarly research experience Several high quality examples of previous quality projects or research outputs relative to opportunity 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some examples of quality experience or scholarly research experience Some high quality examples of previous quality projects or research outputs relative to opportunity 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited examples of quality experience or scholarly research experience Limited examples of previous quality projects or research outputs relative to opportunity 5	No quality experience or scholarly research experience 0
Project/experimental plan and research design <small>(need to meet all descriptors to obtain specific score)</small>	20	Criteria for Quality in Medicine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear rationale Well informed by literature Clear and feasible project plan Novel project Appropriate intervention plan Appropriate outcomes measures and analysis 20	Criteria for Quality in Medicine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear rationale Partially informed by literature Clear and feasible project plan May be novel Somewhat appropriate intervention plan Generally appropriate outcomes measures and analysis 15	Criteria for Quality in Medicine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear rationale Partially informed by literature Lack of clarity and feasibility in project plan Not novel Questionable intervention plan Questionable outcomes measures and analysis 5	Criteria for Quality in Medicine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear rationale Not adequately informed by literature Not clear or feasible project plan Not novel Questionable intervention plan Questionable outcomes measures and analysis 0
		Criteria for Advancement of Medicine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly innovative Feasible New or novel research Clear outcome measures Well informed by literature Concrete and achievable goals 	Criteria for Advancement of Medicine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solid and feasible May be new or novel research Clear outcome measures Well informed by literature Concrete and achievable goals 	Criteria for Advancement of Medicine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about feasibility and quality Not new or novel research Partially clear outcome measures Partially informed by literature Unclear goals 	Criteria for Advancement of Medicine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serious concerns about feasibility and quality Not new or novel research Unclear outcome measures Not supported by literature Unclear goals
Significance and expected outcomes	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant potential for the project or research to contribute to improvement in quality in medicine/health/health standards The problem that the project or research is seeking to address is important Challenges existing models, technologies or treatments 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some potential for the project or research to contribute to improvement in quality in medicine/health/health standards The problem that the project or research is seeking to address is somewhat important Partially challenges existing models, technologies or treatments 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited potential for the project or research to contribute to improvement in quality in medicine/health/health standards The problem that the project or research is seeking to address is somewhat important Minimally challenges existing models, technologies or treatments 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little or no potential for the project or research to contribute to improvement in quality in medicine/health/health standards Importance of the project or research is questionable Does not challenge existing models, technologies or treatments 0
Relative importance	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly dependent on Avant funding to complete research or project Highly important for future career Highly likely to make a significant impact on quality of health care or health policy 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Somewhat dependent on Avant funding to complete research or project Somewhat important for future career Somewhat likely to make a significant impact on quality of health care or health policy 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimally dependent on Avant funding to complete research or project Minimally important for future career Unlikely to make a significant impact on quality of health care or health policy 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not at all dependent on Avant funding to complete research or project Not important for future career Will not make a significant impact on quality of health care or health policy 0
Supervision	15	Highly successful track record of supervisory success 15	Moderate track record of supervisory success 10	Some track record of supervisory success 5	No track record of supervisory success 0