

Expression of Interest Evaluation Criteria

Dimension		Weighting		Evaluation Criteria					
Relevance to the Foundation's objectives	25	Strong alignment to the Foundation's focus areas of either safety, quality or professionalism and rational and credible explanation of how the project will enhance these areas	25	Moderate alignment to the Foundation's focus areas of either safety, quality or professionalism and reasonable explanation of how the project will enhance these areas	15	Minimal alignment to the Foundation's focus areas of either safety, quality or professionalism	5	No alignment to the Foundation's focus areas of either safety, quality or professionalism	0
Project type	10	Project falls within a preferred project type <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Funding • Education initiatives focusing on quality, safety and professionalism • Leadership development programs 	10	Project is somewhat related to a preferred project type	5	Project does not fall within a preferred project type	0		
Topic area	10	Project clearly addresses at least one of the specific domains of Quality Improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety • Effectiveness • Patient-centredness • Timeliness • Efficiency • Equity Or is specifically about professionalism in medicine	10	Project is somewhat related to at least one of the specific domains or professionalism in medicine	5	Project does not fall within the specific domains or professionalism in medicine	0		
Leadership and project team experience	15	Highly successful track record of project leadership experience in the fields of safety, quality or professionalism in the practice of medicine with demonstrated outcomes experience	15	Moderate track record of project leadership experience in the fields of safety, quality or professionalism in the practice of medicine with demonstrated outcomes experience	10	Some track record of project leadership experience in the fields of safety, quality or professionalism in the practice of medicine with demonstrated outcomes experience	5	No track record of project leadership experience in the fields of safety, quality or professionalism in the practice of medicine with demonstrated outcomes experience	0
Continuing project	10	Project is new and has not been commenced previously under other funding	10	Project was commenced without funding and not completed	6	Project was commenced under other funding and has not yet been completed	2	Project was previously commenced and was discontinued	0
Project design	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear rationale • Well informed by literature • Clear and feasible project plan using known quality and safety methods • Novel project • Appropriate intervention plan • Appropriate outcomes measures and analysis 	20	<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	<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 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear rationale • Not adequately informed by literature • No clear and feasible project plan • Not novel • Questionable intervention plan • Questionable outcomes measures and analysis 	0
Relative importance of funding	10	Highly dependent on Avant funding to complete project	10	Somewhat dependent on Avant funding to complete project	7	Minimally dependent on Avant funding to complete project	3	Not at all dependent on Avant funding to complete project	0