

Dimension	Weighting	Evaluation Criteria							
Relevance to the Foundation's objectives	30	<p>Strong alignments to the Foundation's focus areas of safety, quality or professionalism and rational and credible explanation of how the project will enhance these areas.</p> <p>Clearly addresses at least one of the specific domains of Quality Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety • Effectiveness • Patient-centredness • Timeliness • Efficiency • Equity <p>Or is specifically about professionalism in medicine</p>	21-30	<p>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</p> <p>Somewhat related to at least one of the specific domains or professionalism in medicine</p>	10-20	<p>Minimal alignment to the Foundation's focus areas of either safety, quality or professionalism</p> <p>Tenuous relationship between the project and the specific domains or professionalism in medicine</p>	1-9	<p>No alignment to the Foundation's focus areas of either safety, quality or professionalism</p> <p>Does not fall within the specific domains or professionalism in medicine</p>	0
Project type	15	<p>Project falls within a preferred project type</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Funding • Education initiatives focusing on quality, safety and professionalism • Leadership development programs 	9-15	<p>Project is somewhat related to a preferred project type</p>	1-8	<p>Project does not fall within a preferred project type</p>	0		
Leadership and project team experience	20	<p>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</p>	15-20	<p>Moderate track record of project leadership experience in the fields of safety, quality or professionalism in the practice of medicine with demonstrated outcomes experience</p>	9-14	<p>Some track record of project leadership experience in the fields of safety, quality or professionalism in the practice of medicine with demonstrated outcomes experience</p>	4-8	<p>No track record of project leadership experience in the fields of safety, quality or professionalism in the practice of medicine with demonstrated outcomes experience</p>	0-3
Project rationale and feasibility	10	<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 	8-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear rationale • Partially informed by literature • Clear and feasible project plan • May be novel 	5-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear rationale • Partially informed by literature • Lack of clarity and feasibility in project plan • Not novel 	2-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear rationale • Not adequately informed by literature • No clear and feasible project plan • Not novel 	0-1
Project methodology and design	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate intervention plan • Appropriate outcomes measures and analysis 	8-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Somewhat appropriate intervention plan • Generally appropriate outcomes measures and analysis 	5-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questionable intervention plan • Questionable outcomes measures and analysis 	2-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questionable intervention plan • Questionable outcomes measures and analysis 	0-1
Indicative budget	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Falls within specified range • Appears reasonable for the project proposed 	9-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Falls within the specified range • May not be reasonable for the project proposed 	1-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Falls outside the specified range 	0		