

# Avant Foundation Grants 2022

## Expression of interest evaluation criteria

Dimension	Weighting	Evaluation criteria							
<b>Relevance to the Foundation's objectives</b>	<b>20</b>	<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"> <li>• Safety</li> <li>• Effectiveness</li> <li>• Patient-centredness</li> <li>• Timeliness</li> <li>• Efficiency</li> <li>• Equity</li> </ul> <p>Or is specifically about professionalism or leadership in medicine.</p>	<b>15-20</b>	<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, professionalism or leadership in medicine.</p>	<b>9-14</b>	<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, professionalism or leadership in medicine.</p>	<b>4-8</b>	<p>No alignment to the Foundation's focus areas of either safety, quality or professionalism.</p> <p>Does not fall within the specific domains, professionalism or leadership in medicine.</p>	<b>0-3</b>
<b>Relevance to the Foundation's specific research priorities</b>	<b>10</b>	Project is strongly aligned to one or more of the research priorities.	<b>8-10</b>	Project has some alignment to the specific research priorities.	<b>5-7</b>	There is only a tenuous alignment between the project and the specific research priorities.	<b>1-4</b>	The project is not at all aligned with the specific research priorities.	<b>0</b>
<b>Project type</b>	<b>15</b>	<p><b>Research</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic research focused on quality, safety and professionalism in medicine</li> </ul> <p><b>Quality improvement projects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aligned to the established dimensions of quality, provide sustainable changes to practice and are scalable to environments beyond the setting in which the project has been completed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Leadership programs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programs to improve leadership capability in quality and safety in medicine.</li> </ul> <p><b>Education initiatives focusing on quality, safety and professionalism</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education programs focused on developing skills in quality, safety and professionalism.</li> </ul>	<b>9-15</b>	Project is somewhat related to a preferred project type.	<b>1-8</b>	Project does not fall within a preferred project type.	<b>0</b>		
<b>Leadership and project team experience</b>	<b>20</b>	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.	<b>15-20</b>	Moderate track record of project leadership experience in the fields of safety, quality or professionalism in the practice of medicine with demonstrated outcomes experience.	<b>9-14</b>	Some track record of project leadership experience in the fields of safety, quality or professionalism in the practice of medicine with demonstrated outcomes experience.	<b>4-8</b>	No track record of project leadership experience in the fields of safety, quality or professionalism in the practice of medicine.	<b>0-3</b>
<b>Project rationale and feasibility</b>	<b>10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear rationale</li> <li>• Well informed by literature</li> <li>• Clear and feasible project plan using known quality and safety methods</li> <li>• Novel project</li> </ul>	<b>8-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear rationale</li> <li>• Partially informed by literature</li> <li>• Clear and feasible project plan</li> <li>• May be novel</li> </ul>	<b>5-7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear rationale</li> <li>• Partially informed by literature</li> <li>• Lack of clarity and feasibility in project plan</li> <li>• Not novel</li> </ul>	<b>2-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear rationale</li> <li>• Not adequately informed by literature</li> <li>• No clear and feasible project plan</li> <li>• Not novel</li> </ul>	<b>0-1</b>
<b>Project methodology and design</b>	<b>10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate intervention plan</li> <li>• Appropriate outcomes measures and analysis</li> </ul>	<b>8-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Somewhat appropriate intervention plan</li> <li>• Generally appropriate outcomes measures and analysis</li> </ul>	<b>5-7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionable intervention plan</li> <li>• Questionable outcomes measure and analysis</li> </ul>	<b>2-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No intervention plan</li> <li>• No outcomes measure and analysis</li> </ul>	<b>0-1</b>
<b>Indicative budget</b>	<b>15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Falls within specified range</li> <li>• Appears reasonable for the project proposed</li> </ul>	<b>9-15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Falls within specified range</li> <li>• May not be reasonable for the project proposed</li> </ul>	<b>1-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Falls outside the specified range</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>		