

RBWH Foundation Grants Round 4 – Scoring Criteria

Patient Care 1
 Research 3

Patient Care

	Quality of Care Impact (50%)	Evaluation (25%)	Initiative Feasibility (25%)
5	Strongly Patient-centred. Excellent contribution to holistic care approach that enhances patients' and their families' wellbeing, experience, satisfaction, and environment, during their stay.	Has a well-developed rationale and clear objectives . Describes outcomes that are capable of significantly improving patients' and their families' wellbeing.	Strong evidence of detailed planning related to implementing the initiative (risks and mitigation strategies identified)
	Excellent potential to set new benchmarks for patient care/wellbeing/experience at RBWH and/or STARS.	Comprehensively describes evaluation mechanisms such as surveys, feedback, initiative deployment etc.	Comprehensive budget that aligns with initiative proposal and is strongly justified (e.g. cost estimates, recent quotes upload)
	Promotes the greatest benefit and reach throughout the department/s involved, and/or has large potential to reach to be implemented in other departments or across RBWH and/or STARS.	Strong potential to benefit patients and families beyond the funding period , with potential continuity of improvement.	Strong evidence of consumer consultation and support of the initiative.
4	Patient-centred. Very good contribution to holistic care approach that enhances patients' and their families' wellbeing, experience, satisfaction, and environment, during their stay.	Has a well-developed rationale and robust objectives . Describes outcomes that are capable of improving patients' and their families' wellbeing.	Good evidence of detailed planning related to implementing the initiative (risks and mitigation strategies identified)
	Good potential to set new benchmarks for patient care/wellbeing/experience at RBWH and/or STARS.	Well described evaluation mechanisms such as surveys, feedback, initiative deployment etc.	Appropriate budget that aligns with initiative proposal and is strongly justified (e.g. cost estimates, recent quotes upload)
	Promotes the substantial benefit and reach throughout the department/s involved, and/or has good potential to reach to be implemented in other departments or across RBWH and/or STARS.	Very good potential to benefit patients and families beyond the funding period , with potential continuity of improvement.	Very good evidence of consumer consultation and support of the initiative

	Quality of Care Impact (50%)	Evaluation (25%)	Initiative Feasibility (25%)
3	Reasonably Patient-centred. Good contribution to holistic care approach that enhances patients' and their families' wellbeing, experience, satisfaction, and environment, during their stay.	Has a reasonably developed rationale and good objectives . Describes outcomes that are capable of improving patients' and their families' wellbeing.	Evidence of reasonable planning related to implementing the initiative (some risks and strategies identified)
	Potential to set new benchmarks for patient care/wellbeing/experience at RBWH and/or STARS.	Reasonable described evaluation mechanisms such as surveys, feedback, initiative deployment etc.	Appropriate budget that aligns with initiative proposal and is justified (e.g. cost estimates, recent quotes upload)
	Promotes the benefit and reach throughout the department/s involved, and/or has potential to reach to be implemented in other departments or across RBWH and/or STARS.	Good potential to benefit patients and families beyond the funding period , with potential continuity of improvement.	Good evidence of consumer consultation and support of the initiative
2	Limited Patient-centred and/or contribution to holistic care approach that enhances patients' and their families' wellbeing.	Weakly developed rationale and limited objectives . Outcomes may be capable of improving patients' and their families' wellbeing.	Limited evidence of planning related to implementing the initiative (no risks and strategies identified)
	Limited potential to set new benchmarks for patient care/experience at RBWH and/or STARS.	Limited description evaluation mechanisms such as surveys, feedback, initiative deployment etc.	Budget that poorly aligns with initiative proposal and is poorly justified .
	Promotes the benefit but demonstrates weak reach throughout the department/s involved, and/or has weak potential to reach to be implemented in other departments or across RBWH and/or STARS.	Limited potential to benefit patients and families beyond the funding period , with potential continuity of improvement.	Limited evidence of consumer consultation and support of the initiative
1	Not Patient-centred. Unclear contribution to care approach that enhances patients' and their families' wellbeing.	Unclear rationale and unclear objectives . Outcomes have limited potential to improve patients' and their families' wellbeing.	No evidence of planning related to implementing the initiative (no risks and strategies identified)
	No potential to set new benchmarks for patient care/experience at RBWH and/or STARS.	Limited to no description evaluation mechanisms such as surveys, feedback, initiative deployment etc.	Inappropriate budget that does not aligns with initiative proposal.
	Unclear benefit and weak reach throughout the department/s involved, and/or has no potential to reach to be implemented in other departments or across RBWH and/or STARS.	No potential to benefit patients and families beyond the funding period , with potential continuity of improvement.	No evidence of consumer consultation and support of the initiative

Research

	Clinical Impact and Implementation (40%)	Methodology (30%)	Project Feasibility (30%)
5	Highly developed and well-articulated plan for translation into practice.	The project aims and research plan are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported by well justified hypothesis/ rationale. Focused, well-defined, coherent with an excellent study design. 	Early Career Applicant: With evidence of excellent support (indicator through listed collaborators) and their mentorship is well described. Experienced applicant: Strong research team without major weaknesses in expertise.
	Addresses an important unmet need for cohort of patients at RBWH/STARS.	Well identified and managed scientific and technical <u>risks</u> (including cross-departmental personnel if applicable).	Recruitment at RBWH and/or STARS is highly feasible (or strong evidence of access to retrospective data)
	Strong evidence of engagement with patients and <u>consumers</u> . Excellent engagement with <u>frontline clinicians</u> .	Project would be competitive with similar research proposals at the national/international level.	Comprehensive budget that <u>aligns</u> with project proposal and is <u>strongly justified</u> (e.g. cost estimates, recent quotes upload)
4	Clearly articulated plans for further work towards translation.	The project aims and research plan are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported by well justified hypothesis/ rationale. Focused, well-defined, coherent with and a very good study design, few minor concerns. 	Early Career Applicant: With some evidence of support (indicated through collaborators) and their mentorship is described with some detail. Experienced applicant: Strong research team without major weaknesses in expertise.
	Addresses an unmet need for patients at RBWH/STARS.	Have identified and managed scientific and technical <u>risks</u> , with several minor concerns.	Recruitment at RBWH and/or STARS appears feasible (or good evidence of access to patient data).
	Strong evidence of engagement with patients and <u>consumers</u> . Good engagement with <u>frontline clinicians</u> .	Project the potential to be competitive with high quality, similar research proposals at the national/international level.	Appropriate budget that <u>aligns</u> with project proposal and is <u>strongly justified</u> (e.g. cost estimates, recent quotes upload)

	Clinical Impact and Implementation (40%)	Methodology (30%)	Project Feasibility (30%)
3	Clear potential for translation in practice.	The project aims and research plan are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported by a sound hypothesis/ rationale. Logical, generally clear in the study design with several minor concerns. 	Research team generally strong but with one clear weakness.
	Builds on work in addressing an identified clinical need at RBWH/STARS	Have identified and managed scientific and technical risks , with several major concerns.	Recruitment at RBWH and/or STARS appears feasible (or good evidence of access to patient data).
	Some engagement with patients and consumers and frontline clinicians indicated/planned.	Project the potential to be competitive with high quality, similar research proposals at the state/national level.	Appropriate budget that aligns with project proposal and is reasonably justified (e.g. cost estimates, recent quotes upload)
2	Possible potential for translation in practice.	The project aims and research plan are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported by a satisfactory hypothesis/ rationale. Supported by satisfactory study design with several major concerns/weaknesses. 	Research team reasonable (indicated through collaborators), with more than one significant weakness in expertise.
	Addresses an identified clinical need at RBWH/STARS.	Limited evidence of identified and managed scientific and technical risks , with several major concerns.	Recruitment at RBWH and/or STARS may be feasible.
	Little evidence of engagement with patients, consumers, and frontline clinicians indicated.	Project may be competitive with similar research proposals at the state/national level.	Budget that poorly aligns with project proposal and is poorly justified .
1	No clear translational relevance.	The project aims and research plan are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Underpinned by weak hypothesis/ rationale. Significantly flawed in study design, with several major concerns/weaknesses. 	Feasibility of overall project is doubtful. Evident lack of support and expertise.
	Repetition of previous work in addressing an identified clinical need at RBWH/STARS	Little to no evidence of identified and managed scientific and technical risks .	Recruitment at RBWH and/or STARS is doubtful.
	Little to no evidence of engagement with patients, consumers, and frontline clinicians.	Project would not be competitive with similar research proposals at the state/national level.	Inappropriate budget that does not align with initiative proposal.