

## RBWH Foundation Grants Round 2 – Scoring Criteria

Patient Care ..... 1  
 Research ..... 3

### Patient Care

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

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

## Research

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

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