# Transformation grants assessment criteria

Avant Foundation

| Category | Sub-Category | Criteria | 1 = Not evident | 2= Fair | 3= Good | 4= Great | 5 = Excellent | Weighting | Score out of 5 | Weighted Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Project rationale** | Transformation | The project has the potential to create a transformative impact on the practice of medicine | Low transformative potential | Somewhat transformative potential | Moderate transformative potential | Very transformative potential | Highly transformative potential | **10%** | **5** | 0.5 |
| | Rationale | Project has a clear and compelling rationale with the nature and significance of the problem and the purpose of the proposed research clearly explained | Unclear rationale and/or not compelling | Somewhat clear rationale and/or somewhat compelling | Moderately clear rationale and moderately compelling | Clear and compelling rationale | Very clear and highly compelling rationale | **5%** | **5** | 0.25 |
| | Literature | The project is well informed by literature | Not informed by literature | Partially informed by literature | Adequately informed by literature | Well informed by literature | Very well informed by literature | **5%** | **5** | 0.25 |
| | Innovation | The project is innovative in the hypotheses or research questions addressed; or in the use of novel technology/ methodology | Not innovative | Somewhat innovative | Innovative | Very innovative | Extremely innovative | **5%** | **5** | 0.25 |
| **Project design and resourcing** | Competence and Reputation | The applicant organisation and project team members have a sound reputation for excellence | Poor reputation | Moderate reputation. | Good reputation | Great reputation | Excellent reputation | **5%** | **5** | 0.25 |
| | Expertise | Project team has demonstrated knowledge and expertise in this field | Insufficient knowledge and expertise in this field | Moderate knowledge and expertise in this field | Good knowledge and expertise in this field | Great knowledge and expertise in this field | Excellent knowledge and expertise in this field | **5%** | **5** | 0.25 |
| | Design | Project is well designed | Ineffective design | Reasonable design | Good design | Great design | Excellent design | **5%** | **5** | 0.25 |
| | Resourcing | Project is appropriately resourced to deliver proposed outcomes | Inappropriately resourced team | Somewhat appropriately resourced team | Appropriately resourced team | Well resourced team | Highly resourced team | **5%** | **5** | 0.25 |
| **Project impact and purpose** | Safety | The project will significantly contribute to Avant Foundation's impact goal of improving Patient Safety | Poor alignment with Patient Safety | Reasonable alignment with Quality, Safety or Sustainability | Good alignment with Quality, Safety or Sustainability | Great alignment with Quality, Safety or Sustainability | Excellent alignment with Quality, Safety or Sustainability | **5%** | **5** | 0.25 |
| | Impact measures | The proposed impact outcomes will make a positive contribution to Avant Foundation's impact goals | The proposed impact outcomes are unconvincing or not likely to contribute to Avant Foundation's impact goals | The proposed impact outcomes are reasonably likely to contribute to Avant Foundation's impact goals | The proposed impact outcomes will make a good contribution to Avant Foundation's impact goals | The proposed impact outcomes will make a great contribution to Avant Foundation's impact goals | The proposed impact outcomes will make an excellent contribution to Avant Foundation's impact goals | **5%** | **5** | 0.25 |
| | Need and Importance | Research proposed is important and addresses a significant need or gap in health research and/or the healthcare system | Not important and/or no need | Somewhat important and/or some need | Moderate importance and/or moderate need | Great importance and/or great need | Significant importance and/ or significant need | **5%** | **5** | 0.25 |
| | Knowledge | The project will enhance the body of knowledge in its area | Unlikely to enhance the body of knowledge in its area | May enhance the body of knowledge in its area | Likely to enhance the body of knowledge in its area | Will enhance the body of knowledge in its area | Will greatly enhance the body of knowledge in its area | **5%** | **5** | 0.25 |
| | Scale | Project has high potential for scaling beyond the life of the grant | The project is not scalable | The project may be scalable | The project is scalable | The project has a high potential for scalability | The project has a high potential for scalability | **5%** | **5** | 0.25 |
| | Relevance | The outcomes are applicable and/or relevant to other populations | The outcomes are not applicable or relevant to other populations | The outcomes may be applicable and/or relevant to other populations | The outcomes are likely to be applicable and/or relevant to other populations | The outcomes will be applicable and/or relevant to other populations | The outcomes will be highly applicable and/or relevant to other populations | **5%** | **5** | 0.25 |
| **Project budget and timeframes** | Value | The project represents good use of funds and value for investment | Poor use of funds and/or poor value for investment | Reasonable use of funds/ reasonable value for investment | Good use of funds/ good value for investment | Great use of funds/ great value for investment | Excellent use of funds/ Excellent value for investment | **5%** | **5** | 0.25 |
| | Clarity | There is clarity in what the funding will be allocated to (e.g. personnel, direct research, equipment) | Unclear funding allocations | Somewhat clear funding allocations | Moderately clear funding allocations | Clear funding allocations | Very clear funding allocations | **5%** | **5** | 0.25 |
| | Consistency | Budget is consistent with the scope of the project | Inconsistency between budget and scope | Some consistency between budget and scope | Moderate consistency between budget and scope | Good consistency between budget and scope | Great consistency between budget and scope | **5%** | **5** | 0.25 |
| | Feasibility | It is feasible that the project can be completed with the proposed budget | Infeasible | Somewhat feasible | Moderately feasible | Feasible | Highly feasible | **5%** | **5** | 0.25 |
| | Timeframe | The project will be completed within the given timeframes | Unlikely to be completed within the given timeframes | Somewhat likely to be completed within the given timeframes | Moderately likely to be completed within the given timeframes | Likely to be completed within the given timeframes | Highly likely to be completed within the given timeframes | **5%** | **5** | 0.25 |
| **SCORE** | | | | | | | | **100%** | | **5** |

Final weighted score



*Any changes to the assessment criteria will be published on the Avant website. 04/25 (DT-4252)

# Transformation grants assessment criteria

Avant Foundation

| Category | Sub-Category | Criteria | 1 = Not evident | 2= Fair | 3= Good | 4= Great | 5 = Excellent | Weighting | Score out of 5 | Weighted Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Project rationale | Transformation | The project has the potential to create a transformative impact on the practice of medicine | Low transformative potential | Somewhat transformative potential | Moderate transformative potential | Very transformative potential | Highly transformative potential | 10% | 5 | 0.5 |
| | Rationale | Project has a clear and compelling rationale with the nature and significance of the problem and the purpose of the proposed research clearly explained | Unclear rationale and/or not compelling | Somewhat clear rationale and/ or somewhat compelling | Moderately clear rationale and moderately compelling | Clear and compelling rationale | Very clear and highly compelling rationale | 5% | 5 | 0.25 |
| | Literature | The project is well informed by literature | Not informed by literature | Partially informed by literature | Adequately informed by literature | Well informed by literature | Very well informed by literature | 5% | 5 | 0.25 |
| | Innovation | The project is innovative in the hypotheses or research questions addressed; or in the use of novel technology/ methodology | Not innovative | Somewhat innovative | Innovative | Very innovative | Extremely innovative | 5% | 5 | 0.25 |
| Project design and resourcing | Competence and Reputation | The applicant organisation and project team members have a sound reputation for excellence | Poor reputation | Moderate reputation. | Good reputation | Great reputation | Excellent reputation | 5% | 5 | 0.25 |
| | Expertise | Project team has demonstrated knowledge and expertise in this field | Insufficient knowledge and expertise in this field | Moderate knowledge and expertise in this field | Good knowledge and expertise in this field | Great knowledge and expertise in this field | Excellent knowledge and expertise in this field | 5% | 5 | 0.25 |
| | Design | Project is well designed | Ineffective design | Reasonable design | Good design | Great design | Excellent design | 5% | 5 | 0.25 |
| | Resourcing | Project is appropriately resourced to deliver proposed outcomes | Inappropriately resourced team | Somewhat appropriately resourced team | Appropriately resourced team | Well resourced team | Highly resourced team | 5% | 5 | 0.25 |
| Project impact and purpose | Safety | The project will significantly contribute to Avant Foundation's impact goal of improving Patient Safety | Poor alignment with Patient Safety | Reasonable alignment with Quality, Safety or Sustainability | Good alignment with Quality, Safety or Sustainability | Great alignment with Quality, Safety or Sustainability | Excellent alignment with Quality, Safety or Sustainability | 5% | 5 | 0.25 |
| | Impact measures | The proposed impact outcomes will make a positive contribution to Avant Foundation's impact goals | The proposed impact outcomes are unconvincing or not likely to contribute to Avant Foundation's impact goals | The proposed impact outcomes are reasonably likely to contribute to Avant Foundation's impact goals | The proposed impact outcomes will make a good contribution to Avant Foundation's impact goals | The proposed impact outcomes will make a great contribution to Avant Foundation's impact goals | The proposed impact outcomes will make an excellent contribution to Avant Foundation's impact goals | 5% | 5 | 0.25 |
| | Need and Importance | Research proposed is important and addresses a significant need or gap in health research and/or the healthcare system | Not important and/or no need | Somewhat important and/or some need | Moderate importance and/or moderate need | Great importance and/or great need | Significant importance and/or significant need | 5% | 5 | 0.25 |
| | Knowledge | The project will enhance the body of knowledge in its area | Unlikely to enhance the body of knowledge in its area | May enhance the body of knowledge in its area | Likely to enhance the body of knowledge in its area | Will enhance the body of knowledge in its area | Will greatly enhance the body of knowledge in its area | 5% | 5 | 0.25 |
| | Scale | Project has high potential for scaling beyond the life of the grant | The project is not scalable | The project may be scalable | The project is scalable | The project has a high potential for scalability | The project has a high potential for scalability | 5% | 5 | 0.25 |
| | Relevance | The outcomes are applicable and/or relevant to other populations | The outcomes are not applicable or relevant to other populations | The outcomes may be applicable and/or relevant to other populations | The outcomes are likely to be applicable and/or relevant to other populations | The outcomes will be applicable and/or relevant to other populations | The outcomes will be highly applicable and/or relevant to other populations | 5% | 5 | 0.25 |
| Project budget and timeframes | Value | The project represents good use of funds and value for investment | Poor use of funds and/or poor value for investment | Reasonable use of funds/ reasonable value for investment | Good use of funds/ good value for investment | Great use of funds/ great value for investment | Excellent use of funds/Excellent value for investment | 5% | 5 | 0.25 |
| | Clarity | There is clarity in what the funding will be allocated to (e.g. personnel, direct research, equipment) | Unclear funding allocations | Somewhat clear funding allocations | Moderately clear funding allocations | Clear funding allocations | Very clear funding allocations | 5% | 5 | 0.25 |
| | Consistency | Budget is consistent with the scope of the project | Inconsistency between budget and scope | Some consistency between budget and scope | Moderate consistency between budget and scope | Good consistency between budget and scope | Great consistency between budget and scope | 5% | 5 | 0.25 |
| | Feasibility | It is feasible that the project can be completed with the proposed budget | Infeasible | Somewhat feasible | Moderately feasible | Feasible | Highly feasible | 5% | 5 | 0.25 |
| | Timeframe | The project will be completed within the given timeframes | Unlikely to be completed within the given timeframes | Somewhat likely to be completed within the given timeframes | Moderately likely to be completed within the given timeframes | Likely to be completed within the given timeframes | Highly likely to be completed within the given timeframes | 5% | 5 | 0.25 |
| SCORE | | | | | | | | 100% | | 5 |

Final weighted score



*Any changes to the assessment criteria will be published on the Avant website. 04/25 (DT-4252)