

## Capacity Building Score Matrix

Reviewers should score based on their overall impression of the application and the response to review. Reviewers for the Capacity Building grant scheme should specifically assess the ability of the application to demonstrate that it will (i) benefit the whole Emergency Department and (ii) build future capacity in Emergency Medicine research.

Review Criteria		Definition	Score
1.	Importance to Emergency Care	Develops emergency medicine research capacity in Queensland and leads to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better care for patients in Emergency Medicine and/or support and outcomes for staff providing services in Emergency Medicine <b>and/or</b></li> <li>Improved access to treatment, time to recovery, degree of full recovery <b>and/or</b></li> <li>Cost savings for patient (travel, return to work, etc) and/or health service delivery</li> </ul>	
2.	Scientific Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach and robustness of research vision, research program design and strategy that builds on the existing research capacity</li> </ul>	
3.	Significance and Innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes new knowledge/novelty, <b>and/or</b></li> <li>Degree of innovation in methodology, techniques, cross-disciplinary approaches <b>and/or</b></li> <li>Generation of new research output <b>and/or</b></li> <li>Impact and significance such as for the patient, community, societal, clinical, economic and translation</li> </ul>	
4.	Investigator and Team Track Record	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Team quality and capability relevant and appropriate to the proposed vision and strategy and relative to the capacity building opportunity</li> <li>Ability to build and champion Emergency Medicine research capacity in Queensland and beyond</li> </ul>	
5.	Translation into Practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of the practical ability to translate research output and research outcomes into practice <b>and/or</b></li> <li>Potential to disseminate research outputs</li> </ul>	
6.	Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriateness of expenditure</li> <li>Impact of expenditure</li> </ul>	
<b>Average Score</b> (divide by 6)			

### Scale

5	<b>Strong</b> Fully addresses the criterion and sets forth a compelling argument as to the application's merit in this area
4	<b>Acceptable</b> Enough of the key points in the criterion are covered to make a legitimate case for consideration. Additional information gives significant enough argument to be seen as a highlight in the application
3	<b>Average</b> Either enough of the key points in the criterion are addressed or sufficient evidence is provided, to make a case for meeting the criterion. However, the narrative is such that it is unremarkable and does not rise beyond cursory interest
2	<b>Weak</b> Addresses only some of the elements within the criterion with sufficient detail in the application
1	<b>Very weak</b> Does not sufficiently address the elements within the criterion to be considered

*\*Applications will be ranked from highest to lowest scores with the highest scoring applications recommended for funding.*

### Closing Comments and Advice for Applicants (Optional Comments)

*Professional reviewer feedback and advice that might assist the applicant to improve their proposal for current and future rounds. Applications will not be scored on the optional comments, but these may be further utilised by the Strategic Grants Committee and/or the EMF staff in providing guidance to applicants\**