



## Program Score Matrix

Reviewers should score each application based on their overall impression of the application and the response to review.

Review Criteria	Weighting	Definition	Score
Scientific Quality	30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes approach and robustness of the research strategy and methodology / experimental design</li> </ul>	
Importance to Emergency Care	30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements in the field of Emergency Medicine for the benefit of patients and/or support and outcomes for staff providing services in the field of Emergency Medicine</li> <li>Improved access to treatment, time to recovery, degree of full recovery</li> <li>Capacity to improve upon current best practice through knowledge/novelty, degree of innovation in methodology, equipment, techniques, cross-disciplinary approaches, generation of new research output, impact for the patient and community</li> <li>Explicit training and career development strategy for early career researchers, with at least one higher degree in research student involved in the research</li> </ul>	
Investigator & Team	20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigator and team quality</li> <li>Track record in translating outcomes</li> <li>Capability relevant to the application and relative to opportunity</li> <li>Productivity gains through multidisciplinary collaboration, integration and cohesiveness of the team <b>and</b></li> <li>Program evidence of existing collaboration or appropriateness of proposed new collaborative arrangements</li> </ul>	
Budget	10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriateness of expenditure</li> <li>Impact of expenditure</li> </ul>	
Translation into practice	10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of the practical ability and plan to communicate and disseminate findings into the research and emergency care community <b>and</b></li> <li>Evidence and plan to translate outcomes into practice</li> <li>Cost benefits to patients and/or cost savings or released capacity to health systems</li> </ul>	
<b>TOTAL Score</b>			

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