You will be provided **three** scores for your application by the Steering Committee: one for Approach, one for Impact, and one for Relevance using the scoring system described below.

**Score Guide**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Score** | **Descriptor** | **Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses** |
| High | 1 | Exceptional | Exceptionally strong with no weaknesses |
| 2 | Outstanding | Outstanding |
| 3 | Excellent | Very strong with only some minor weaknesses |
| Medium | 4 | Very Good | Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses |
| 5 | Good | Strong but with at least one moderate weakness |
| 6 | Satisfactory | Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses |
| Low | 7 | Fair | Some strengths but with at least one major weakness |
| 8 | Marginal | A few strengths and a few major weaknesses |
| 9 | Poor | Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses |
| **Non-numeric score options:** DF = Deferred, AB = Abstention, CF = Conflict, NP = Not Present, ND = Not Discussed. | | | |
| **Minor Weakness:** An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen approach/relevance/impact. | | | |
| **Moderate Weakness:** A weakness that lessens approach/relevance/impact. | | | |
| **Major Weakness:** A weakness that severely limits approach/relevance/impact. | | | |

As the applicant, does your proposal sufficiently answer the questions posed below?

**Approach**  
Are the conceptual or clinical framework, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well‐integrated, well‐reasoned, and appropriate to the aims of the project? Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics?

**Impact**  
Reflects the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved. Is the proposal competitive for additional external funding to advance the broader use of clinical innovation in healthcare? Note that an application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact and thus deserve a high impact/priority score. For example, an investigator may propose to carry out important work that by its nature is not innovative but is essential to move a field forward.

**Relevance**Is it a collaborative effort between Faculty and Clinicians as they work to solve healthcare challenges through innovative solutions? Is it intended to demonstrate improved clinical outcomes, reductions of cost, and higher quality practices through the creation of equipment or facilities to evaluate and improve health care through clinical innovation? Does the research contribute to scholarship and support for advanced degrees to prepare new generations of experts in the field?

Your budget will be considered in your evaluation. Be sure that it meets the minimum 70/30 split, with no institution receiving more than 70% of the allocated funds. Ideally, funds are kept as close to 50/50 as possible as expertise and expenses allow. Any budgets that fall outside of the 70/30 split will not be considered for funding.

Along with a score, you should be provided reasonably detailed comments on the proposal’s strengths and weaknesses and the reasoning for your scores in each category.

If you have any questions, contact [Hanna Sperry](mailto:Hanna.M.Sperry@osfhealthcare.org), [Brad Andersh](mailto:bja@fsmail.bradley.edu), or Academic Collaborations Staff at [IAI@osfhealthcare.org](mailto:IAI@osfhealthcare.org).