# Assessment form proposal KNMP grant

Name main applicant: …………………………………………………………………….

Title proposal: ………………………………………………………………………………………………………….

Reviewer (to fill in during assessment, will be anonymised when communicated with applicants): ………………………………………………………………………………….

Rubric for assessment: please give one score per category – see rubric for proposed scores (feel free to choose a score in between the categories given).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **low** | **middle** | **high** | **Comment** | **Score** |
| **Consortium composition** | 1  Substantial lacking in expertise, program management and network to achieve the results aimed at. | 5  Some expertise is lacking, network not completely sufficient | 10  Adequate expertise represented, adequate network involved |  |  |
| **Originality** | 1  Already part of existing care, published earlier | 5  In parts published before, already tested in pilots, not fully implemented | 10  New idea or approach, not tested or implemented before , involving innovative applications or behaviour |  |  |
| **Societal relevance** | 1  Little chance to change healthcare, for individual benefit or social savings | 10 Some potential to improve healthcare for individuals and some chance to save money for society | 20  High potential to improve individualized care, to save money for society |  |  |
| **Strategy** | 1  Weak methodology, substantial lacking to achieve valid outcomes | 10  Partly adequate methodology but still room for improvement in design, patient numbers, comparator group, outcome measures, data management and analysis | 20  Suitable, valid methodology, appropriate design, patient numbers, comparator group, outcome measures, data management and analysis |  |  |
| **Feasibility** | 1  Too ambitious, not feasible within time or with personal and money available; project management is unclear | 10  Partly feasible, lack in man power, barriers and facilitators are equally present; project management is present but should be more efficient and clear | 20  Feasible to carry out within time and financial possibilities, few barriers, outweighed by facilitators; project management is clear and efficient |  |  |
| **Implementability** | 1  Low chance to be implemented nationwide | 10  Moderate chance to be implemented nationally, some parts are too ambitious, needs more effort to be implemented | 20  High chance to be implemented nationwide |  |  |
| **Patient participation** | 1  Patients are not explicitly involved in the project | 10  Patients are involved in some aspects of the project | 20  Patients are involved in all relevant aspects of the project |  |  |
| **Budget** | 1  Too high or too low; not in line with the expected project costs | 10  Could be improved in some aspects | 20  Realistic |  |  |
| **Sum score** | 8 | 70 | 140 |  |  |