



Ministry of Health Innovation Pathway

PHC Evaluation Matrix

The purpose of this evaluation matrix is to help consider the fit of PHC-based innovation proposals for the Ministry of Health Innovation Pathway (2024/25 fiscal year). The matrix below is in alignment with PHC's values and the Ministry of Health's *Fit Against Criteria Matrix* (see Appendix B: Decision Support Tool within the Innovation Pathway Program Guide, November 1, 2023).

Process for January 19, 2024 Intake:

1. PHC needs to identify the top five (5) internal innovation proposals for the Ministry of Health.
2. Applicant will submit a PDF copy of the completed intake form to [Holly van Heukelom](#) by **January 19, 2024**.
3. All intake forms will be reviewed and compared against PHC's internal evaluation matrix by PHC's innovation team, the Innovarium.
4. Holly will reach out to all applicants by January 31, 2024. The top five (5) applicants might be asked to make some revisions to their applications and to submit their final intake forms by **February 5, 2024**.
5. Once the Ministry of Health has selected the PHC innovation proposals (by March 8, 2024), then Holly will contact all of the unsuccessful applicants to discuss alternative [funding streams and opportunities](#) that might be a good fit.

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------|----------|---------|------|-------|
| PROJECT NAME: | | | | | |
| TEAM LEADER: | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT(S): | | | | | |
| EXECUTIVE SPONSOR: | | | | | |
| TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED: | | | | | |
| PRIMARY REVIEWER: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Criteria | Substantial | Moderate | Minimal | None | SCORE |
| Scoring Value | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 0 = None, 1 = Minimal, 2 = Moderate, 3 = Substantial | | | | | |
| 1. Innovation Gap | | | | | |
| Innovation addresses an existing gap or problem – how different is the innovation from other solutions (if any) in existence? | | | | | |
| 2. Value Proposition | | | | | |
| Impact on patient (clinical impact, number of patients, population health, social determinants of health, health equity, patient and family experience) | | | | | |
| Impact on provider experience | | | | | |
| Impact on health human resources | | | | | |
| Impact on the environment (planetary health) | | | | | |



| | | | | | |
|---|--|----------------|--|--|-----|
| 3. Spread / Scale | | | | | |
| Potential for broad system impact (spread / scale) | | | | | |
| 4. Scientific Merit | | | | | |
| Reasonable expectation of benefit realisation (0 = no benefit, 1 = partial benefit, 2 = break-even, 3 = positive ROI) | | | | | |
| Implementation study is methodologically sound and generates high quality evidence | | | | | |
| Risk mitigation in study design | | | | | |
| Suitability of project team and engagement of partners | | | | | |
| 5. Relevance | | | | | |
| Alignment to PHC values and priorities | | | | | |
| Alignment to Health System priorities | | | | | |
| Measurable impacts within study timeframe – defined metrics and outcomes within study period (0 = beyond 18 months, 1 = within 18 months, 2 = within 12 months, 3 = within 6 months) | | | | | |
| Total Score | | | | | /39 |
| Score minimum: 27/39 | | Recommendation | | | |

Additional Considerations: quality of application, budget accuracy, other resources available to support project, space, operations, etc.

Feedback to be provided to Team Leader:

| Consideration | Feedback |
|------------------------------------|----------|
| Innovation Gap | |
| Value Proposition | |
| Spread / Scale | |
| Scientific Merit | |
| Relevance | |
| Quality of Application | |
| Budget Accuracy | |
| Other Resources to Support Project | |
| Data (Access, Budget) | |
| Space, Operations | |
| Other | |

