



Fiscal Year 2018 EMTS Provider Grants Program
Incentive Category Request Scoring Tool

Need		
15 points possible		
Level 1 (1-5 pts)	Level 2 (6-10 pts)	Level 3 (11-15 pts)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> description of the proposed incentive category/subcategory is vague or poorly defined little or no evidence of need for the proposed incentive category/subcategory supported by surveys or other non-scientific evidence* little or no data provided to support need for increased applications in the proposed incentive category/subcategory little or no indication of statewide or regional support this incentive category/subcategory is already thoroughly addressed and has ample availability for funding through the existing structure of the grant program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> description of the proposed incentive category/subcategory is generally defined good evidence of need for the proposed incentive category/subcategory supported by Level III or Level IV scientific evidence* some data provided to support need for increased applications in the proposed incentive category/subcategory some indication of statewide or regional support this incentive category/subcategory is adequately addressed or has opportunities for funding through the existing structure of the grant program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> description of the proposed incentive category/subcategory is well defined strong, convincing evidence of need for the proposed incentive category/subcategory supported by Level I or Level II scientific evidence* strong and convincing data provided to support need for increased applications in the proposed incentive category/subcategory strong indication of statewide or regional support this incentive category/subcategory is not addressed or has limited opportunities for funding through the existing structure of the grant program
Statewide or Regional Impact		
15 points possible		
Level 1 (1-5 pts)	Level 2 (6-10 pts)	Level 3 (11-15 pts)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provides little or no evidence there is statewide or regional impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provides good evidence of statewide or regional impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provides strong and convincing evidence of statewide or regional impact
Systems Integration		
10 points possible		
Level 1 (1-3 pt)	Level 2 (4-7 pts)	Level 3 (8-10 pts)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provides little or no evidence the proposed incentive category/subcategory addresses and improves system compatibility proposed incentive category/subcategory is duplicative of other efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provides good evidence the proposed incentive category/subcategory addresses and improves system compatibility proposed incentive category/subcategory possibly duplicative of other efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provides strong and convincing evidence the proposed incentive category/subcategory addresses and improves system compatibility proposed incentive category/subcategory is not duplicative of other efforts



Fiscal Year 2018 EMTS Provider Grants Program
Incentive Category Request Scoring Tool

Priority to Underdeveloped or Aged Systems		
5 points possible		
Level 1 (1 pt)	Level 2 (2-3 pts)	Level 3 (4-5 pts)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provides little or no evidence the proposed incentive category/subcategory addresses underdeveloped or aged emergency medical and trauma services systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provides good evidence the proposed incentive category/subcategory addresses underdeveloped or aged emergency medical and trauma services systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provides strong and convincing evidence the proposed incentive category/subcategory addresses underdeveloped or aged emergency medical and trauma services systems
Cost Effectiveness		
5 points possible		
Level 1 (1 pt)	Level 2 (2-3 pts)	Level 3 (4-5 pts)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> did not evaluate alternatives or shows little or no evidence reduced match is the most cost effective option to encourage increased applications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> evaluated some alternatives and shows good evidence reduced match is the most cost effective option to encourage increased applications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> evaluated many alternatives and shows strong and convincing evidence reduced match is most cost effective option to encourage increased applications

* The levels of scientific evidence used by the US Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality:

Level Type of scientific evidence

- Ia Scientific evidence obtained from meta-analyses of randomized clinical trials
- Ib Scientific evidence obtained from at least one randomized clinical trial
- Ila Scientific evidence obtained from at least one well-designed, non-randomized controlled prospective study
- Ilb Scientific evidence obtained from at least one well-designed, quasi-experimental study
- III Scientific evidence obtained from well-designed observational studies, such as comparative studies, correlation study or case-control studies
- IV Scientific evidence obtained from documents or opinions of experts committees and/or clinical experiences of renowned opinion leaders