



2017-A Health Policy Fellowship

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR APPLICANTS

LAST UPDATED: AUGUST 11, 2016

Elements that are taken into consideration when applications are reviewed:

- Career interruptions such as pregnancy, early child care, illness or eldercare that can influence opportunity for research output and other related knowledge production.
- Different disciplines and environments offer different opportunities for research output and forms of knowledge production.
- Reputation of the applicant's academic host institutions or potential host policy organization will not affect the evaluation of the applicant.
- Greater emphasis will be put on the applicant's suitability for placement within a policy-making organization, rather than their academic and research achievements.

Each application is rated in each of the four evaluation areas:

- Career development and goals
- Characteristics and abilities
- Achievements and activities
- Referee's assessment of the applicant

All applications will be reviewed by MSFHR staff for eligibility for the health policy fellowship award competition prior to being submitted to the review pane and potential policy assignment supervisor.

Evaluating Career Development and Goals	Weighting – 35%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the chosen policy assignment complement the applicant’s research project, interests and career pathway? • Does the applicant describe what they hope to learn and/or achieve as a result of being awarded and completing a fellowship? • Does the applicant indicate any individual plans for incorporating the fellowship experience into specific career goals? • Does the applicant indicate an interest in pursuing a career incorporating health policy and/or contributing to the research-policy interface? 	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Outstanding The proposed policy assignment is exceptionally well-aligned with the applicant’s research project, interests, and career pathway. The applicant superbly describes how the fellowship will influence their research and career path, and shows an exceptional interest in utilizing health policy and contributing to the research-policy interface.</p>	<p>4.5 – 4.9</p>
<p>Excellent The proposed policy assignment complements most aspects of the applicant’s research project, and is strongly aligned with the applicant’s interests and career pathway. The applicant describes in excellent detail how the fellowship will influence their research and their career path, and shows great interest in utilizing health policy and contributing to the research-policy interface.</p>	<p>4.0 – 4.4</p>
<p>Very Good The proposed policy assignment complements many aspects of the applicant’s research project, and is in alignment with many aspects the applicant’s interests and career pathway. The applicant describes in very good detail how the fellowship will influence their research and their career path, and shows reasonable interest in utilizing health policy and contributing to the research-policy interface.</p>	<p>3.5 – 3.9</p>
<p>Good The proposed policy assignment complements parts of the applicant’s research project, and is in alignment with some aspects of the applicant’s interests and career pathway. The applicant describes in some detail how the fellowship will influence their research and their career path, and shows some interest in utilizing health policy and contributing to the research-policy interface.</p>	<p>3.0 – 3.4</p>
<p>Less than Adequate The applicant’s interests and goals do not align well with the policy assignment or with policy work in general. The applicant has given no indication for plans on incorporating fellowship experiences or policy work in general into their research or career aspirations.</p>	<p>0.0 – 2.9</p>

Evaluating Characteristics and Abilities	Weighting – 35%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the overall grantsmanship and general impression of the application. • Does the applicant demonstrate sought-after characteristics and abilities – such as critical thinking, independence, organizational skills, communication skills, analytical skills, leadership, and the ability to work with diverse user groups – that complement working in a policy environment? • Does the applicant describe any previous policy work experience or incorporation of policy-related activities in their research? • Does the application include examples of previous knowledge translation, either within their research or elsewhere? 	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Outstanding The application is superbly written. The applicant describes characteristics and abilities that are extremely relevant to working in a policy environment and has a reasonable amount prior policy work experience. The applicant has demonstrated outstanding examples of and interest in knowledge translation in all aspects of their work.</p>	<p>4.5 – 4.9</p>
<p>Excellent The application is exceptionally well written. The applicant describes characteristics and abilities that are strongly relevant to working in a policy environment and has some policy work experience. The applicant has demonstrated excellent examples of and interest in knowledge translation in all aspects of their work.</p>	<p>4.0 – 4.4</p>
<p>Very Good The application is well written. The applicant describes characteristics and abilities that are mostly relevant to working in a policy environment and has some prior policy work experience. The applicant has demonstrated very good examples of and interest in knowledge translation in some aspects of their work.</p>	<p>3.5 – 3.9</p>
<p>Good The application is satisfactorily written. The applicant describes characteristics and abilities that are somewhat relevant to working in a policy environment and has little prior policy work experience. The applicant has demonstrated good examples of and interest in knowledge translation in some aspects of their work.</p>	<p>3.0 – 3.4</p>
<p>Less than Adequate The application is written poorly. The applicant demonstrates few skills or abilities that complement the policy environment. The applicant has no prior policy experience and demonstrates few to no examples of and little to no interest in knowledge translation.</p>	<p>0.0 – 2.9</p>

Evaluating Achievements and Activities	Weighting – 20%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the number, importance and breadth of the applicant’s academic and non-academic achievements relative to their education and experience. These would include distinctions, awards and credentials, presentations, publications, knowledge translation activities and projects, and other recognizable achievements. For their level of training, has the applicant shown professional leadership and accomplishments in research-related and other activities? Has the applicant shown an interest in policy-related activities through the development of other skills and additional research activity? 	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Outstanding</p> <p>All aspects of the applicant’s distinctions, awards and activities for their stage of research career indicate recognition of a superior level of talent, both in terms of academics and extracurricular activities. The applicant’s activities also demonstrate an extremely high level of leadership, accomplishment, interest in and contribution to policy-related activities.</p>	<p>4.5 – 4.9</p>
<p>Excellent</p> <p>The applicant’s distinctions, awards and activities for their stage of research career indicate recognition of a superb level of talent, both in terms of academics and extracurricular activities. The applicant’s activities demonstrate a high level of leadership, accomplishment, and interest in policy-related activities.</p>	<p>4.0 – 4.4</p>
<p>Very Good</p> <p>The applicant has a reasonable number of distinctions, awards and activities for their stage of research career indicating an above-average level of talent, both in terms of academics and extracurricular activities. The applicant’s activities demonstrate an adequate level of leadership, accomplishment, and interest in policy-related activities.</p>	<p>3.5 – 3.9</p>
<p>Good</p> <p>The applicant has received a moderate number of distinctions, awards and activities for their stage of research career indicating an average level of talent, both in terms of academics and extracurricular activities. The applicant’s activities demonstrate a modest level of leadership, accomplishment, and interest in policy-related activities.</p>	<p>3.0 – 3.4</p>
<p>Less than Adequate</p> <p>The applicant has received a number of distinctions, awards and activities for their stage of research that indicate a below average level of talent, both in terms of academics and extracurricular activities. The applicant demonstrates little to no activities demonstrating leadership, accomplishment, or interest in policy-related activities.</p>	<p>0.0 – 2.9</p>

Evaluating the Letter of Reference	Weighting – 10%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use the letter of reference in your review to provide you with an overall impression of the applicant. • Does the letter of reference provide evidence of the applicant’s personal characteristics, strengths and skills that correlate with policy work, e.g. critical thinking, and communication, organizational and analytical skills? • Does the letter of reference from the academic supervisor support the applicant’s proposed interruption to their postdoctoral research program, and encourage participation in the fellowship? 	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Outstanding Reference is unanimously strong in its support of the applicant and provides highly detailed assessments of the applicant’s overall strengths, skills, and personal characteristics that align extremely well with working in a policy environment. The academic supervisor provides unconditional support and exceptional encouragement for the applicant to take up the fellowship, if awarded.</p>	<p>4.5 – 4.9</p>
<p>Excellent Reference is very positive in its support of the applicant and provides strong assessments of the applicant’s overall strengths, skills, and personal characteristics that correlate well with working in a policy environment. The academic supervisor provides strong support and encouragement for the applicant to take up the fellowship, if awarded.</p>	<p>4.0 – 4.4</p>
<p>Very Good Reference is mostly positive in its support of the applicant and provides good assessments of the applicant’s overall strengths, skills, and personal characteristics that can be mostly applied to a policy environment. The academic supervisor provides good support and some encouragement for the applicant to take up the fellowship, if awarded.</p>	<p>3.5 – 3.9</p>
<p>Good Reference is somewhat positive in its support of the applicant and provides only general assessments of the applicant’s overall strengths, skills, and personal characteristics that could be applied to a policy environment. The academic supervisor provides reasonably good support and modest encouragement for the applicant to take up the fellowship, if awarded.</p>	<p>3.0 – 3.4</p>
<p>Less than Adequate Reference is not positive in its support of the applicant and provides only a vague assessment of the applicant. The academic supervisor provides little to no support or encouragement for the applicant to take up the fellowship, if awarded.</p>	<p>2.0 – 2.9</p>