



2018 HEALTH PROFESSIONAL-INVESTIGATOR COMPETITION



EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR LETTER OF INTENT

The key purpose of the Letter of Intent (LOI) is to determine if an applicant has a level of research experience and/or expertise that will allow them to successfully complete the proposed research project.

Note to reviewers:

- Read all assigned LOIs before scoring any of them.
- LOIs must be scored in each of the following three areas (each area weighted equally):
 1. Research track record and mentorship
 2. Relevant research expertise
 3. Proposed research
- Applicants must score a total of **3.0 or higher** in order to be invited to submit a full application. Please utilize the full range of the 4.9 scale when scoring.
- Please consider the following when scoring:
 - The proposed research project is being assessed as an integral part of the applicant's development as an independent researcher within the health system. MSFHR's funding is ultimately for the researcher – we do not fund the research project *per se*.
 - Research contributions:
 - i. Different disciplines and environments offer different opportunities for research contributions, publications and other forms of knowledge production.
 - ii. Focus on the quality and impact of published works and contributions to grey literature, not simply the number.
 - iii. Applicants are advised to describe their contributions to multi-authored or collaborative works. Reviewers should assess the specific contribution of the applicant to the work.
 - iv. For academic publications, journal impact factors can vary from discipline to discipline and do not necessarily indicate the quality of the individual publications.

Note: KT Science applications will be subject to additional evaluation criteria. KT science explores the theories, mechanisms, concepts and/or methods by which evidence is used in health care practice and policy.

- All LOIs have been reviewed by MSFHR research competitions staff and are eligible for the 2018 Health Professional-Investigator LOI stage.





MICHAEL SMITH FOUNDATION
FOR HEALTH RESEARCH

Discover. Connect. Engage.

- Please provide the rationale for your assessment, especially for instances where LOIs are rated near or below 3.0. Whenever possible, please provide constructive advice to assist applicants in improving the quality of their current or future applications.

We thank you for using only objective and non-inflammatory language, and for avoiding language that might be construed as sarcastic, flippant or inappropriate in any way.



Research Track Record and Mentorship	
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <p>The applicant has a track record that demonstrates previous experience and a committed interest in research. This should be reflected in the appropriate sections of the LOI and the abbreviated CCV. Please assess the applicant’s research track record in the context of their career stage and determine the applicant’s potential for successfully completing their proposed research project based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the applicant’s research training (formal or experiential): is the level of research training and expertise adequate for research? • Consider the quality of the applicant’s research activities and contributions (including publications, policy papers, government reports, issue papers, etc.) • Consider the applicant’s access to research mentorship and/or continuing research learning, and thought leaders in the applicant’s proposed field of research. • Additional criteria for KT science research proposal only: Do the applicant’s previous research activities and contributions demonstrate a clear focus on KT science? 	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Excellent to Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant shows clear evidence of previous research training and/or experience, which is more than appropriate for successful completion of the proposed research project. • The applicant has an impressive record of research contributions and activities that will undoubtedly ensure the success of the proposed research. • The applicant has unfettered access to mentors and/or continuing learning resources and relevant thought leaders necessary for successful completion of their research. • For KT science research proposal only: The applicant demonstrates an impressive understanding and history of KT science-related work. 	<p>4.0 – 4.9</p>



<p>Good to Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant shows some evidence of previous research training and/or experience, and this level of training and experience is adequate for completion of the proposed research project. • The applicant has a sufficient record of research contributions and activities that will help to ensure some success of the proposed research. • The applicant has reasonable access to mentors and/or continuing learning resources and relevant thought leaders that will help guide them to complete their research. • For KT science research proposal only: The applicant demonstrates a strong understanding and history of KT science-related work. 	<p>3.0 – 3.9</p>
<p>Less than Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant does not provide enough evidence of adequate research experience, and what is provided is not appropriate or applicable for completing the proposed research project. • The applicant has a relatively weak record of research contributions and activities, likely making the proposed research difficult to complete. • The applicant has a vague or incomplete mentorship plan and/or does not have ready access to continuing research learning resources to adequately fill knowledge gaps for completion of the proposed research. • For KT science research proposal only: The applicant demonstrates no clear understanding or past evidence of KT science-related work. 	<p>0.0 – 2.9</p>

Relevant Research Expertise	
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <p>The applicant should clearly articulate how their combined professional and research expertise and experiences are relevant to their proposed research project. Please assess the relevance of the applicant's expertise to their proposed research project based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the applicant's combined professional and research expertise generally align with the main topic of the proposed research project? • Does the applicant's combined professional and research expertise and experience allow for the successful completion of the proposed research project (i.e. do they possess the level of knowledge necessary to successfully conduct the methodologies presented in the proposed research)? 	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Excellent to Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant's combined professional and research expertise perfectly aligns with the main topic of the proposed research project. • The applicant possesses an exceptional skillset and knowledge base that will allow for successful completion of the proposed research project. 	4.0 – 4.9
<p>Good to Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant's combined professional and research expertise generally aligns with the main topic of the proposed research topic. • The applicant possesses a general skillset and knowledge base that will allow for completion of the proposed research project. 	3.0 – 3.9
<p>Less than Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant's combined professional and research expertise does not align with the main topic of the proposed research project. • The applicant possesses an incomplete skillset and weak knowledge base that makes successful completion of the proposed research project unlikely. 	0.0 – 2.9

Proposed Research	
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <p>The proposed research should clearly indicate the overall significance of the project as well as its aims and methodologies. Assessment should be based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the design and methodology clear and well-integrated into the research proposal? • Does the proposed research align with the purpose and objectives of this funding opportunity? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Will the research contribute to health, health care and/or health system innovation? • Additional criteria for KT science research proposal only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does the research address the study of both the process and the outcomes of the KT research? ○ Will the program of research add to the body of knowledge on effective KT? 	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Excellent to Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design and methodologies of the proposed research project are extremely well-described and highly appropriate for the problem or topic being studied. • The proposed research perfectly aligns with the purpose and objectives of this funding opportunity and will likely contribute significantly to health, health care and/or health system innovation. • For KT science research proposal only: The research clearly addresses KT science processes and outcomes and will significantly add to the body of knowledge on effective KT. 	<p>4.0 – 4.9</p>
<p>Good to Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design and methodologies of the proposed research project are adequately described and appear to be appropriate for the problem or topic being studied. • The proposed research mostly aligns with the purpose and objectives of this funding opportunity, and could potentially contribute to health, health care and/or health system innovation. • For KT science research proposal only: The research mostly addresses KT science processes and outcomes that will add to the body of knowledge on effective KT. 	<p>3.0 – 3.9</p>



<p>Less than Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design and methodologies of the proposed research project are ambiguous and/or insufficient or inappropriate for the problem or topic being studied. • The proposed research does not align with the purpose and objectives of this funding opportunity and is unlikely to contribute to health, health care and/or health system innovation. • For KT science research proposal only: The research does not address KT science processes and outcomes, and will result in little contribution to the body of knowledge on effective KT. 	<p>0.0 – 2.9</p>
--	-------------------------

