



MICHAEL SMITH FOUNDATION  
FOR HEALTH RESEARCH

Discover. Connect. Engage.

## 2018 REACH COMPETITION

### EVALUATION CRITERIA

Last updated: **March 7, 2018**

**Instructions for all reviewers:**

- Read all assigned applications before rating any of them.
- Use this document as a guide to assist you in establishing a rating for each criterion according to the assessment descriptors provided.
- Applications must be rated in each of the three evaluation areas:
  - Proposed activity (40%)
  - Merit and feasibility (40%)
  - Potential impact (20%)

All applications have been screened by MSFHR staff and are eligible for the 2018 Reach competition.

Reviewers are asked to provide their written assessment of each assigned application that supports their ratings to MSFHR ApplyNet. Please provide constructive advice to assist applicants in improving the quality of their applications. Please also explain the rationale for your assessment.

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.



Proposed Activity	Weighting – 40%
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	
<p>Please consider the following when assessing the applicant’s proposed dissemination activity/ies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose, objectives, outcomes, etc. of the proposed work are described and in alignment with the objectives of this funding opportunity.</li> <li>• The benefits to the target audience(s) are described.</li> <li>• Appropriate research users (research community, knowledge-users, public, etc. and sectors (private, public, etc.)) have been identified and are included.</li> <li>• A description of follow-up activities to evaluate outcomes and/or intended impacts has been included.</li> <li>• The research/health professional trainee has been included in a meaningful way within the project demonstrating effective knowledge translation (KT) capacity-building.</li> <li>• Letter(s) of support from collaborators and/or stakeholders demonstrates their commitment to the proposed work and outline any resources provided, if applicable.</li> </ul>	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<b>Outstanding</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The description of the proposed work is exceptional. The purpose, objectives, and proposed outcomes are extremely well thought out and clearly articulated, and strongly align with the objectives of this funding opportunity.</li> <li>• The benefits to the target audience from the dissemination activity are clearly evident and highly enriching.</li> <li>• The application clearly identifies and includes relevant research users with strong justification for their participation.</li> <li>• A thorough and highly effective plan to evaluate outcomes and/or intended impacts is presented.</li> <li>• The trainee plays an essential role in the project; the application includes an exceptional and effective training plan for KT capacity-building.</li> <li>• The application provides evidence of unconditional commitment from stakeholder groups/collaborators through a letter(s) of support, if applicable.</li> </ul>	<p><b>4.5 – 4.9</b></p> <p><b>May be funded</b></p>
<b>Excellent</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose, objectives and outcomes of the proposed work are extremely well presented and clearly described, and are in alignment with the award objectives.</li> </ul>	



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The benefits to the target audience from the dissemination activity are meaningful and well described.</li> <li>• The application identifies and includes relevant research users with justification for their participation.</li> <li>• An appropriate and effective plan to evaluate outcomes and/or intended impacts is described.</li> <li>• The trainee plays a central role in the project; the application includes a strong training plan for KT capacity-building.</li> <li>• The application provides evidence of strong commitment from stakeholder groups/collaborators through a letter(s) of support, if applicable.</li> </ul>	<p><b>4.0 – 4.4</b></p> <p><b>May be funded</b></p>
<p><b>Very Good</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose, objectives and outcomes of the proposed work are well-defined and mostly align with the award objectives.</li> <li>• The benefits to the target audience from the dissemination activity are described and will ensure some uptake of relevant knowledge occurs.</li> <li>• The application identifies and includes mostly relevant research users and provides suitable justification for them.</li> <li>• A plan to evaluate outcomes and/or intended impacts is reasonably described.</li> <li>• The trainee plays a solid supporting role in the project; the application includes a reasonable plan for KT capacity-building.</li> <li>• The application provides evidence of commitment from some, but not all identified stakeholder groups/collaborators through a letter(s) of support, if applicable.</li> </ul>	<p><b>3.5 – 3.9</b></p> <p><b>May be funded (above 3.8)</b></p>
<p><b>Good</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose, objectives and outcomes of the proposed work are included, but with modest detail, and are only somewhat aligned with the award objectives.</li> <li>• The benefits to the target audience from the dissemination activity are outlined, but lack detail.</li> <li>• The application identifies and includes some relevant research users, but lacks detailed justification for them.</li> <li>• A plan to evaluate outcomes and/or intended impacts is included, but lacks specific details or timelines.</li> <li>• The trainee plays only a secondary role in the project; the application includes a general plan for KT capacity-building that lacks specifics.</li> </ul>	<p><b>3.0 – 3.4</b></p> <p><b>Not fundable</b></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some stakeholder groups/collaborators have been identified, but their relevance to the proposal is unclear, and they only provide ambiguous commitments, if applicable.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Less than Adequate</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose, objectives and outcomes of the proposed work are either not included or severely lack appropriate detail.</li> <li>Little to no tangible benefit of the dissemination activity, or its potential impact is indicated.</li> <li>The application severely lacks relevant research users, and any adequate justification for them.</li> <li>The trainee does not play a meaningful role in the project; the application does not includes a plan for KT capacity-building.</li> <li>No plan to evaluate outcomes and/or intended impacts is included.</li> <li>The application does not include other stakeholders/collaborators when clearly some should have been included in order for the activity to be successful.</li> </ul>	<p><b>0.0 – 2.9</b></p> <p><b>Not fundable</b></p>



Merit and Feasibility		Weighting – 40%
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>		
<p>Please consider the following when assessing the merit and feasibility of the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dissemination activity described in the proposal is effective and appropriate for the target audience.</li> <li>• The research evidence to be disseminated is supported by a relevant and trusted body of knowledge.</li> <li>• The participating researcher(s) and research user(s) are appropriate for the proposed work, and details on the role and degree of participation are provided for each team member.</li> <li>• The requested budget is appropriate and justified for the proposed work plan.</li> <li>• The work plan is reasonable and achievable within the proposed timeframe.</li> </ul>		
Assessment Descriptor	Score	
<b>Outstanding</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The format and content of the dissemination activity is perfectly tailored to the intended target audience.</li> <li>• Research evidence to be disseminated is supported by a highly reputable and high-impact body of work.</li> <li>• The role and participation of researchers and research user team members are appropriate, well-described and highly justified for the proposed dissemination activity.</li> <li>• The requested budget is highly appropriate and well justified for the proposed work.</li> <li>• The work plan is exceptionally well-crafted, with clearly defined objectives that are highly achievable within the proposed timeframe.</li> </ul>	<p><b>4.5 – 4.9</b></p> <p><b>May be funded</b></p>	
<b>Excellent</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The format and content of the dissemination activity is well-adapted to the intended target audience.</li> <li>• Research evidence to be disseminated is supported by a highly reliable and well-known body of work.</li> <li>• The role and participation of researchers and research user team members are appropriate and clearly justified for the proposed dissemination activity.</li> <li>• The requested budget is appropriate and well justified for the proposed work.</li> </ul>	<p><b>4.0 – 4.4</b></p> <p><b>May be funded</b></p>	



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work plan is clearly articulated with defined objectives that are achievable within the proposed timeframe.</li> </ul>	
<b>Very Good</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The format and content of the dissemination activity is appropriate for the intended target audience.</li> <li>Research evidence to be disseminated is supported by a recognized, but limited body of work.</li> <li>The role and participation of researchers and research user team members are clear and mostly justified for the proposed work.</li> <li>The requested budget is suitable for the proposed work, with reasonable justification included.</li> <li>The work plan is effectively described with the inclusion of practical objectives that are likely achievable within the proposed timeframe.</li> </ul>	<p><b>3.5 – 3.9</b></p> <p><b>May be funded (above 3.8)</b></p>
<b>Good</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The format and content of the dissemination activity is somewhat tailored to the intended target audience.</li> <li>Research evidence to be disseminated is partially supported by a relatively small body of work with limited impact.</li> <li>The role and participation of researchers and research user team members are described in some detail, but lack clear justification for their inclusion in the proposed work.</li> <li>The requested budget is somewhat appropriate for the proposed work, but lacks clear justification and detail.</li> <li>The work plan provides only generalized details with the inclusion of vague objectives that may be achievable within the proposed timeframe.</li> </ul>	<p><b>3.0 – 3.4</b></p> <p><b>Not fundable</b></p>
<b>Less than Adequate</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The format and content of the dissemination activity is not appropriate for the intended target audience.</li> <li>Research evidence to be disseminated is generally unsupported by a relevant body of work, making it highly questionable.</li> <li>The role and participation of researchers and research user team members are described in limited detail, and lack clear justification for their inclusion in the proposed work.</li> </ul>	<p><b>0.0 – 2.9</b></p> <p><b>Not fundable</b></p>



- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The requested budget is inappropriate for the proposed work and lacks clear justification and detail.</li><li>• The work plan lacks appropriate detail and is unlikely to be achievable within the proposed timeframe.</li></ul> |  |
|--|--|



Potential Impact	Weighting – 20%
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	
<p>Please consider the following when assessing the applicant’s proposed dissemination activity/ies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed dissemination activity demonstrates relevance to, and has potential to positively impact the health of British Columbians and the BC health system.</li> <li>• The research evidence being disseminated has potential to inform and/or improve further health research, practice and/or policy.</li> <li>• The proposed dissemination activity sets out to establish continued collaboration between researchers and research users following the end of the award term.</li> </ul>	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<b>Outstanding</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed dissemination activity is highly relevant and will positively impact the health of British Columbians and/or the BC health system.</li> <li>• The proposed dissemination activity has a high likelihood of informing and/or improving further health research, practice and/or policy.</li> <li>• An exceptionally well-developed plan is in place to ensure that meaningful and productive collaborations between researchers and research users continue following the end of this funding opportunity.</li> </ul>	<p><b>4.5 – 4.9</b></p> <p><b>May be funded</b></p>
<b>Excellent</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed dissemination activity is very relevant and has strong potential to impact the health of British Columbians and/or the BC health system.</li> <li>• The proposed dissemination activity will most likely inform and/or improve further health research, practice and/or policy.</li> <li>• A strong plan is in place to ensure that effective collaborations between researchers and research users continue following the end of this funding opportunity.</li> </ul>	<p><b>4.0 – 4.4</b></p> <p><b>May be funded</b></p>
<b>Very Good</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed dissemination activity is mostly relevant and has some potential to impact the health of British Columbians and the BC health system.</li> <li>• The proposed dissemination activity will inform and/or improve further health research, practice and/or policy to some extent.</li> </ul>	<p><b>3.5 – 3.9</b></p> <p><b>May be funded (above 3.8)</b></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A solid plan is described to ensure that collaborations between researchers and research users continue following the end of this funding opportunity.</li> </ul>	
<b>Good</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed dissemination activity is of limited interest and relevance to the health of British Columbians and the BC health system.</li> <li>• The proposed dissemination activity may facilitate the use of some research evidence to inform and/or improve further health research, practice and/or policy.</li> <li>• A broad plan is included that outlines possible future collaborations between researchers and research following the end of this funding opportunity.</li> </ul>	<p><b>3.0 – 3.4</b></p> <p><b>Not fundable</b></p>
<b>Less than Adequate</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed dissemination activity is of minimal interest and relevance to the health of British Columbians and the BC health system.</li> <li>• It is highly unlikely the proposed dissemination activity will inform and/or improve further health research, practice and/or policy.</li> <li>• There is little-to-no description of a plan for future collaborations between researchers and research following the end of this funding opportunity.</li> </ul>	<p><b>0.0 – 2.9</b></p> <p><b>Not fundable</b></p>