



2019 HEALTH PROFESSIONAL-INVESTIGATOR COMPETITION

EVALUATION CRITERIA

DEADLINES:

LETTER OF INTENT: **February 11, 2019, 4:30 P.M. PT**

FULL APPLICATION: **April 17, 2019, 4:30 P.M. PT**

Notice to panel chairs and scientific officers:

1. The panel is encouraged to use the full range of the rating scale (0.0 – 4.9) in assessing each application.
2. During the review panel meeting, discuss each application, and as panelists arrive at a consensus score, ensure that adjustments are made to the appropriate component of the overall score — and not to the overall score itself.

Note to all reviewers:

1. Read all assigned applications in detail before rating any of them.
2. Applications will be separated into and reviewed within two distinct pools: early career health professional researchers (within five years of obtaining the terminal research degree and/or within 10 years of obtaining the relevant health professional degree) and more established health professional researchers in order to ensure a more equitable review process.
3. Each application is rated in the following three evaluation areas: track record (30 percent), research proposal (45% percent), and research environment & support and impact of award (25 percent).
4. You are encouraged to use the full range of scores in assessing each application.
5. Be aware of unconscious bias, i.e., an implicit, unintentional attitude or assumption that effects the way one thinks or acts. MSFHR encourages all reviewers to review the [CIHR Unconscious Bias Training Module](#) prior to reviewing applications.
6. Please consider the following when assessing applications:
 - a. The proposed research project is being assessed as an integral part of the applicant's capability as a health researcher. MSFHR's funding is for the researcher — we do not fund the program of research *per se*.
 - b. Assess the overall research *capability* within the context of an applicant's relative career stage. Applicants who have recently completed their terminal research degree or health professional training are more likely to provide evidence for *potential* research ability compared to applicants who are more established in their careers, who will likely show more examples of *demonstrated* research ability. Within each context, both are legitimate forms of research capability.
 - c. Reviewers should take care not to disadvantage applicants for career interruptions such as pregnancy, early child care and/or illness or eldercare, which can influence opportunity for professional activities, research output and other related knowledge production.
 - d. Different disciplines and environments offer different opportunities for research output and forms of knowledge production.

- e. The reputation of the applicant's host institution should not affect the evaluation of the applicant.
 - f. Publications and contributions:
 - i. Different disciplines and environments offer different opportunities for research contributions, publications and other research related activities.
 - ii. Focus on the quality and impact of the publications, not simply the number.
 - iii. Applicants are advised to describe their contribution in multi-authored or collaborative publications. Reviewers should assess the specific contribution of the applicant to the work.
 - iv. Journal impact factors vary from discipline to discipline and do not necessarily indicate the quality of the individual publications.
 - v. Give consideration to justified delays in research and dissemination of research results, as some circumstances make it impossible or undesirable for researchers to publish results prior to applying.
 - g. The value and impact of an applicant's research environment and support within the context of their application as a whole is taken into account, not the size or reputation of the institution.
7. All applicants are encouraged to include a range of appropriate traditional and non-traditional knowledge translation (KT) activities in their research proposal in one of two ways:
- a. As components of the research proposal (the practice of KT).
 - b. As the focus of the research proposal (KT science). Applicants will declare themselves in this category but the final decision will be made by MSFHR. These applicants will be evaluated against additional KT science criteria.

Note: *KT science explores the theories, mechanism, concepts, and/or methods by which evidence is used in healthcare practice and policy. Additional information about, and resources on KT can be found [here](#).*

8. All applications have been screened by MSFHR staff and are deemed eligible for the 2019 HP-I competition.

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

In the written assessment, we request that you use only objective and non-inflammatory language, and to avoid language that might be construed as sarcastic, flippant, or inappropriate in any way.



| Track Record | Weighting – 30% |
|---|---|
| <p>Assessment Criteria</p> <p>The applicant should provide evidence of a track record that shows a committed interest in research. Please assess the applicant's track record in context to their career stage, and determine the applicant's potential for sustained research success based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider receipt of prestigious awards, prizes and distinctions, and acknowledgements for leadership and career achievements. • Consider the applicant's body of research and professional activities and contributions (including publications, policy papers, government reports, issue papers, etc.) as a whole: Has the applicant provided examples of how their activity has led, or could lead to a change in policy and/or practice? • Consider the applicant's expertise in the proposed area of research and relevant experiences; does the applicant possess the necessary research capability to successfully conduct the proposed research? • Assess the applicant's ability to successfully plan and engage in KT activities appropriate to the research (e.g. publications, communication with decision makers, community meetings, practice guidelines, research forums, presentations, etc.). • Assess the strengths, intellectual capacity and research capability of the applicant, as described by the applicant's referees. • Additional criteria for KT science research proposal only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does the applicant's previous contributions or clinical activities demonstrate a clear focus on KT science? | |
| Assessment Descriptor | Score |
| <p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence of a high number of prestigious and highly competitive prizes, awards and distinctions, and several acknowledgements for leadership and career achievement relative to the applicant's career stage. • The applicant has made several contributions that have significantly impacted their field and have directly led to change in policy and/or practice, and provides evidence of exceptional professional achievements. • The applicant provides evidence of extensive relevant research expertise and experiences, and numerous examples of highly creative advancement in their field. • The applicant demonstrates exceptional experience in a variety of KT activities appropriate to the research. • The letters of reference are from highly reputable individuals, providing detailed assessments of the applicant's strengths, research capability, and intellectual capacity, and are unanimous in their support for the applicant. • For KT science research proposal only: The applicant demonstrates an exceptional understanding and impressive history of KT science-related work. | <p>4.5 – 4.9</p> <p>may be funded</p> |
| <p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence of several important prizes, awards and distinctions, and acknowledgements for leadership and career achievement relative to the applicant's career stage. | <p>4.0 – 4.4</p> <p>may be funded</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant has made several contributions that have impacted their field and have strong potential to change in policy and/or practice, and provides evidence of strong professional achievements. • The applicant provides strong evidence of relevant research expertise and experiences, and evidence of consistent creative advancement in their field. • The applicant demonstrates considerable experience in a variety of KT activities that are mostly appropriate to the proposed research. • The letters of reference are of high quality and from credible and authoritative sources providing a reasonable assessment of the applicant's strengths, research capability, and intellectual capacity, and are strong in their support for the applicant. • For KT science research proposal only: The applicant demonstrates a strong understanding and history of KT science-related work. | |
| <p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence of receipt of some prizes, awards and distinctions, and acknowledgements for leadership and career achievement relative to the applicant's career stage. • The applicant has made some notable contributions that have had moderate impact in their field and some potential to change in policy and/or practice, and provides evidence of some professional achievements. • The applicant provides solid and mostly relevant evidence of research expertise and experiences, and some creative advancement in their field. • The applicant demonstrates a suitable level of experience in a variety of KT activities that are mostly appropriate to the proposed research. • The letters of reference are from credible sources and provide a positive, but general assessment of the applicant's strengths, research capability, and intellectual capacity, and are generally positive in their support for the applicant. • For KT science research proposal only: The applicant demonstrates an appropriate understanding and some past evidence of KT science-related work, with the potential for more in future activities. | <p>3.5 – 3.9</p> <p>may be funded (above 3.8)</p> |
| <p>Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence of some prizes, awards and distinctions, and acknowledgements for leadership and career achievement, but relatively fewer in number and/or from less competitive sources. • The applicant has made modest contributions that have had limited impact in their field, and limited ability to affect change in policy and/or practice, and provides limited evidence of any professional achievement. • The applicant provides limited evidence of relevant research expertise and experiences, and modest creative advancement relative to their field. • The applicant demonstrates an adequate level of experience in limited examples of KT activities, not all of which are appropriate for the proposed research. | <p>3.0 – 3.4</p> <p>not fundable</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The letters of reference are from credible sources but provide limited details about the applicant's strengths, research capability, and intellectual capacity, and are positive, but low-key in their support for the applicant. For KT science research proposal only: The applicant demonstrates a basic understanding and relatively few instances of KT science-related work. | |
| <p>Less than Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is little evidence of prizes, awards and distinctions, and acknowledgements for leadership and career achievement relative to the applicant's career stage. The applicant's contributions have had little-to-no impact in their field, with no evidence of any ability to influence change in policy and/or practice, and few, if any examples of relevant professional achievement. The applicant provides no demonstrable evidence of relevant research capabilities or creative advancement relative to their field. The applicant demonstrates an unsuitable level of experience in knowledge translation activities, and/or provides examples that are irrelevant to the proposed research. The letters of reference are brief, impersonal, and with little information about the applicant's strengths, research capability, and intellectual capacity, and are muted or ambiguous their support for the applicant. For KT science research proposal only: The applicant demonstrates no understanding or past evidence of KT science-related work. | <p>0.0 – 2.9</p> <p>not fundable</p> |

| Research Proposal | Weighting – 45% |
|--|-----------------|
| <p>Assessment Criteria</p> <p>The applicant's research proposal should provide detail for the first three years of the salary award (i.e. up until renewal), but should also include some information on potential research plans for years four and five. The research proposal should include details on specific aims, rationale, methodology, setting or location, information about collaborators (if applicable), feasibility and a timeline. Consider the following when assessing the applicants' proposed research project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conceptual framework, design, and methods: Are they adequately described, well-integrated, innovative, and relevant to the specific aims of the research project? Is the proposed research well-aligned with the applicant's knowledge and abilities? The potential for advancement of knowledge: Does the proposed research address a need or gap in health research, or generate evidence that informs best practices for health and/or health care in BC that will have an impact on patient outcomes? Is the proposed research feasible within the initial three-year time frame of the award and does it include consideration for future directions of study? | |

| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are KT-related activities embedded within the program of research through, for example, researcher user¹ engagement, research dissemination and/or research uptake activities, both within and beyond the clinical research community? • Additional criteria for KT science research proposal only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does the research proposal describe how the dissemination or implementation of research findings is being studied²? ○ Does the research proposal address the study of both the process and the outcomes of KT research through an overarching conceptual model or theory? ○ Will the research proposal add to the body of knowledge on effective KT? | |
|--|---|
| Assessment Descriptor | Score |
| <p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed research project represents innovative and original leading-edge concepts, and describes hypotheses and methodologies that are of the caliber expected of a health professional-researcher who is at the forefront of the field. • The proposed research is perfectly aligned with the applicant's skills and abilities. • The proposed research has exceedingly high potential for knowledge advancement and identifies an extremely significant health research gap or method of implementation that will have a substantial and far-reaching impact on health and/or health care. • The feasibility and projected schedule for completing the research proposal are clear and realistic, and future considerations for the project are thoughtful and well-articulated. • KT activities included are highly appropriate and effective, occur throughout the research project within and beyond the clinical research community as appropriate to the program of research. • For KT science research proposal only: The proposed research project provides a clear plan on how findings will be implemented and/or disseminated, clearly addresses the processes and outcomes through a coherent and effective framework, and will be an invaluable addition to the body of effective KT. | <p>4.5 – 4.9</p> <p>may be funded</p> |
| <p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed research project is of high quality, and presents concepts and methodology that are pertinent and highly innovative. • The proposed research is well-aligned with the applicant's skills and abilities. | <p>4.0 – 4.4</p> <p>may be funded</p> |

¹ Research users are the target audience(s) of research evidence. Research users are experts on their needs, environment and local context. Including research users as equal members of the research team will ideally result in more relevant research evidence and an increased likelihood of its use for the purpose of making informed decisions about health policies, programs and/or practices. A research user may include, but is not limited to, other researchers, policy makers, health care practitioners, decision makers, health care administrators, educators, patient user group, or health charity, and the public. [Adapted from Canadian Institutes of Health Research's 'Guide to Knowledge Translation Planning at CIHR: Integrated and End-of-Grant Approaches', www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/45321.html; accessed September 27, 2017].

² Refer to [Proctor et al. \(2012\) Implementation Science, 7:96](#) for additional KT Science research proposal criteria.

| | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed research has strong potential for knowledge advancement and identifies an important health research gap or method of implementation that will have a strong impact on health and/or health care. • The feasibility is sound and the projected schedule for completing the research proposal is realistic, and future work is well-described and represents creative and exciting extensions of the current project. • Knowledge translation activities are appropriate and effective, occur throughout the research project within and beyond the clinical research community as appropriate to the program of research. • For KT science research proposal only: The proposed research proposal provides clear detail on how findings will be implemented and/or disseminated, addresses most of the proposed outcomes and will be a great addition to the body of effective KT. | |
| <p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The concepts and methodology presented in the research proposal are pertinent and well-presented, and generally support the goals of the proposed research. • The proposed research is mostly aligned with the applicant's skills and abilities. • The proposal shows some potential for knowledge advancement and identifies a health research gap or method of implementation that will have a notable impact on health and/or health care. • The proposed research is generally feasible with only minor concerns regarding the projected schedule for completion, and future work is outlined representing mostly conventional extensions of the core project. • Knowledge translation activities are planned to occur throughout the research project within and beyond the clinical research as appropriate to the program of research. • For KT science research proposal only: The proposed research project provides evidence on how findings will be implemented and/or disseminated, but lacks some detail. It addresses many of the proposed outcomes and will be a useful addition to the body of effective KT. | <p>3.5 – 3.9</p> <p>may be funded (above 3.8)</p> |
| <p>Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The concepts and methodology presented in the research proposal are valid, but description of some concepts and methodology need more clarification. • The proposed research proposal is somewhat aligned with the applicant's skills and abilities. • The proposal shows some potential for knowledge advancement, and identifies a health research gap or method of implementation that will have a limited impact on health and/or health care. • The feasibility and projected schedule for completing the proposed research are adequate and a brief outline of future research plans are included, but with questionable relevance and a general lack of detail. • KT activities are planned to occur, but for when and to whom is unclear, making their potential effectiveness suspect. | <p>3.0 – 3.4</p> <p>not fundable</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For KT science research proposal only: The proposed research proposal provides limited detail on how findings will be implemented and/or disseminated, and addresses only some of the proposed outcomes. Its contribution to the body of effective KT will have limited impact on the field. | |
| <p>Less than Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed research may be valid but its experimental design and methodologies are flawed, unclear and underdeveloped. • The proposed research is mostly incompatible with the applicant's skills and abilities. • The proposed research does not appear to have the potential for advancing knowledge in the area and fails to identify any health research gap or method of implementation that would have an impact on health and/or health care. • The feasibility and projected schedule for completing the research proposal is unrealistic, and no thought is given to future avenues of research past the three year time frame of the award. • Little-to-no KT activity has been included in the proposal • For KT science research proposal only: The proposed research proposal provides no evidence on how findings will be implemented and/or disseminated, fails to address the proposed research outcomes and does not contribute to the body of effective KT. | <p>0.0 – 2.9</p> <p>not fundable</p> |

| Research Environment & Support and Award Impact | Weighting – 25% |
|---|---|
| <p>Assessment Criteria</p> <p>It is vital for an application to demonstrate strong departmental/institutional support to the applicant's research development and productivity, and provide evidence of a commitment for at least 50 percent of their time to be protected for research. Elements to consider include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear acknowledgment of support from the applicant's department head, or equivalent, for the required appointment, protected research time and a commitment of continued support post-award. • The availability and accessibility of personnel, facilities, and infrastructure required to conduct the proposed research: Is the proposed research environment appropriate for the research proposal, including KT activities? • Access to relevant thought leaders and other knowledge resources: Is adequate research support and/or mentorship available? • Is there evidence of organizational resources (e.g. administrative services, infrastructural support, etc.) that would support the proposed research? • The level of impact the award will have on the applicant's research career trajectory. | |
| Assessment Descriptor | Score |
| <p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is unqualified commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required protection of time and research appointment needed to take up the award, and continued support post-award. | <p>4.5 – 4.9</p> <p>may be funded</p> |



| | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant's research environment is ideally set-up and well-equipped for the proposed research and associated KT activities, and provides all the necessary resources for success of the research project. • The applicant has already established strong connections with mentors and/or research experts in the field to enhance the required expertise needed for the proposed research. • There is unequivocal and extensive evidence of physical, financial and administrative resources from the department/host institution (space, operating funds and/or equipment, etc.) to support the proposed research project. • Receipt of the award will have a tremendous impact on the applicant's research career, helping to ensure future success as a health professional-investigator. | |
| <p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a strong commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required appointment and protected research time for the duration of award, and continued support post-award. • The applicant's research environment is well set-up and equipped for the proposed research and provides strong resources to help ensure success of the project. • The applicant has ready access to, and has established some contact with experienced mentors and those with additional research expertise in the applicant's area of study. • There is considerable evidence of physical, financial and administrative resources from the department/host institution (space, operating funds and/or equipment) to support the proposed research project. • Receipt of the award will have a substantial impact on the applicant's research career, likely helping to ensure future success as a health professional-investigator. | <p>4.0 – 4.4</p> <p>may be funded</p> |
| <p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence of a firm commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required appointment and protected research time for the duration of award, and conditional commitment for continued support post-award. • The applicant's research environment is suitably set-up with some key equipment available for the proposed research, but lacks some of the necessary resources required for success. • The applicant has some access to recognized experts in the applicant's area of study, and relevant mentors who can provide research or career guidance. • There is some evidence of physical and financial resources from the host institution (space, start-up funds and/or equipment), to support the proposed research project. • Receipt of the award will have a noted impact on the applicant's research career, contributing somewhat to the future success as a health professional-investigator. | <p>3.5 – 3.9</p> <p>may be funded (above 3.8)</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence of a generally positive, but tenuous commitment from the host institution to provide the required appointment and protected research time for the duration of award is provided, and only a vague assurance of support post-award. • The applicant's research environment is somewhat set-up for the proposed research, but is missing some key equipment/materials that will need to be outsourced, making the success of the project somewhat questionable. • The applicant has potential, but unconfirmed access to relevant research expertise and mentors in the applicant's area of study, but is making an effort to establish connections. • Evidence of physical and financial resources from the host institution (space, start-up funds and/or equipment) is mentioned, but in ambiguous terms. • Receipt of the award will have a very limited impact on the applicant's research career, possibly contributing to future success as a health professional-investigator. | <p>3.0 – 3.4</p> <p>not fundable</p> |
| <p>Less than Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no stated commitment from the host institution to provide the required appointment and protection of time for the duration of the award, or afterwards. • The applicant's research environment is inadequate for the proposed research and does not provide the suitable resources necessary for the success of the proposed research. • The applicant has no confirmed to mentors or experts in the applicant's field of study, and provides no indication that an effort is being made to find and/or connect to them. • There is no evidence of support from the host institution for physical or financial resources. • Receipt of the award will have little-to-no impact on the applicant's research career, and will be mostly irrelevant to future success as a health professional-investigator. | <p>0.0 – 2.9</p> <p>not fundable</p> |

Mitacs Accelerate Application Proposal (if applicable)

Assessment Criteria

Refer to the Mitacs Accelerate Application proposal (Part 1) upload, and the relevant section in Additional Information of the HP-I application form. The assessment of this information is not to be included in the overall score of the HP-I application, but rather considered separately. Please comment on the following elements as they relate to the HP-I project as a whole:

- The proposed intern(s)'s role in the HP-I project is appropriate for their academic degree level, and beneficial to the intern(s)'s training and career development.
- The proposed project involving the intern has no adverse effects on the environment.

