MICHAEL SMITH FOUNDATION FOR HEALTH RESEARCH

BC's health research funding agency

2019 REACH COMPETITION

⟫ EVALUATION CRITERIA

DEADLINE: **MAY 30, 2019, 4:30 P.M. PT**

Quality of Proposed Activity	Weighting – 40%

Assessment Criteria

Please consider the following when assessing the applicant's proposed dissemination activity/ies:

- The purpose and objectives of the proposed work are described and in alignment with the objectives of this funding opportunity.
- The application includes a description of the dissemination activity, tool or product, including the desired audience and how the work will benefit them.
- The application lists the primary outcomes/outputs of the proposed dissemination activity, tool or product, and how they will be measured and evaluated.
- The application explains how researchers and research users will engage in the co-development and implementation of the proposed work.
- The research/health professional trainee has been included in a meaningful way.

Assessment Descriptor	Score
Outstanding • The purpose and objectives are extremely well thought-out, clearly written, and perfectly align with the objectives of this funding opportunity. • The description of the proposed work is exceptional; the benefits to the identified target audience from the dissemination activity are clearly evident and highly enriching. • The primary outcomes/outputs are extremely well described, clearly providing a process for how to measure and evaluate them. • The application clearly explains how researchers and research users will engage in the co-development and implementation of the proposed work. • The trainee plays an essential role in the project; the application includes a unique and effective plan for knowledge translation (KT) capacity-building.	**4.5 – 4.9** **may be funded**
Excellent • The purpose and objectives for the proposed work are well-presented and clearly described, and strongly align with the award objectives. • The description of the proposed work is clear and complete; the benefits to the target audience from the dissemination activity are meaningful and well described. • The primary outcomes/outputs are clear and well planned, providing an effective process for how to measure and evaluate them. • The application includes an effective plan for how researchers and research users will engage in the co-development and implementation of the proposed work. • The trainee plays a central role in the project; the application includes a strong plan for KT capacity-building.	**4.0 – 4.4** **may be funded**
Very Good • The purpose and objectives for the proposed work are outlined and mostly align with the award objectives.	**3.5 – 3.9** **may be funded**

• The description of the proposed work provides a general picture of the proposed activity, tool or product; the benefits to the target audience are described and will ensure that some uptake of relevant knowledge occurs. • The primary outcomes/outputs are outlined in some detail, providing a suitable process for how to measure and evaluate them. • The application includes a reasonable plan for how researchers and research users will engage in the co-development and implementation of the proposed work. • The trainee plays an important supporting role in the project; the application includes a reasonable plan for KT capacity-building.	
Fair • The purpose and objectives of the proposed work are included, but with modest detail, and are only somewhat aligned with the award objectives. • The application provides an overly-generalized outline of the proposed work; the benefits to the target audience from the dissemination activity appear to be minimal and incongruent with the proposed work. • The primary outcomes/outputs are vaguely outlined, providing only limited detail for a process to measure and evaluate them. • The application includes only a vague outline for how researchers and research users will engage in the co-development and implementation of the proposed work. • The trainee plays only a background role in the proposed work with modest participation; the application includes a minimal plan for KT capacity-building that lacks specifics.	**3.0 – 3.4** **not fundable**
Less than Adequate • The purpose and objectives of the proposed work are either not included or severely lack appropriate detail. • The description of the proposed work provided is poorly written and lacks suitable details; specific audiences have not been identified and little to no tangible benefit of the dissemination activity, or its potential impact is indicated. • The primary outcomes/outputs are not clearly listed, with no discernable details on how they are to be measured or evaluated. • The application includes no clear plan for how researchers and research users will engage in the co-development and implementation of the proposed work. • The trainee does not play a meaningful role in the project; the application does not include any plan for KT capacity-building.	**0.0 – 2.9** **not fundable**

EVALUATION CRITERIA

2019 **REACH** COMPETITION   2

Merit and Feasibility	Weighting – 40%

Assessment Criteria
Please consider the following when assessing the merit and feasibility of the application:
- The dissemination activity described in the proposal is effective and appropriate for the target audience.
- The research evidence to be disseminated is supported by a relevant and trusted body of knowledge.
- The participating researcher(s) and research user(s) team members are appropriate for the proposed work, and details on their role and degree of participation are provided.
- The requested budget is appropriate and justified for the proposed work plan.
- The proposed work plan is reasonable and achievable within the proposed timeframe, and clearly outlines milestones and deliverables.

Assessment Descriptor	Score
Outstanding • The format and content of the dissemination activity is extremely effective and perfectly tailored to the intended target audience. • The research evidence to be disseminated is supported by a highly reputable and high-impact body of work. • The role and participation of researcher and research user team members are appropriate, well-described and highly justified for the proposed dissemination activity. • The requested budget is perfectly aligned and justified for the proposed work. • The work plan is exceptionally well-crafted, with clearly defined milestones and deliverables that are highly achievable within the proposed timeframe.	**4.5 – 4.9** **may be funded**
Excellent • The format and content of the dissemination activity is highly effective and well-adapted to the intended target audience. • The research evidence to be disseminated is supported by a highly reliable and well-known body of work. • The role and participation of researcher and research user team members are appropriate and clearly justified for the proposed dissemination activity. • The requested budget is appropriate and well-justified for the proposed work. • The proposed work plan is clearly articulated, highlighting all the necessary details, with well-defined milestones and deliverables that are achievable within the proposed timeframe.	**4.4 – 4.0** **may be funded**
Very Good • The format and content of the dissemination activity is generally effective and appropriate for the intended target audience. • The research evidence to be disseminated is supported by a recognized, but limited body of work. • The role and participation of researcher and research user team members are clear and mostly justified for the proposed work. • The requested budget is suitable for the proposed work, with reasonable justification included.	**3.5 – 3.9** **may be funded**

• The proposed work plan is described, but with some gaps in detail, and outlines milestones and deliverables that are likely feasible within the timeline given.	
Fair • The format and content of the dissemination activity is somewhat tailored to the intended target audience, but its effectiveness is questionable. • The research evidence to be disseminated is partially supported by a relatively small body of work with limited impact. • The role and participation of researcher and research user team members are described in some detail, but lack clear justification for their inclusion in the proposed work. • The requested budget is somewhat appropriate for the proposed work, but lacks clear justification and detail. • The proposed work plan is provided, but in limited detail, providing milestones and deliverables of questionable feasibility within an ambiguous timeframe.	**3.0 – 3.4** **not fundable**
Less than Adequate • The format and content of the dissemination activity is ineffective and not appropriate for the intended target audience. • The research evidence to be disseminated is generally unsupported by a relevant body of work, making it highly questionable. • 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. • The requested budget is inappropriate for the proposed work and lacks clear justification and detail. • The proposed work plan is poorly written, lacking specific milestones and deliverables, and is of dubious feasibility within the timeframe of the award.	**0.0 – 2.9** **not fundable**

Potential Impact	Weighting – 20%
Assessment Criteria Please consider the following when assessing the applicant's proposed dissemination activity/ies: • The proposed dissemination activity demonstrates relevance to, and has potential to positively impact the health of British Columbians and/or the BC health system. • The research evidence being disseminated has potential to inform and/or improve further health research, practice and/or policy. • The application describes how the continued engagement between researcher and research users will be monitored and/or continue past the award term.	
Assessment Descriptor	**Score**

Outstanding • The proposed dissemination activity, tool or product is extremely relevant to, and will positively impact the health of British Columbians and/or the BC health system. • The proposed dissemination activity, tool or product has a high likelihood of informing and/or improving further health research, practice and/or policy. • A clear and practical plan is described to ensure that meaningful and productive collaborations between researchers and research users continue past the award term.	**4.5 – 4.9** **may be funded**
Excellent • The proposed dissemination activity is highly relevant to, and has strong potential to impact the health of British Columbians and/or the BC health system. • The proposed dissemination activity will most likely inform and/or improve further health research, practice and/or policy. • A solid plan is in place to ensure that effective collaborations between researchers and research users continue following the end of this funding opportunity.	**4.0 – 4.4** **may be funded**
Very Good • The proposed dissemination activity is generally relevant to, and has some potential to impact the health of British Columbians and the BC health system. • The proposed dissemination activity will inform and/or improve further health research, practice and/or policy to some extent. • A general process is described, for continuing the collaboration between researchers and research users following the end of this funding opportunity, but it lacks some specific detail.	**3.5 – 3.9** **may be funded**
Fair • The proposed dissemination activity is of limited interest and relevance to, and will have a limited impact on the health of British Columbians and the BC health system. • The proposed dissemination activity may facilitate the use of some research evidence to inform and/or improve further health research, practice and/or policy. • A vague plan is included that outlines possible future collaborations between researchers and research following the end of this funding opportunity, but is generally lacking in detail.	**3.0 – 3.4** **not fundable**
Less than Adequate • The proposed dissemination activity is generally irrelevant to, and will have no impact on the health of British Columbians and the BC health system. • It is highly unlikely the proposed dissemination activity will inform and/or improve further health research, practice and/or policy. • There is little-to-no indication that the collaboration between researchers and research users will continue past the award term.	**0.0 – 2.9** **not fundable**