



MICHAEL SMITH FOUNDATION
FOR HEALTH RESEARCH

BC's health research funding agency

2020 REACH COMPETITION



EVALUATION CRITERIA

DEADLINE: **SEPTEMBER 28, 2020, 4:30 P.M. PT**

Quality of Proposed Work	Weighting – 50%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <p>The following criteria are used when assessing the applicant's proposed dissemination events, activities, and/or tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose and objectives of the proposed work are described and align with the objectives of this funding opportunity. • The application includes a description of the dissemination events, activities, and/or tools, including the desired audience and how the work will benefit them. • The proposed work is reasonable, feasible within the proposed timeline, and makes appropriate use of team members. • The research evidence to be disseminated is supported by a relevant and trusted body of knowledge, and has relevance to 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. 	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 target audience are clearly evident and highly enriching. • The proposed work plan is exceptionally well crafted, with highly achievable milestones identified within the indicated timeline; all team members are exceptionally well utilized. • The research evidence to be disseminated is supported by a highly reputable and high-impact body of work that is extremely relevant to the health of British Columbians and/or the BC health system. • The research evidence being disseminated is extremely significant and will no doubt inform and/or improve further health research, practice and/or policy. 	<p>4.5 – 4.9</p> <p>may be funded</p>
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose and objectives for the proposed work are well-presented, clearly described, and strongly align with the objectives of this funding opportunity. • The description of the proposed work is clear and complete; the benefits to the target audience are meaningful and well-described. • The proposed work plan is clearly articulated, highlighting all the necessary detail, with well-defined milestones that are mostly achievable within the proposed timeframe. • The research evidence to be disseminated is supported by a highly reliable and well-known body of work, and is highly relevant to the health of British Columbians and/or the BC health system. • The research evidence being disseminated is highly significant and will very likely inform and/or improve further health research, practice and/or policy. 	<p>4.0 – 4.4</p> <p>may be funded</p>



<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose and objectives for the proposed work are outlined and mostly align with the objectives of this funding opportunity. • The description of the proposed work provides a general picture of the proposed dissemination events, activities, and/or tools; the benefits to the target audience are described and will ensure that some uptake of relevant knowledge occurs. • The proposed work plan is generally outlined with some gaps in detail, and identifies some milestones that are likely feasible within the timeline given. • The research evidence to be disseminated is supported by a recognized, but limited body of work that is of moderate relevance to the health of British Columbians and/or the BC health system. • The research evidence being disseminated is of moderate significance and has the potential to inform and/or improve further health research, practice and/or policy. 	<p>3.5 – 3.9 may be funded</p>
<p>Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose and objectives of the proposed work are included, but with modest detail, and are only somewhat aligned with the objectives of this funding opportunity. • The application provides a highly generalized outline of the proposed work; the benefits to the target audience appear to be minimal, and partially incongruent with the proposed work. • The proposed work plan is provided, but in limited detail, providing milestones of questionable feasibility within an ambiguous timeframe. • The research evidence to be disseminated is partially supported by a relatively small body of work with limited impact and relevance to the health of British Columbians and/or the BC health system. • The research evidence being disseminated is of modest significance, with limited potential to inform and/or improve further health research, practice and/or policy. 	<p>3.0 – 3.4 not fundable</p>
<p>Less than Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose and objectives of the proposed work are either not included or severely lack appropriate detail, and generally not aligned with the objectives of this funding opportunity. • The description of the proposed work is poorly written and lacks suitable details; the specific audience has not been identified and little-to-no tangible benefit of the dissemination activity is indicated. • The proposed work plan is poorly written, lacking specific milestones, and is of dubious feasibility within the timeframe of the award. • The research evidence to be disseminated is generally unsupported by a relevant body of work, making it highly questionable, and is mostly unrelated to the health of British Columbians and/or the BC health system. • The research evidence being disseminated is not significant and likely has no potential to inform and/or improve further health research, practice and/or policy. 	<p>0.0 – 2.9 not fundable</p>



Team Quality and Engagement	Weighting – 50%
<p>Assessment Criteria The following criteria is used when assessing the merit and feasibility of the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The appropriateness of the composition and relevant experience of the team as a whole, and details are provided on the degree of participation for each team member. • The application explains how researchers and research users will engage in the co-development and implementation of the proposed work, including plans for continued engagement past the term of the award. • The research/health professional trainee has been included in a way that enhances their KT experience and skills, and demonstrates effective KT capacity-building. 	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team composition aligns perfectly with the needs of the proposed work, explicitly describing how team experience relates to meeting all of the goals of the proposed work, and the degree of participation for each team member is clearly indicated. • The application clearly explains how researchers and research users will engage in the co-development and implementation of the proposed work, and articulates a realistic plan for continued engagement with one another following the term of the award. • The trainee plays a vital role in the project, including critical decision-making that will unquestionably enhance their KT experience or skills, and help build KT research capacity. 	<p>4.5 – 4.9 may be funded</p>
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team composition is well-aligned with the needs of the proposed work, clearly stating how team experience relates to meeting most of the goals of the proposed work, and the degree of participation for most team members is clearly indicated. • The application includes an effective plan for how researchers and research users will engage in the co-development and implementation of the proposed work, and proposes a sensible plan for continued engagement with one another following the term of the award. • The trainee plays a key role in the project, including important decision-making that will very likely enhance their KT experience or skills, and help build KT capacity. 	<p>4.4 – 4.0 may be funded</p>
<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team composition is mostly relevant to the needs of the proposed work, stating in general terms how team experience relates to the goals of the convening and collaborating activities, and the degree of participation of team members is generally outlined. • The application outlines a general plan for researchers and research users to engage with one another in the co-development and implementation of the 	<p>3.5 – 3.9 may be funded</p>



BC's health research funding agency

<p>proposed work, and includes a brief plan for continued engagement with one another following the term of the award.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The trainee plays an active, but secondary role in the project with some decision-making ability that may enhance their KT experience or skills, and has the potential to help build KT capacity. 	
<p>Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team composition is somewhat relevant to the needs of the proposed work, with the application stating in vague terms how team experience relates to the goals of the proposed work; the degree of participation of most team members is generally outlined, but gaps in information are evident. The application includes some mention of how researchers and research users will engage one another to co-develop and implement the proposed work, but lacks detail and provides a vague description of how engagement could continue past the term of the award. The trainee plays only a supporting role in the project with limited decision-making ability, and it is unclear as to whether it will enhance their KT experience or skills, and/or be effective in helping to build KT capacity. 	<p>3.0 – 3.4</p> <p>not fundable</p>
<p>Less than Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team composition does not appear to align with the needs of the proposed work, contains significant personnel gaps, and does not mention how it will meet the goals of the proposed work; no information on the degree of participation of team members is provided. There is no clear plan for researchers and research users to engage with one another to co-develop and implement the proposed work, or continue engagement following the term of the award. The trainee plays only a passive role in the project, and with no decision-making ability, making it unlikely that their KT experience or skills will be enhanced, or that broader KT capacity will be developed. 	<p>0.0 – 2.9</p> <p>not fundable</p>

