



2021 HEALTH PROFESSIONAL-INVESTIGATOR COMPETITION

EVALUATION CRITERIA

DEADLINES:

LETTER OF INTENT: **JUNE 4, 2021, 4:30 P.M. PT**

FULL APPLICATION: **AUGUST 20, 2021, 4:30 P.M. PT**

Applicant Expertise and Experience	Weighting – 20%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <p>Please assess the applicant’s potential as an independent researcher based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualifications of the applicant, including both clinical and research training and experience (relative to career stage and health profession), with consideration of how the applicant’s research experience and training align with the proposed research area and methods. • Expertise and productivity of the applicant as demonstrated by research and professional contributions, including awards and other forms of professional recognition.* • Evidence of the applicant’s ability to successfully employ knowledge translation tools and activities, and the potential to contribute to changing policy/practice related to patient health and/or the health system.* <p>*Productivity and track record should be weighed with consideration of the norms of the applicant’s career stage, health profession and research area.</p>	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant’s combined clinical and research training and experience provide the expertise needed to complete the proposed research. Clinical expertise and research training are well aligned with the proposed research area and methods. • The applicant has an established track record of research productivity indicative of a committed interest in research. The track record demonstrates the applicant’s proficiency as an independent researcher. • The applicant has an established track record of leading or co-leading knowledge translation activities and is well-positioned to contribute to changing policy/practice related to patient health and/or the health system. 	<p>4.5 – 4.9</p> <p>may be funded</p>
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant’s combined clinical and research training and experience provide the expertise needed to complete the proposed research. Clinical expertise and research training are aligned with the proposed research area and methods. • The applicant has a track record of research productivity indicative of a committed interest in research. The track record demonstrates that the applicant is an independent researcher or has strong potential to become an independent researcher. • The applicant has a track record of leading or co-leading knowledge translation activities and is well-positioned to contribute to changing policy/practice related to patient health and/or the health system. 	<p>4.0 – 4.4</p> <p>may be funded</p>

<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant's combined clinical and research training and experience provide the expertise needed to complete the proposed research with only minor potential knowledge gaps. Clinical expertise and research training are mostly aligned with the proposed research area and methods. • The applicant has a track record of research productivity that provides evidence of a committed interest in research. The track record demonstrates that the applicant has the potential to become an independent researcher. • The applicant has some track record with knowledge translation activities that provides evidence that the applicant is positioned to contribute to changing policy/practice related to patient health and/or the health system. 	<p>3.5 – 3.9</p> <p>may be funded (above 3.8)</p>
<p>Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant's combined clinical and research training and experience provide some of the expertise needed to complete the proposed research; however, there are multiple potential knowledge gaps. Clinical expertise and research training are only partially aligned with the proposed research area and methods. • The applicant has a limited track record of research productivity, demonstrating some interest in research. The track record does not demonstrate that the applicant has the potential to be an independent researcher. • The applicant has a limited track record with knowledge translation activities and it is not clear if the applicant is positioned to contribute to changing policy/practice related to patient health and/or the health system. 	<p>3.0 – 3.4</p> <p>not fundable</p>
<p>Less than Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant's combined clinical and research training and experience do not provide adequate expertise to complete the proposed research. Clinical expertise and research training are not aligned with the proposed research area and methods. • The applicant has a limited track record of research productivity, and the applicant's commitment to research is not clear. The track record does not demonstrate the potential for the applicant to be an independent researcher. • The applicant has a limited track record with knowledge translation activities and the applicant is not positioned to contribute to changing policy/practice related to patient health and/or the health system. 	<p>0.0 – 2.9</p> <p>not fundable</p>

Research Proposal	Weighting – 40%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completeness of the background/literature review and relevance to the research question(s), research design, and methods. • Clarity and originality* of the research question(s) and potential of the research to address important knowledge gaps that directly impact patient health and/or the health system. • Clarity of rationale for the research design and methods. • Appropriateness and feasibility of the research design and methods. • Appropriateness and feasibility of the project timeline. • Appropriateness and feasibility of the budget statement. • Adequacy of the identification of risks and plans for management of potential difficulties that may be encountered during the term of the research. • Appropriateness and adequacy of the proposed knowledge translation tools and/or activities to influence policy and/or practice related to patient health and/or the health system. • Appropriateness and adequacy of any proposed collaborations required to carry out the research (if applicable). <p>*Originality refers to research that will generate new knowledge that may be vital to the progress of a field. Originality does not necessarily require innovation in research methods or approaches. Reference: https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/39914.html</p>	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The background/literature review is complete and relevant to the research question(s), research design, and methods. • The research proposal contains clear research question(s), is original, and will address important knowledge gaps that directly impact patient health and/or the health system. • The research design and methods are clearly described, feasible, and appropriate to address the research question(s). • The timeline is appropriate and feasible. • The budget statement is appropriate and feasible. • The research proposal identifies risks that may be encountered during the term of the research and how to manage/mitigate these risks. • The knowledge translation plan is clearly described and appropriate. 	<p>4.5 – 4.9</p> <p>may be funded</p>
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The background and literature review is sufficient and provides adequate context on the research question(s), research design, and methods. • The research proposal contains clear research question(s). The proposed research proposal is very likely to be original, and very likely to address important knowledge gaps that directly impact patient health and/or the health system. • The research design and methods are clearly described, feasible, and appropriate to address the research question(s), with only a few minor details lacking. 	<p>4.0 – 4.4</p> <p>may be funded</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timeline is appropriate and feasible. • The budget statement is appropriate and feasible, with only a few minor details lacking. • The research proposal identifies risks that may be encountered during the term of the research and how to manage/mitigate these risks. • The knowledge translation plan is clearly described and appropriate. 	
<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The background/literature review may lack some details, but the information is sufficient to support the research question(s), research design, and methods. • The research proposal contains clear research question(s) and has the potential to be original. It is likely that the proposed research will address knowledge gaps that directly impact patient health and/or the health system. • The research design and methods are feasible, and appropriate to address the research question(s), with only some details lacking. • The timeline is appropriate and feasible but may be missing some details. • The budget statement is appropriate and feasible, with some details lacking. • The research proposal identifies all major risks likely to be encountered during the term of the research and how to manage/mitigate these risks. Some minor risks and mitigation approaches may be missing. • The knowledge translation plan is largely appropriate but may lack some details. 	<p>3.5 – 3.9</p> <p>may be funded (above 3.8)</p>
<p>Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The background/literature review does not provide adequate information to support the research question(s), research design, and methods. • The research question(s) are unclear and/or they require major revision. It is unclear whether the research will be original and/or whether the proposed research will address knowledge gaps that directly impact patient health and/or the health system. • The research design and methods have major flaws and/or is not appropriate to address the research question(s). • The timeline is of questionable feasibility and/or lacks key details. • The budget statement is of questionable feasibility, lacks key details, or has multiple inaccuracies. • The research proposal fails to identify important risks that are likely to be encountered during the term of the research and how to manage/mitigate these risks. • The knowledge translation plan is poorly described and/or inappropriate. 	<p>3.0 – 3.4</p> <p>not fundable</p>
<p>Less than Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The background/literature review is missing and/or does not provide adequate information to support the research question(s), research design, and methods. • The research proposal does not contain clear research question(s), the proposed research is not original, and/or the proposed research does not address knowledge gaps that directly impact patient health and/or the health system. 	<p>0.0 – 2.9</p> <p>not fundable</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research design and methods are poorly described, is not feasible, or is not appropriate to address the research question(s). • The timeline is inappropriate or not feasible. • The budget statement is incomplete, inaccurate or not feasible. • The research proposal is missing information on risk assessment and mitigation. • The knowledge translation plan is missing, poorly described and/or inappropriate. 	
--	--

Support for Research Activities	Weighting – 20%
Assessment Criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level 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. • Availability and accessibility of personnel, facilities and infrastructure required to conduct the proposed research and perform the knowledge translation activities. • Availability and accessibility of collaborators and mentors to advise and support research and knowledge translation activities where appropriate. 	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
Outstanding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required protection of time, research appointment, and continued support post-award. • The research support statement describes how the applicant plans to access all of the necessary supports for the research and knowledge translation activities. • The letters of support and reference provide evidence that the applicant has established strong connections with mentors and/or collaborators to advise and support research and knowledge translation activities where appropriate. 	4.5 – 4.9 may be funded
Excellent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required protection of time, research appointment, and continued support post-award. • The research support statement provides details on how the applicant plans to access the necessary supports for the research and knowledge translation activities, with only minor details missing. • The letters of support and reference provide evidence that the applicant has established connections with mentors and/or collaborators to advise and support research and knowledge translation activities where appropriate. 	4.0 – 4.4 may be funded
Very Good <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence of a commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required protection of time, research appointment, and continued support post-award. 	3.5 – 3.9 may be funded (above 3.8)



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research support statement describes how the applicant plans to access the necessary supports for the research and knowledge translation activities, with some details missing. • The letters of support and reference provide some evidence that the applicant has established connections with mentors and/or collaborators to advise and support research and knowledge translation activities where appropriate. 	
<p>Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence of a commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required protection of time and research appointment, with some potential for continued support post-award. • The research support statement is missing important information on how the applicant plans to access the necessary supports for the research and knowledge translation activities. • The letters of support and reference do not provide sufficient evidence that the applicant has established connections with mentors and/or collaborators to advise and support research and knowledge translation activities where appropriate. 	<p>3.0 – 3.4</p> <p>not fundable</p>
<p>Less than Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The commitment from the host institution is inadequate and does not guarantee the required protection of time, research appointment, and continued support post-award. • The research support statement is missing, or is missing vital information on how the applicant plans to access the necessary supports for the research and knowledge translation activities. • The letters of support and reference from key mentors and/or collaborators are missing and it is unlikely that the applicant has sufficient support to complete the research and knowledge translation activities. 	<p>1.0 – 2.9</p> <p>not fundable</p>

Impact of Award	Weighting – 20%
Assessment Criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact the award will have on the applicant's research career trajectory as a health professional investigator. 	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
Outstanding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The support from the award is vital to moving the applicant along a career trajectory towards a career as a successful independent health professional investigator. 	4.5 – 4.9 may be funded
Excellent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The support from the award will clearly facilitate the applicant along a career trajectory towards a career as a successful independent health professional investigator. 	4.0 – 4.4 may be funded
Very Good <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The support from the award will be helpful to progress the applicant along a career trajectory towards a career as a successful independent health professional investigator. 	3.5 – 3.9 may be funded (above 3.8)
Fair <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The support from the award will assist the applicant along a career trajectory towards a career as a successful independent health professional investigator. 	3.0 – 3.4 not fundable
Less than Adequate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The support from the award will have no impact on the applicant's career trajectory towards a career as a successful independent health professional investigator. 	2.0 – 2.9 not fundable

Mitacs Accelerate Application Proposal (if applicable)
Assessment Descriptor
<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.