



2021 HEALTH PROFESSIONAL-INVESTIGATOR COMPETITION

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR LETTER OF INTENT

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 – 40%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <p>Please assess the applicant’s potential for sustained research success 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 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. 	<p>3.5 – 3.9</p> <p>may be funded</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>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 the potential for independent research. • 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 independent research. • 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"> • Clarity and originality of the research question(s). • Potential of the proposed research to address important knowledge gaps that directly impact patient health and/or the health system. • Clarity, appropriateness and feasibility of the research design and methods. • Clarity, appropriateness and feasibility of the knowledge translation plan. • Access to the necessary resources and supports to complete research and knowledge translation activities. 	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research proposal contains clear research question(s) and it is clear that the research will yield new knowledge. • It is clear that the proposed research 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 completely appropriate to address the research question. • Knowledge translation plan is clearly described and appropriate. • The applicant has access to the necessary resources and supports to complete the research and knowledge translation activities. 	<p>4.5 – 4.9</p> <p>may be funded</p>
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research proposal contains clear research question(s) and it is very likely that the research will yield new knowledge. • It is likely that the proposed research 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. • The knowledge translation plan is described and sufficient. • The research proposal contains sufficient detail on the necessary resources and supports. The applicant has access to all resources and supports needed to complete the research and knowledge translation activities. 	<p>4.0 – 4.4</p> <p>may be funded</p>
<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research proposal contains clear research question(s) that may benefit from a minor amount of refinement. The research question(s) have the potential to yield new knowledge. • There is potential that the proposed research will address important knowledge gaps that directly impact patient health and/or the health system. • The research design and methods are described, and likely to be feasible, with only minor omissions or clarifications required. The design and methods are suitable for the research question. • The knowledge translation plan is largely appropriate but may lack some details. 	<p>3.5 – 3.9</p> <p>may be funded</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research proposal contains adequate detail on the necessary resources and supports. The applicant is likely to have access to all the resources and supports needed to complete the research and knowledge translation activities. 	
<p>Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research proposal contains research question(s) that are unclear and would benefit from additional refinement or it is not clear that the research will yield new knowledge. It is not clear that the proposed research will address important knowledge gaps that directly impact patient health and/or the health system. The research design and methods are described but important details are missing or the design and methods are not fully appropriate to address the research question. The knowledge translation plan is poorly described and/or inappropriate. The description of the resources and supports lacks important information or the applicant does not have access to some key necessary resources and supports to complete the research. 	<p>3.0 – 3.4</p> <p>not fundable</p>
<p>Less than Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research proposal does not contain clear research question(s) and/or the proposed research will not yield new knowledge. The proposed research does not address important knowledge gaps that directly impact patient health and/or the health system. The research design and methods are not clearly described and/or are not appropriate to address the research question(s). The knowledge translation plan is missing, poorly described and/or inappropriate. There is no description of the resources and supports in the research proposal or the applicant lacks access to the necessary resources and supports to complete the research. 	<p>0.0 – 2.9</p> <p>not fundable</p>

Impact of Award	Weighting – 20%
Assessment Criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impact of the award on the applicant's career progression 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 an 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 an 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 an independent health professional investigator. 	3.5 – 3.9 may be funded
Fair <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The support from the award will assist the applicant along a career trajectory towards a career as an 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 an independent health professional investigator. 	1.0 – 2.9 not fundable