



2021 REACH COMPETITION

EVALUATION CRITERIA

DEADLINE: JUNE 4, 2021, 4:30 P.M. PT

| Team Quality and Engagement | Weighting – 50% |
|--|---|
| <p>Assessment Criteria</p> <p>The following criteria is used when assessing the quality and degree of engagement of the team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roles of all team members are described and the team has the expertise and experience to carry out the dissemination activities. • The dissemination activities are collaboratively planned and implemented by the researcher and research user in a way that meaningfully engages the expertise of each individual. • The role of the research/health professional trainee provides professional development opportunities for the trainee, including opportunities to develop leadership and KT skills. | |
| Assessment Descriptor | Score |
| <p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roles of all team members are described. The team has ample expertise and experience to successfully deliver the dissemination activities. • The application outlines how researcher and research user will work together to collaboratively plan and implement the dissemination activities, using their combined skills and expertise. • The role of the research/health professional trainee provides high-quality opportunities to develop leadership and KT skills and will provide excellent professional development for the trainee. | <p>4.5 – 4.9</p> <p>may be funded</p> |
| <p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roles of all team members are described. The team has adequate expertise and experience to deliver the dissemination activities. • The application contains adequate detail outlining how the researcher and the research user will work together to collaboratively plan and implement the dissemination activities, using their combined skills and expertise. • The role of the research/health professional trainee provides quality opportunities to develop leadership and KT skills, and will support professional development. | <p>4.0 – 4.4</p> <p>may be funded</p> |
| <p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roles of all team members are described. The team has adequate expertise and experience to deliver the dissemination activities, with only minor concerns about gaps. • The application provides an outline of how the researcher and the research user will work together to collaboratively plan and implement the dissemination activities. The outline may lack some detail but there is evidence of meaningful engagement between the researcher and research user. • The role of the research/health professional trainee provides limited opportunities to develop leadership and KT skills, and modest support for professional development. | <p>3.5 – 3.9</p> <p>may be funded</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roles of all team members are described, but important details are missing. The team lacks key expertise and experience to deliver the dissemination activities. • The application provides an outline of how the researcher and the research user will work together to collaboratively plan and implement the dissemination activities, but the outline lacks important details or lacks evidence of meaningful engagement between the researcher and the research user. • The role of the research/health professional trainee provides few opportunities to develop leadership and KT skills; there is no substantive support for professional development | <p>3.0 – 3.4</p> <p>not fundable</p> |
| <p>Less than Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roles of all team members are not described. The team lacks key expertise and experience to deliver the dissemination activities. • The application does not explain how the researcher and the research user will work together to collaboratively plan and implement the dissemination activities, or lacks evidence of meaningful engagement between the researcher and the research user. • The role of the research/health professional trainee does not provide opportunities for the trainee to develop leadership and KT skills, and does not support professional development. | <p>0.0 – 2.9</p> <p>not fundable</p> |



| Quality of Proposed Work | Weighting – 50% |
|---|---|
| <p>Assessment Criteria</p> <p>The following criteria is 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 dissemination activities are described and align with the objectives of this funding opportunity. • The application includes a description of the dissemination activities, including the desired audience and how the work will benefit them. • The work plan is reasonable, and feasible within the proposed timeline. • The budget is appropriate for the dissemination activities, with justification for the amounts requested. • The expected outputs and/or outcomes of the dissemination activities are clearly stated, along with the potential impacts on health research, the health system and/or the health of British Columbians. | |
| Assessment Descriptor | Score |
| <p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose and objectives of the dissemination activities are clearly described, and align perfectly with the objectives of this funding opportunity. • The dissemination activities are appropriate for the purpose and for the participants. • The work plan is well crafted, with highly achievable milestones identified within the timeline. • The budget is well organized, provides sufficient detail, and is appropriate for the proposed dissemination activities, with adequate justification provided for expenses. • The expected outputs and/or outcomes of the dissemination activities are well described and likely to advance the uptake of research evidence that will have an impact on health, health research 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 purpose and objectives of the proposed dissemination activities are described, and align well with the objectives of this funding opportunity. • The dissemination activities are appropriate for the purpose and for the participants. • The work plan is clearly articulated and includes milestones that are feasible within the indicated timeline. • The budget is well organized, adequately detailed, and is appropriate for the proposed dissemination activities, with adequate justification provided for expenses. • The expected outputs and/or outcomes of the dissemination activities are well described and likely to advance the uptake of research evidence that will have an impact on health, health research 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 purpose and objectives of the dissemination activities are described with only a few minor omissions, and mostly align with the objectives of this funding opportunity. • The dissemination activities are suitable for the purpose and for the participants involved; however, there may be some minor issues with fit or some minor details missing in the description. • The work plan is adequately described, with only a few minor details omitted, and includes milestones that are feasible within the timeline. • The budget is adequately organized and detailed, is appropriate for the proposed activities, and adequate justification is provided for expenses. • The expected outputs and/or outcomes of the dissemination activities are well described and likely to advance the uptake of research evidence that will have an impact on health, health research and/or the health system. | <p>3.5 – 3.9</p> <p>may be funded</p> |
| <p>Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose and objectives of the dissemination activities are described but lack sufficient detail, and/or do not fully align with the objectives of this funding opportunity. • The dissemination activities are not adequately described or they are not suitable for the purpose and for the participants. • The work plan has limited detail, and the milestones do not seem feasible. • The budget lacks important detail, is not fully appropriate for the proposed activities, or lacks justification for expenses. • The expected outputs and/or outcomes of the dissemination activities are described but it is questionable whether the dissemination activities will advance the uptake of research evidence that will have an impact on health, health research 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 purpose and objectives of the dissemination activities are vague or not aligned with the objectives of this funding opportunity. • The dissemination activities are not sufficiently described, or they are inappropriate for the purpose or for the participants. • The work plan lacks sufficient detail, does not include specific milestones, or is not feasible within the timeframe. • The budget lacks key details or is otherwise not appropriate for the proposed activities, and expenses are not justified. • The expected outputs and/or outcomes of the dissemination activities are poorly described and it is not likely that the dissemination activities will advance the uptake of research evidence that will have an impact on health, health research and/or the health system. | <p>0.0 – 2.9</p> <p>not fundable</p> |