



Michael Smith
**Health
Research BC**

2022 Research Trainee Program

EVALUATION CRITERIA

DEADLINES

Letter of intent: December 6, 2021, 4:30 p.m. PT

Full application: February 14, 2022, 4:30 p.m. PT

Applicant Expertise and Experience	Weighting – 30%
<p>Assessment Criteria Please assess the applicant's expertise and experience based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualifications of the applicant, including research training and experience, and clinical training and experience (where applicable), with consideration of how the proposed research area and methods build on the applicant's experience and training. • Research quality, productivity, expertise, and leadership 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 implement knowledge translation (KT) strategies, activities, and/or use KT tools to inform practice, policy and further research, as appropriate to their area of research.* <p>*productivity, leadership, and KT skills should be weighed with consideration of the applicant's career stage, health profession (if applicable), and research area.</p>	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed research builds on and synergizes with the applicant's research training and experience. The research training and clinical training (where applicable), complement the proposed research area and methods. • The applicant has an established record of research productivity, including quality research outputs, and has demonstrated leadership in their field and amongst their peers. • The applicant demonstrates expertise with KT strategies, activities and/or tools to inform practice, policy and further research, as appropriate to their area of research. 	<p>4.5 – 4.9 may be funded</p>
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed research builds on the applicant's research training and experience. The research training, and clinical training (where applicable), are aligned with the proposed research area and methods. • The applicant has a record of research productivity, including quality research outputs, and has demonstrated some leadership in their field and amongst their peers. • The applicant demonstrates a good understanding of KT strategies, activities and/or tools to inform practice, policy and further research, as appropriate to their area of research. 	<p>4.0 – 4.4 may be funded</p>

<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant’s research training and experience provides the necessary expertise to complete the proposed research with some minor potential knowledge gaps. The research training, and clinical training (where applicable), are adequately aligned with the proposed research area and methods. • The applicant has a record of research productivity, including high quality research outputs, and has demonstrated some leadership in their field and/or amongst their peers. • The applicant demonstrates some understanding of KT strategies, activities and/or tools to inform practice, policy and further research, as appropriate to their area of research. 	<p>3.5 – 3.9 may be funded (above 3.8)</p>
<p>Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant’s research training and experience provides some of the expertise needed to complete the proposed research; however, there are multiple potential knowledge gaps. The research training, and clinical training (where applicable), are only partially aligned with the proposed research area and methods. • The applicant has a limited record of research outputs and/or the quality of the research outputs is poor. The applicant has not demonstrated leadership in their field or amongst their peers. • The applicant demonstrates limited understanding of KT strategies, activities and/or tools to inform practice, policy and further research, as appropriate to their area of research. 	<p>3.0 – 3.4 not fundable</p>
<p>Less than Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant’s research training and experience do not provide adequate expertise to complete the proposed research. The research training, and clinical training (where applicable) are not aligned with the proposed research area and methods. • The applicant’s research productivity is limited and/or the quality of the research outputs is poor. The applicant does not demonstrate leadership in their field or amongst their peers. • The applicant demonstrates poor understanding of KT strategies, activities and/or tools to inform practice, policy and further research, as appropriate to their area of research. 	<p>0 – 2.9 not fundable</p>

Research Project	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. • 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. • 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 KT tools and/or activities. <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. • The research design and methods are clearly described, feasible, and appropriate to address the research question(s). • The timeline 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 KT plan is clearly described and appropriate. 	<p style="text-align: center;">4.5 – 4.9 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. • The research design and methods are clearly described, feasible, and appropriate to address the research question(s), with only a few minor details lacking. • The timeline 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 KT plan is clearly described and appropriate. 	<p>4.0 – 4.4 may be funded</p>
<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. • 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 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 KT plan is largely appropriate but may lack some details. 	<p>3.5 – 3.9 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 on 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. • 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 research proposal fails to identify important risks that are likely to be encountered during the term of the research propose actions to manage/mitigate these risks. • The KT plan is poorly described and/or inappropriate. 	<p>3.0 – 3.4 not fundable</p>
<p>Less than Adequate</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 proposal does not contain clear research question(s), the proposed research is not original, and/or the proposed research does not address knowledge gaps. • The research design and methods are poorly described, not feasible, or not appropriate to address the research question(s). • The timeline is inappropriate or not feasible. • The research proposal is missing information on risk assessment and mitigation. • The KT plan is missing, poorly described and/or inappropriate. 	<p>0 – 2.9 not fundable</p>

Environment and Support	Weighting – 30%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The alignment of the proposed research and KT activities with the expertise of the applicant, supervisor, co-supervisor (if applicable), mentors, and collaborators. Adequacy of sources of funding to complete the proposed research project and KT activities. Access to the necessary personnel, facilities and infrastructure necessary to complete the proposed research and KT activities, including support from collaborators, where appropriate. A confirmation of protected research time and the availability of mentorship/training opportunities for the applicant. <p>Note: Collaborators and mentors can be from within or external to the applicant's host institution.</p>	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed research and KT activities align well with the expertise of the applicant and supervisor(s), with letters of collaboration from any mentors or collaborators who are needed to fill gaps in expertise. There is evidence of adequate sources of funding to complete the proposed research project and KT activities. There is evidence that the applicant will have access to the personnel, facilities and infrastructure necessary to complete the proposed research. There is evidence of support from collaborators, where needed to complete the research project and KT activities. There is a confirmation of protected research time and ample mentorship/training opportunities available to support the professional development of the applicant. 	<p>4.5 – 4.9 may be fundable</p>
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed research and KT activities align with the expertise of the applicant and supervisor(s), with letters of collaboration from mentors or collaborators who are needed to fill all but the most minor gaps in expertise. There is evidence of adequate sources of funding to complete the proposed research project and KT activities. There is evidence that the applicant will have access to the personnel, facilities and infrastructure necessary to complete the proposed research and KT activities, with only minor potential gaps. There is evidence of support from collaborators, where needed, to complete the research project and KT activities. There is a confirmation of protected research time and a number of mentorship/training opportunities available to support the professional development of the applicant. 	<p>4.0 – 4.4 may be fundable</p>

<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed research and KT activities align with the expertise of the applicant and supervisor(s), with minor gaps in expertise, and insufficient collaboration/mentorship to fill these gaps. • There is evidence of adequate sources of funding to complete the proposed research project and KT activities, with only minor details lacking. • There is evidence that the applicant will have access to the personnel, facilities and infrastructure necessary to complete the proposed research and KT activities, with only minor potential gaps. Evidence of support from necessary collaborators is not provided. • There is a confirmation of protected research time with some mentorship/training opportunities available to support the professional development of the applicant. 	<p>3.5 – 3.9 may be fundable (above 3.8)</p>
<p>Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed research and KT activities have some alignment with the expertise of the applicant and supervisor(s), with major gaps in expertise and insufficient collaboration/mentorship to fill these gaps. • The application lacks key details on the source of funding for the research and KT activities, or there are concerns that the funding is inadequate. • There are concerns that the applicant will not have access to the personnel, facilities and infrastructure necessary to complete the proposed research and KT activities. Evidence of support from necessary collaborators is not provided. • There are concerns that the applicant will not have sufficient protected research time. There are only limited mentorship/training opportunities available, or the opportunities are not fully suitable for the professional development of the applicant. 	<p>3.0 – 3.4 not fundable</p>
<p>Less than Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed research and KT activities have poor alignment with the expertise of the applicant and supervisor(s), with considerable gaps in expertise. • The application does not provide sources of funding or the funding is inadequate to support the proposed research and KT activities. • The applicant will not have access to the personnel, facilities and infrastructure necessary to complete the proposed research and KT activities. Evidence of support from necessary collaborators is not provided. • The applicant will not have sufficient protected research time. There are very limited mentorship/training opportunities available to the applicant and/or these opportunities align poorly with the professional development of the applicant. 	<p>0 – 2.9 not fundable</p>