



Michael Smith
**Health
Research BC**

2024 Scholar Program & 2024 Health Professional-Investigator Program

EVALUATION CRITERIA

DEADLINES

Letter of intent: November 21, 2023, 4:30 p.m. PT

Full application: January 22, 2024, 4:30 p.m. PT

Applicant Expertise and Experience	Weighting – 30%
<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 research and clinical training and experience, with consideration of how the applicant’s research experience and training align with the proposed research area and methods.* • Expertise and leadership of the applicant as demonstrated by quality of research and other professional contributions.** • Evidence of the applicant’s ability to successfully implement pathway to impact*** (knowledge translation; KT) strategies and activities, as appropriate to their area of research.** <p>*Applicants may collaborate with other researchers to ensure adequate expertise for their research program.</p> <p>**Productivity, leadership, and KT skills should be weighed with consideration of the applicant’s career stage, health profession and research area.</p> <p>***For more information, please refer to Section 10 of the Scholar and HP-I Programs Guidelines.</p>	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant’s research and clinical training and experience is well aligned with the proposed research and will provide the expertise needed to complete the proposed research. • The applicant has a well-established record of quality research outputs and professional contributions for their career stage. The applicant demonstrates proficiency as an independent researcher. The applicant demonstrates leadership in their field and among their peers. • The applicant demonstrates proficiency with pathway to impact (KT) strategies and activities, as appropriate to their area of research. 	<p>4.5 – 4.9</p> <p>may be funded</p>
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant’s research and clinical training and experience is aligned with the proposed research and will provide the expertise needed to complete the proposed research. • The applicant has a record of quality research outputs and professional contributions for their career stage, demonstrating the applicant’s capability as an independent researcher. The applicant demonstrates some leadership in their field and among their peers. • The applicant demonstrates some expertise with pathway to impact (KT) strategies and activities, as appropriate to their area of research. 	<p>4.0 – 4.4</p> <p>may be funded</p>

<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant's research and clinical training and experience is mostly aligned with the proposed research and will provide the expertise needed to complete the proposed research, with minimal gaps. • The applicant has a record of quality research outputs and professional contributions for their career stage, demonstrating the applicant's potential as an independent researcher. The applicant demonstrates the potential for leadership in their field and among their peers. • The applicant demonstrates capability with pathway to impact (KT) strategies and activities, 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 and clinical training and experience is partially aligned with the proposed research and will provide some of the expertise needed to complete the proposed research, but there are concerns of some unfilled gaps in expertise. • The applicant has a limited record of quality research outputs and professional contributions for their career stage. There is limited evidence of the applicant's potential to succeed as an independent researcher. The applicant does not demonstrate leadership in their field or among their peers. • The applicant demonstrates limited ability with pathway to impact (KT) strategies and activities, considering 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 and clinical training and experience are not aligned with the proposed research and there are significant concerns of unfilled gaps in the expertise needed to complete the proposed research. • The applicant has a limited record of quality research outputs and professional contributions for their career stage. There is no evidence of the applicant's potential to succeed as an independent researcher. The applicant does not demonstrate leadership in their field or among their peers. • The applicant demonstrates poor understanding of pathway to impact (KT) strategies and activities, considering their area of research. 	<p>0 – 2.9 not fundable</p>

Research Program	Weighting – 50%
<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 timeline for the research program. • 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 pathway to impact (KT) activities. • 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 program 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 attainable. • The research program identifies risks that may be encountered during the term of the research and how to manage/mitigate these risks. • The pathway to impact (KT) activities are clearly described and appropriate. • The proposed collaborations are complementary and will contribute to carrying out the research (if applicable). 	<p>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. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research program contains clear research question(s). The research 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 largely feasible. • The research program identifies risks that may be encountered during the term of the research and how to manage/mitigate these risks, with only minor details lacking. • The pathway to impact (KT) activities are described and largely feasible. • The proposed collaborations are complementary and will contribute to carrying out the research, although some minor details may be lacking (if applicable). 	<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 program contains clear research question(s) and has the potential to be original. It is likely that the 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 program 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 pathway to impact (KT) activities are largely appropriate but may lack some details and there may be some minor issues with feasibility. • The proposed collaborations will contribute to carrying out the research, with only a few minor gaps in expertise or resources (if applicable). 	<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 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 research will address knowledge gaps. • The research design and methods have major flaws and/or are not appropriate to address the research question(s). • The timeline is of questionable feasibility and/or lacks key details. 	<p>3.0 – 3.4 not fundable</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research program fails to identify important risks that are likely to be encountered during the term of the research and propose actions to manage/mitigate these risks. • The pathway to impact (KT) activities are not well described or not well suited to the research program. • It is not clear how the proposed collaborations will contribute to carrying out the research or there are significant gaps in expertise or resources (if applicable). 	
<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 program does not contain clear research question(s), the research is not original, and/or the research does not address knowledge gaps. • The research design and methods are poorly described, are not feasible, or are not appropriate to address the research question(s). • The timeline is inappropriate or not feasible. • The research program is missing information on risk assessment and mitigation. • The pathway to impact (KT) activities are missing, poorly described or inappropriate. • The application lacks information on collaborations that are needed to carry out the research, and/or there are major gaps in expertise or resources (if applicable). 	<p>0 – 2.9 not fundable</p>

Environment and Support	Weighting – 20%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An adequate level of support from the applicant’s department head (or equivalent) for the required research appointment, protected research time, and a commitment of continued support post-award. • The mentorship plan is appropriate to support the applicant on their career path. • Availability and accessibility of personnel, facilities and infrastructure required to conduct the proposed research and perform the pathway to impact (KT) activities. This includes a clear and appropriate budget statement explaining how they plan to obtain the operating funds needed to support the proposed research. • Availability of collaborators to advise and support research and KT activities where appropriate. (Note: Collaborators and mentors can be from within or external to the applicant’s host institution.) <p>Reminder: Health Research BC encourages department heads to use the Department Head Form to describe any concrete practices or resources they will provide to support accessibility, diversity and inclusion in their work environment and in mentoring and professional development.</p>	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required research appointment, protection of time, and continued support post-award. • The mentorship plan is comprehensive and suitable to support the applicant on their career path. • The applicant will have access to all the necessary supports for the research and pathway to impact (KT) activities. The budget statement is appropriate and feasible. • The letters of collaboration provide evidence that the applicant has established strong connections with collaborators to advise and support research and KT activities, where appropriate. 	<p>4.5 – 4.9 may be fundable</p>
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required research appointment, protection of time, and continued support post-award. • The mentorship plan is thorough and suitable to support the applicant on their career path. • The applicant will have access to all the necessary supports for the research and pathway to impact (KT) activities, with only minor details missing. The budget statement is appropriate and feasible, with only a few minor details lacking. 	<p>4.0 – 4.4 may be fundable</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The letters of collaboration provide evidence that the applicant has connected with collaborators that are needed to advise and support research and KT activities, where appropriate. 	
<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is evidence of a commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required research appointment, protection of time, and continued support post-award. The mentorship plan is adequate and suitable to support the applicant on their career path. The applicant will have access to all the necessary supports for the research and pathway to impact (KT) activities, with some details missing. The budget statement is appropriate and largely feasible, with some details lacking. The letters of collaboration provide some evidence that the applicant has connected with collaborators that are needed to advise and support research and KT activities, where appropriate. 	<p>3.5 – 3.9 may be fundable (above 3.8)</p>
<p>Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is limited evidence of a commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required research appointment, protection of time, and continued support post-award. The mentorship plan is limited or not designed to support the applicant on their career path. It is not clear that the applicant will have access to the necessary supports for the research and pathway to impact (KT) activities. The budget statement is of questionable feasibility, lacks key details, or has important inaccuracies. The letters of collaboration do not provide sufficient evidence that the applicant has established the necessary connections with collaborators to advise and support research and KT activities, where appropriate. 	<p>3.0 – 3.4 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 research appointment, protection of time, and continued support post-award. The mentorship plan is inadequate or not suitable to support the applicant on their career path. The research support statement is missing vital information on how the applicant plans to access the necessary supports for the research and pathway to impact (KT) activities. The budget statement is incomplete, inaccurate or not feasible. The letters of collaboration from key collaborators are missing and it is unlikely that the applicant has sufficient support to complete the research and KT activities. 	<p>0 – 2.9 not fundable</p>

Mitacs Accelerate Application Proposal (if applicable)

Assessment Criteria

Refer to the Mitacs Accelerate application proposal upload, and the relevant section in Additional Information of the Scholar or HP-I application form. The assessment of this information is not to be included in the overall score of the Scholar or HP-I application, but rather considered separately. Please comment on the following elements as they relate to the Scholar or HP-I project as a whole:

- The proposed intern(s)'s role in the Scholar or 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.