



2019 Pathway to Patient-Oriented Research (P2P) Award EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR APPLICANTS

LAST UPDATED: August 13, 2018

Applications are rated in each of the three evaluation areas:

1. Quality and engagement of team (30%)
2. Relevance and feasibility (50%)
3. Potential impact (20%)

All applications will be screened by BC SUPPORT Unit staff to ensure they meet the eligibility criteria for the 2019 Pathway to Patient Oriented Research (P2P) Award competition prior to being submitted to the review panel. Applications that do not meet eligibility criteria will not be considered for review.

Quality and Engagement of the Team	Weighting – 30%
<p>Assessment Criteria Please consider the quality of the research team described in the application based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The participating researchers, patients and other stakeholders on the project are appropriate to the topic area of the proposed work, and details are provided on each team member's degree of participation. • There is clear demonstration how researchers, patients and other stakeholders will engage in the collaborative development and implementation of the proposed work. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the team has previously worked together, evidence of successful partnerships (e.g., description of previous successful partnerships) has been provided. ○ If the team has not previously worked together, rationale for why this new partnership is likely to succeed has been included. 	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team composition is described in detail and well-justified and is made up of established individuals with high quality track records, and appropriate research users providing the perfect balance of knowledge and experience to meet the goals of the proposed work. • The application clearly articulates how researchers, patients and other stakeholders will engage in the collaborative development and implementation of the proposed work. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the team has worked together, ample evidence and examples of success are provided demonstrating past success. ○ If the team has not previously worked together, detailed reasoning as to why this new partnership is likely to succeed is clearly described. 	<p>4.5 – 4.9</p>
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team composition is well-described and justified and is made up of established individuals with quality track records, and appropriate research users providing a strong balance of knowledge and experience to meet the goals of the proposed work. • The application describes how researchers, patients and other stakeholders will engage in the collaborative development and implementation of the proposed work. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the team has worked together, convincing evidence of success is provided demonstrating past success. ○ If the team has not previously worked together, strong rationale as to why this new partnership is likely to succeed is evident. 	<p>4.0 – 4.4</p>
<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team composition is reasonably described, and is mostly made up of established individuals with solid records, and appropriate research users 	<p>3.5 – 3.9</p>

<p>providing suitable balance of knowledge and experience to meet the goals of the proposed work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application includes some detail on how researchers, patients and other stakeholders will engage in development and implementation of the proposed work. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the team has worked together, some convincing examples of past success are provided. ○ If the team has not previously worked together, suitable rationale as to why new partnership is likely to succeed is provided. 	
<p>Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team composition is outlined and is made up of some established individuals with decent records, and suitable research users providing an adequate, although not ideal balance of knowledge and experience that could potentially meet the goals of the proposed work. • The application includes modest detail on how researchers, patients and other stakeholders will engage in development and implementation of the proposed work. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the team has worked together, some examples of past work are provided. ○ If the team has not previously worked together, rationale as to why new partnership is likely to succeed is provided but lacks detail. 	<p>3.0 – 3.4</p>
<p>Less than Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team composition vaguely described and is made up of less experienced individuals and/or irrelevant research users that do not provide a suitable balance of knowledge and experience to meet the goals of the project. • The application includes little to no detail on how researchers, patients and other stakeholders will engage in development and implementation of the proposed work. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the team has worked together, little to no examples of past work is provided. ○ If the team has not previously worked together, rationale as to why new partnership is likely to succeed is not included. 	<p>0.0 – 2.9</p>

Relevance and Feasibility	Weighting – 50%
<p>Assessment Criteria Please assess the proposed work plan on its overall relevance and feasibility based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The patient-oriented question being addressed is important and clearly described. • Justification for the proposed work is based in critically appraised literature. • The aims and outline of the proposed work are clearly described and feasible, and appropriate to the objectives of this funding opportunity. • The proposed work plan is reasonable and achievable and is supported by an appropriate and justified budget. 	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The patient-oriented question being addressed is crucial to making improvements to the health system and described in exceptional detail. • Justification for the proposed work is supported by a relevant, high-impact and high-quality body of work. • The aims and outline of the proposed work are exceptionally well described and highly feasible, and directly address the objectives of this funding opportunity. • The proposed work plan is exceptional; it is well thought out, highly achievable, and is supported by an appropriate and well-justified budget. 	<p>4.5 – 4.9</p>
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The patient-oriented question being addressed is important to making improvements to the health system and is well described. • Justification for the proposed work is supported by a large reputable and well-known body of work. • The aims and outline of the proposed work are well described and feasible, and directly address the objectives of this funding opportunity. • The work plan is extremely well presented, clearly achievable, and is supported by an appropriate and justified budget. 	<p>4.0 – 4.4</p>
<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The patient-oriented question being addressed is well-known and relevant to certain aspects of the health system and is clearly described. • Justification for the proposed work is supported by recognized, but limited body of work. • The aims and outline of the proposed work are generally well described and mostly feasible, and address most of the objectives of this funding opportunity. • The work plan is clearly outlined, mostly achievable and is supported by an appropriate and justified budget. 	<p>3.5 – 3.9</p>

<p>Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The patient-oriented question being addressed has a narrow focus relevant to a specific aspect of the health system, and is sufficiently described, but with limited detail. • Justification for the proposed work is supported by a relatively small body of work with limited impact. • The aims and outline of the proposed work are described, but in limited detail is somewhat feasible, and address some of the objectives of this funding opportunity. • The work plan is outlined in limited detail, somewhat achievable and is supported by an appropriate budget but lacks suitable justification. 	<p>3.0 – 3.4</p>
<p>Less than Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The patient-oriented question being addressed is irrelevant to the health system and is not suitably described. • Justification for the proposed work is generally unsupported by a relevant body of work, making it highly questionable. • The aims and outline of the proposed work are not well described, appears generally unfeasible, and does not appropriate address the objectives of this funding opportunity. • The work plan provided lacks suitable detail and its achievability is seriously questionable. The budget is not appropriate for the work proposed. 	<p>0.0 – 2.9</p>

Potential Impact	Weighting – 20%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <p>Please assess the potential impact of the proposed work plan based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The potential long-term impact of the proposed work on health care, and/or the health of British Columbians as they relate to patient-oriented research is evident. The proposed work is likely to be successful based on the pilot and/or feasibility activities described, and the related outcomes and/or outputs. Evidence that the research trainee’s role in the proposed work will enhance their experience and skills in patient-oriented research is provided. 	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed work will have enormous impact on health care, and/or the health of British Columbians as it relates to patient-oriented research. The proposed work will be incredibly successful based on the extremely strong pilot and/or feasibility activities described, and the related outcomes and/or outputs. The proposed work clearly identifies the next steps, including expected outcomes and indicators, necessary for a subsequent grant application. The research trainee plays an essential role in the work that will result in unequivocal experience and skill development in patient-oriented research. 	<p>4.5 – 4.9</p>
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed work will have a significant impact on health care, and/or the health of British Columbians as it relates to patient-oriented research. The proposed work will be highly successful based on strong pilot and/or feasibility activities, and the related outcomes and/or outputs. The proposed work identifies next steps, including expected outcomes and indicators, necessary for a subsequent grant application. The research trainee plays an important and productive role in the work that will result in strong experience and skill development in patient-oriented research. 	<p>4.0 – 4.4</p>
<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed work will have a positive impact on health care, and/or the health of British Columbians as it relates to aspects of patient-oriented research. The proposed work will be mostly effective based on solid pilot and/or feasibility activities, and the related outcomes and/or outputs. The proposed work mentions next steps, perhaps some expected outcomes and indicators, necessary for a subsequent grant application. The research trainee plays a key supporting role in the work that will result in valuable experience and skill development in patient-oriented research. 	<p>3.5 – 3.9</p>

<p>Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed work will have a beneficial, but limited impact on health care, and/or the health of British Columbians, although indirectly related to patient-oriented research. • The proposed work provides limited identification of the next steps, with few outcomes or indicators, necessary for a subsequent grant application. • The proposed work will be somewhat effective based on adequate pilot and/or feasibility activities, and the related outcomes and/or outputs. • The research trainee plays a secondary role in the work that will result in useful experience and skill development in patient-oriented research. 	<p>3.0 – 3.4</p>
<p>Less than Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed work will have little to no impact on health care, and/or the health of British Columbians. • The proposed work will be ineffective based on flawed pilot and/or feasibility activities unrelated to outcomes and/or outputs. • The proposed work does not identify next steps and provides no clear outcomes or indicators necessary for a subsequent grant application. • The research trainee plays no significant role in the work resulting no meaningful experience or skill development in patient-oriented research. 	<p>0.0 – 2.9</p>