



## **REVIEWERS' ASSESMENT GUIDE**

### **INSTRUCTIONS**

Please complete one **Review Form** for each proposal that is assigned to you and forward your electronic file to the CFDHRE Program Director, Judy Lux at [foundation@cdha.ca](mailto:foundation@cdha.ca) .

### **REVIEW FORM**

#### **1.0 Administration Information:**

##### **Reviewer's Contact Information**

Please fill in your name, e-mail address and phone number

##### **Project Title**

Please fill in the project title from the first page of the **Grant Application Form**

## 2.0 Organizational Information:

**2.1 Mission, goals and objectives of the organization** - are they well described and do they align with the mission of the CFDHRE?

<http://www.cfdhre.ca/>

Consider the following when determining the rating:

- A vision describes an image of the future that the organization wants to achieve.
- A mission for an organization articulates the purpose of the organization, or what it does to achieve its vision.
- Goals are specific and realistic aims for a specific time period.
- Objectives are clear, specific statements about the intended outcomes that contribute to bigger goals. They are time-limited, concrete, realistic and measurable.

4-5	The mission, goals and objectives are very clearly described, succinct and realistic. They clearly align with the CFDHRE Mission	
2-3	Relatively clearly defined mission, goals and objectives, which are somewhat realistic and they align with the CFDHRE Mission. There may be some ambiguity.	
0-1	Not clear, and not aligned	

Comments:

**2.2 Describe the organizational capacity for conducting the project.**

Consider the following when determining the rating:

- Does the organization have previous working experience with this type of project?
- Does the organization have good knowledge and expertise about this type of project?
- Does the organization have the capacity to oversee the financial management of the grant?
- Does the organization have sound administrative and financial systems?

4-5	Evidence of strong capacity and clearly describes why the organization is well suited for conducting the project.	
2-3	Evidence of moderate capacity and suitability of the organization to oversee the project.	
0-1	Organizational capacity is not outlined, or there is evidence of little capacity and/or suitability for conducting the project.	

Comments:

**2.3 Project participants' names, background and roles in the project.**

(Please note that section 5 requires curriculum vitae for the Lead and Co-Principal Applicant – please refer to this in order to rate this section)

4-5	Roles are well described	
2-3	Roles are moderately described	
0-1	Little or no description of roles	

Comments:

**2.4 Describe why the individual participants in the project are qualified to conduct the project.**

4-5	Participants have strong qualifications and the rationale for inclusion of the participants is clearly articulated.	
2-3	Some reference is made to the individual participants' qualifications but details as to the rationale for the inclusion are limited. Participants are moderately qualified.	
0-1	Participants show little evidence of being qualified for the project and there is no rationale for inclusion.	

Comments:

[Large greyed-out area for comments]

[Empty white area for additional comments]

**2.5 Other participants.** If there is more than one partner organization involved in the project include the following:

Consider the following in determining the rating:

- Are there clearly defined roles and responsibilities of each organization?
- Is there a description of how the partnership enhances the ability to develop and deliver this project?
- Is there evidence of partner commitment? Letters from partners are required to indicate the way in which they will contribute to the success of the project.
- Is there a description of how communication will occur and how cohesiveness between the organizations will be built?

4-5	Very clearly described roles and responsibilities. There is evidence of strong partner commitment to the project. There is a process in place to allow good communication and there is a description of how cohesiveness will be built. There are letters of support from partners.	
2-3	Some reference made to roles and responsibilities. There is evidence of some partner commitment to the project and there is some reference to the roles and responsibilities. There are letters of support from partners.	
0-1	The roles, responsibilities and commitment are poorly described, not clear and/or not appropriate. There are no letters of support from partners.	

Comments:

## ORGANIZATIONAL SCORE

Total of all of the scores in the Organizational section, divided by 5

---

### Project Proposal information:

**3.1 Project objectives:** Objectives for the public education and publication of dental hygiene information projects must align with the **CFDHRE Mission Statement** at <http://www.cfdhre.ca/>

Research projects and research dissemination projects must align with the above mission statement and the research themes in the document **Guiding Research within the Dental Hygiene Profession** located at [http://www.cfdhre.ca/CFDHRE\\_GuidingResearch.pdf](http://www.cfdhre.ca/CFDHRE_GuidingResearch.pdf)

Consider the following when determining the rating:

- Are the objectives time-limited, concrete, realistic and measurable?

4-5	Objectives are very clear, appropriate, realistic, and readily achievable. There is a clear and logical link between the project objectives and the CFDHRE Mission Statement.	
2-3	Objectives are clear, but may not be realistic or achievable. There is a reasonable relationship between the project objectives and the CFDHRE Mission Statement	
0-1	Objectives are not clear, not achievable. There is little or no relationship between the project objectives and the CFDHRE Mission Statement.	

Comments:

### 3.2 Target audience/target of the research

4-5	Project offers a sound rationale for and description of the intended target audience or target of the research.	
2-3	Some description of the audience/target of research is offered, but rationale for choice is limited.	
0-1	Brief reference is made.	
Comments:		
<p><b>3.3 Project need, significance or impact.</b></p> <p>Consider the following in determining the rating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a clearly demonstrated justification of the need, significance or impact of the project?</li> <li>• Is there an explanation of any formal and/or informal information supporting the need for this project along with any evidence such as needs assessments, literature reviews, previous evaluation or assessment results, reports, and project relevant statistics?</li> <li>• Why will the proposed activity address the needs you identified?</li> <li>• Will the project result in short term or long lasting changes?</li> </ul>		
4-5	Sound rationale is provided for the need, significance or impact of the project. Project offers a unique approach to addressing the topic; demonstrates a clear understanding of the issues. The project is highly likely to lead to lasting changes.	
2-3	Only a brief mention of the rational for the need, significance or impact is provided. The proposed project will contribute to change in the short term, long term goals may be questionable.	
0-1	Little or no rational is provided for the need, significance or impact. The proposed project is a time limited one that is unlikely to lead to significant change.	
Comments:		

<p><b>3.4 Literature Review</b></p> <p>Please attach, in the appendices, a list of literature that you have reviewed and summarize the findings in this section. Describe the relevance of the literature review to the study design and research plan.</p> <p>All proposals must be founded on existing evidence based oral health research.</p>		
4-5	Extensive literature review. Strong reference to research surrounding the selected topic and a very clear indication of the relevance to study design/research plan.	
2-3	Literature review is satisfactory. Some information provided on existing research and the relevance to the study design/research plan	
0-1	Incomplete or nonexistent literature review and no indication of the relevance to the study design/research plan.	
Comments:		
<p><b>3.5 Approach or methodology</b></p>		
4-5	The proposed approach or methods for collecting, analyzing, rating and interpreting the research evidence are clearly articulated and appropriate. or The methods for carrying out the public education and the publication of information are clearly articulated and appropriate.	
2-3	Brief reference is made to the approach or methodology and it is somewhat appropriate.	
0-1	Approach or methodology is not described or not appropriate.	
Comments:		
<p><b>3.6 Products or outputs</b></p>		

Consider the following in determining the rating:

- Is there a list of all products, goods, or services that will be produced or delivered as part of the project?
- Are these outputs clearly defined and quantifiable?
- Do the outputs support the attainment of the project outcomes (3.7) below?

4-5	Products or outputs are clearly identified.	
2-3	Products or outputs are briefly described.	
0-1	Products or outputs are not described or defined.	

Comments:

**3.7 Intended results/outcome/impact of the project**

Consider the following in determining the rating:

- Are the outcomes clearly stated for each of the project objectives?
- Are the short term and long term results defined?

4-5	Well described	
2-3	Briefly described	
0-1	Not clearly described	

Comments:

**3.8 Work plan**

4-5	The proposal includes a detailed description of the activities to be carried out with timelines that are realistic and feasible.	
2-3	A partial description of the proposed activities and timelines is provided and they are somewhat realistic and moderately feasible.	
0-1	No work plan or timelines are included or they are not realistic or feasible.	

Comments:

**3.9 Knowledge dissemination plan**

Knowledge translation (KT) is integral to CFDHRE's mission and falls into two main categories, *end of grant KT* and *integrated KT*. With both categories of knowledge translation CFDHRE expects researchers to disseminate their findings and facilitate their translation into improved health, more effective products or services, and/or a strengthened healthcare system. Note that the costs of dissemination are eligible expenditures.

When the primary knowledge users are researchers, dissemination of results through the publication of articles in high quality and accessible journals is appropriate, although other strategies that increase awareness of the results and facilitate their application may also be appropriate. When knowledge-user audiences outside the research community should be informed of specific research findings, comprehensive dissemination goals and strategies can be documented. With integrated KT, stakeholders or potential research knowledge users are engaged in the entire research process and the research is directed at producing solutions to issues or problems the stakeholders/knowledge users have identified.

Consider the following when determining the rating:

- Is the target audience for KT activities appropriate?
- Is the target audience for dissemination of project results appropriate?
- Does the plan involve stakeholders early in the project and throughout?
- Are the KT activities appropriate and timelines realistic?

4-5	A comprehensive plan is in place as to when, how and with whom information on the project will be shared.	
2-3	Reference is made to the necessity of disseminating information on the project but details are lacking.	
0-1	Little mention is made of disseminating information related to the project.	

Comments:

**3.10 Evaluation plan**

In coming to a decision regarding the evaluation plan, the following points should be considered:

- Does the proposal describe how the evaluation will be conducted?
- Are the expected outcomes and indicators of success clearly identified and appropriate?
- Are the approaches to the measurement of variables appropriate and clearly delineated?
- Who will be involved in the collecting of data and when are the data to be collected?
- What is the role of the partners in the evaluation process?
- Have the indicators of success of the project been identified?

4-5	A thorough and detailed plan for the evaluation of the project is presented.	
2-3	An outline of an evaluation plan is included but is lacking in detail.	
0-1	The need for an evaluation plan is stated but details are not provided, or no evaluation plan is included.	

Comments:

**3.11 Bonus section: Originality of the Proposal**

4-5	Strong potential for the creation of new knowledge. Very original proposal.	
2-3	Somewhat original and moderate potential for the creation of new knowledge.	
0-1	Not original no potential for the creation of new knowledge	

Comments:

**4. Budget** including expenditures with a short description of the itemized

expenditures, including other sources of funding; and the total amount requested.		
4-5	The budget is realistic for the proposed activities. Details are provided on each of the costs and how the estimates were determined.	
2-3	Questions arise concerning how realistic the budget is. Justification for some budget items is lacking.	
0-1	Details concerning the budget are sparse.	
Comments:		
<b>5. Required attachments</b>		
Applicant indicates ethics approval is required    Yes    or    No		
Reviewer agrees with this    Yes    or    No		
Lead Principle Applicant and Co-principle applicant have attached a CV: YES                      NO		
Adequate information is provided in the CV                      Yes    or    No		
Comments:		

**PROJECT PROPOSAL SCORE**

Total of all of the scores in the Project Proposals section, divided by 12

\_\_\_\_\_

## OVERALL SCORE

Please complete the Additional Comments section below and then the Overall Score found in the Level of Rating Chart below. The overall score should take into account the comments and does not necessarily have to be a total of the Organizational Information Score and the Project Proposal Score, which are meant to act as guides for calculating the overall score. Reviewers may determine that some items should be weighted more heavily than others for a particular proposal and take that into account in their overall score.

Additional Comments on the Proposal:

### Level of Rating Chart

			<b>OVERALL SCORE</b>
4-5	Represent the highest scores and indicate that the proposal meets or exceeds the expected criteria and should be considered for funding.	Recommended for funding	
2-3	Represent an acceptable score and indicates that the proposal meets all or most of the expected criteria at some level if appropriate revisions are made to the project.	Recommended for funding, if appropriate revisions are made	
0-1	Represent the lowest scores and indicate significant weakness or absence in meeting the expected criteria or a fundamental flaw in the proposal. Not recommended for funding.	Not fundable	

Please forward your electronic versions of the review form to the CFDHRE Program Director, Judy Lux at [foundation@cdha.ca](mailto:foundation@cdha.ca).