

2020-2021 Reviewers' Assessment Guide

ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION	
Research proposal title	
Authors	
Reviewer	

1. Organizational Information (Max 5 pages)	Score /5	Sub-total
1.1 Organizational mission, goals and objectives The mission, goals and objectives of the organization are very clearly and succinctly described; clearly align with the CFDHRE mission.		/15
1.2 Organizational capacity Research proposal clearly describes evidence of strong organizational capacity and how/why the organization is well suited for conducting the research.		
1.3 Participant information and capacity Background and roles of participants are well described. Participants have strong qualifications for carrying out the research and the rationale for inclusion of the participants is clearly articulated. If there is more than one partner organization involved in the research, roles and responsibilities of each organization is clearly defined and there is good evidence of strong partner commitment.		
1.4 Comments		
2. Research Proposal Information (Max 10 pages)	Score /5	Sub-total
2.1 Objectives Research proposal objectives are aligned with the CFDHRE Mission statement AND clearly pertain to specific area of research within CDHA Research Priorities; objectives are clear, appropriate, realistic and measurable.		/70
2.2 Target audience and sampling Research proposal clearly describes with a sound rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the intended target population and target of the research 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the sampling approach 		
2.3 Need, significance, impact Research proposal provides a sound rationale indicating the level of need, significance and/or impact of the research including any supporting evidence; research has a good potential to yield lasting positive changes.		
2.4 Literature review		

Concise and comprehensive literature review. It clearly demonstrates a thorough understanding of the topic area including the research conducted to date and how the proposed research will build upon the existing knowledge base. (2-3pages not including references)		
2.5 Research methodology Research proposal clearly states the overall design methodology being used. Research proposal clearly describes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study question • Rationale • Methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sampling and Recruitment if applicable ○ Measurement /survey instrument ○ Study protocols ○ Data collection ○ Data Analysis 	(out of 30)	
2.6 Work plan Research proposal includes a detailed description of the activities to be carried out with timelines that are realistic and feasible.		
2.7 Knowledge translation/ dissemination plan A comprehensive and realistic KT (dissemination) plan is described indicating when, how and with whom research findings will be disseminated (shared), translated into practice/policy, and/or inform future research.		
2.8 Budget The budget is realistic and relevant to the proposed research question. Details are provided on each of the costs, and sources of funding for shortfall, if any, are included.		
2.9 Overall originality and potential for creation of new knowledge Research proposal is original and has potential for the creation of new knowledge. The research proposal has the potential to contribute to the CDHA research priorities in a substantive manner.		
2.10 Comments		
3. Overall Impression	Score /5	
3.1 The overall impression should Take into account general impressions of the proposal. Reviewers may determine that sections should be weighted more heavily and take that into account in overall score.		Sub-total /5
3.2 Comments:		

Final Score	
Total out of 90	
Total divided by 18 (overall score out of 5)	

Descriptor	Range	Outcome
Outstanding	4.5-5.0	Recommended for funding
Excellent	4.0-4.4	
Very Good	3.5-3.9	Recommended for funding, if appropriate revisions are made. May be discussed by the committee.
Acceptable, but low priority	3.0-3.4	
Needs revisions	2.5-2.9	Not fundable
Needs major revisions	2.0-2.4	
Seriously Flawed	0.0-1.9	