

# 2021 Seed Grant Funding Details



SPOR Evidence Alliance

Strategy for Patient-Oriented Research

Alliance pour des données probantes de la SRAP  
Stratégie de recherche axée sur le patient

Strategy for Patient-Oriented Research

**SPOR**  
Putting Patients First

## Knowledge Dissemination and Implementation with Patient Partnership Using an Equity, Diversity and Social Justice Lens

### Funding Opportunity Details

Funding Organization	SPOR Evidence Alliance
Program Name	2021 SPOR Evidence Alliance Seed Grant Competition
Funding Launch Date	October 4, 2021

### Important Dates

- **Application Opens:** October 4, 2021 (4:00PM ET)
- **Application Deadline:** December 6, 2021 (11:59PM ET)
- **Anticipated Notice of Decision:** February 28, 2022
- **Anticipated Funding Start Date:** April 1, 2022

### Description

The SPOR Evidence Alliance Seed Grant aims to encourage a culture of learning, innovation, and advancement of science in the areas of knowledge synthesis, guideline development, knowledge translation, and patient-oriented research by funding methods projects at the conceptual stage.

Only projects studying **knowledge dissemination and implementation with patient partnership, using an equity, diversity and social justice lens** will be considered. We highly recommend the use of the [SCPOR Patient-Oriented Research Level of Engagement Tool \(PORLET\)](#) in developing your proposal and the [GRIPP2 reporting checklists](#) for reporting of research findings.

**NOTE:** Priority will be given to proposals that aim to engage and improve health outcomes for Black, Indigenous, and socioeconomically disadvantaged populations.

#### **What is knowledge dissemination and implementation?**

For the purpose of this funding opportunity, knowledge dissemination is defined as an active process to communicate results to users<sup>1</sup>. Implementation science is “the scientific study of methods to promote the systematic uptake of research findings and other evidence-based practices into routine practice...to improve the quality and effectiveness of health services and care”<sup>2</sup>.

### Value and Duration

- Up to 2 awards valued at **\$10,000** each for one year (non-renewable)

### Eligibility

Applicants must meet the following eligibility criteria:

<sup>1</sup> Gagnon M. Section 5.1 Knowledge dissemination and exchange of knowledge. Canadian Institutes of Health Research. (2010). <https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/41953.html>

<sup>2</sup> Eccles MP, Mittman BS. (2006). Welcome to Implementation Science. Implementation Sci 1, 1 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-1-1>

# 2021 Seed Grant Funding Details



SPOR Evidence Alliance  
Strategy for Patient-Oriented Research

Alliance pour des données probantes de la SRAP  
Stratégie de recherche axée sur le patient



- A **registered member** of the SPOR Evidence Alliance  
*Everyone is welcome to join and membership registration can be completed at the following link: <https://sporevidencealliance.ca/get-involved/become-an-alliance-member/>*
- A **doctoral student, post-doctoral fellow or an early career researcher** (i.e., full-time, independent researcher for a period of 0 to 5 years)<sup>3</sup> **at a Canadian institution**
- If **doctoral student** or **post-doctoral fellow**, your academic supervisor/mentor must also be a member of the SPOR Evidence Alliance
- Proposed project explores **methodological advancements of knowledge dissemination and implementation with patient partnership using an equity, diversity and social justice lens**

## Expectations

Successful candidates are expected to:

- **Present** at a 2022 summer/fall webinar or at the 2023 Annual General Meeting
- **Provide a financial report and an annual report** on their progress; due within 6 months after the end of the funding period
- **Acknowledge the SPOR Evidence Alliance** for provision of financial support in any publications, poster presentations, and other dissemination activities

## Application Requirements

**Please ensure all components of the application are included with your submission. Failure to submit any required documents will invalidate your application.**

### Application Requirements

- ☐ Completed Online Form
- ☐ Canadian Common CV (*draft version is acceptable*)
- ☐ Project Budget\*
- ☐ Project Timeline
- ☐ Academic Assessment Form (*for trainees, [Appendix 3](#)*)
- ☐ Letter of Support (*for early career researchers*)

### \*Allowable Costs

Grant funds must contribute towards the direct costs of the research for which the funds were awarded, and the benefits should be directly attributable to the grant. The host institution of the successful applicant is responsible for paying any indirect or overhead costs associated with managing the research project funded by the SPOR Evidence Alliance.

Examples of ineligible costs include but are not limited to: salaries for staff who provide administrative support only, training costs for workplace health and safety, costs related to the maintenance of libraries and laboratories, and administrative costs associated with getting a patent for an invention. For a complete list and description of eligible expenses under this grant, please consult the [Tri-Agency Financial Administration Guide](#).

<sup>3</sup> Canadian Institutes of Health Research. (2020). Glossary of Funding-Related Terms. Canadian Institutes of Health Research. <https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/34190.html>

# 2021 Seed Grant Funding Details



SPOR Evidence Alliance  
Strategy for Patient-Oriented Research

Alliance pour des données  
probantes de la SRAP  
Stratégie de recherche axée sur le patient



Eligible expenses can include, but are not limited to the following:

- Payment for research staff (e.g., research assistant)
- Technical services (e.g., transcription, language translation)
- Materials and supplies (e.g., copying, mailing, software/tools)
- Travel related to conducting and/or disseminating research (including meetings with decision makers/policy makers if project relevant)
- Costs related to community mobilization and engagement, including culturally relevant promotional items such as tobacco, cloth, and cash reimbursements (in a method acceptable to the individual or community being reimbursed) to compensate community participation
- Contracts and/or consultant fees for knowledge translation and communication activities

## Application Deadline

- In order to ensure fairness in the evaluation of grant applications, equivalent time must be guaranteed for each reviewer to assess each application. As a result, **the SPOR Evidence Alliance will not accept any updates to applications after the application deadline.**
- Applications will be accepted from **October 4 (4:00PM ET) – December 6 (11:59PM ET)**

## Application Review Process

- Reviewers will be selected from a pool of SPOR Evidence Alliance members with relevant experience and expertise
- Each reviewer will be asked to declare all conflicts of interest at the beginning of the application review process
- Each application will be independently reviewed and scored using a standardized assessment form by two patient/public partners and two researchers
- All applicants will be ranked based on the average of the four scores they received
- The top two scoring applications will be awarded

## Assessment Criteria

Each application package will be rated using the following assessment criteria:

- **Concept (25%)** – Relevance of the Research, Significance and Impact of the Research
- **Feasibility (75%)** – Approaches and Methods, Expertise, Experiences, and Resources
- **Patient-oriented research level of engagement using the [PORLET](#) (for feedback only)** – the degree to which a project meets the definition of patient-oriented research described by the CIHR Strategy for Patient-Oriented Research (SPOR)<sup>4</sup>

See [Appendix 1](#) and [Appendix 2](#).

## For Inquiries

For all inquiries, please contact the SPOR Evidence Alliance at [SPOREA@smh.ca](mailto:SPOREA@smh.ca).

<sup>4</sup> Canadian Institutes of Health Research (2014). *SPOR Patient Engagement Framework*. Retrieved from <http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/48413.html>



## APPENDIX 1: Evaluation Worksheet – Researcher Reviewer<sup>5</sup>

REVIEWER NAME:

APPLICANT NAME:

APPLICANT CAREER LEVEL:

☐ Doctoral Student ☐ Post-doctoral Fellow ☐ Early Career Investigator

Evaluation Checkpoint	Evaluation Guideline(s) for the Checkpoint	Reviewer Score out of 4.9 <sup>6</sup> (to one decimal place)	Reviewer Comments (clearly highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the project based on the evaluation criteria)  NOTE: Strengths and weaknesses listed here will be shared with other peer reviewers and the applicant
<b>CONCEPT – Relevance of the Research (5%)</b>			
Is the project idea relevant to knowledge dissemination and implementation with patient partnership, using an equity, diversity and social justice lens?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project idea is unique and will add new knowledge to the science of knowledge dissemination and implementation with patient partnership, using an equity, diversity and social justice lens.</li> <li>The project aims to engage and improve health outcomes for Black, Indigenous, and socioeconomically disadvantaged populations.</li> </ul>		
<b>CONCEPT – Significance and Impact of the Research (20%)</b>			
Is the project idea creative?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project idea is among the best formulated ideas in its field, stemming from new, incremental, innovative, or high-risk lines of inquiry; new or adapted research in health care, or health systems or health outcomes. When applicable, knowledge translation/ commercialization approaches/ methodologies should be considered, as well as opportunities to apply research</li> </ul>		

<sup>5</sup> Adapted from CIHR Peer Reviewer Manual – Project. Accessed May 19<sup>th</sup>, 2020 from <https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/49564.html#4.2.1>

<sup>6</sup> Grading Criteria

4.5-4.9	Outstanding	The application excels in most or all relevant aspects. Any short-comings are minimal.
4.0-4.4	Excellent	The application excels in many relevant aspects, and reasonably addresses all others. Certain improvements are possible.
3.5-3.9	Good	The application excels in some relevant aspects, and reasonably addresses all others. Some improvements are necessary.
3.0-3.4	Fair	The application broadly addresses relevant aspects. Major revisions are required.
0.0-2.9	Poor	The application fails to provide convincing information and/or has serious inherent flaws or gaps.

# 2021 Seed Grant Funding Details



SPOR Evidence Alliance  
Strategy for Patient-Oriented Research

Alliance pour des données probantes de la SRAP  
Stratégie de recherche axée sur le patient

Strategy for Patient-Oriented Research

**SPOR**  
Putting Patients First

	<i>findings nationally and internationally.</i>		
<i>Is the rationale of the project idea sound?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project rationale is based on a logical integration of concepts.</li> </ul>		
<i>Are the overall goals and objectives of the project well-defined?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The overall goal and objectives of the project are well-defined and clear.</li> <li>The goal states the purpose of the project, and what the project is ultimately expected to achieve.</li> <li>The objectives clearly define the proposed lines of inquiry and/or activities required to meet the goal.</li> <li>The proposed project outputs (i.e., the anticipated results of the project) are clearly described and aligned to the objectives.</li> </ul>		
<i>Are the anticipated project contributions likely to advance basic health-related knowledge, or health care, or health systems or health outcomes?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The context and needs (issues and/or gaps) of the project are clearly described.</li> <li>The anticipated contribution(s) (e.g., publishing in peer-reviewed journals) are clearly described, and should be substantive and relevant in relation to the context of the issues or gaps.</li> <li>The anticipated contribution(s) are realistic (i.e., directly stemming from the project outputs, as opposed to marginally related).</li> </ul>		
<b>FEASIBILITY – Approaches and Methods (50%)</b>			
<i>Are the approaches and methods appropriate to deliver the proposed output(s) and achieve the proposed contribution(s) to advancing health-related knowledge, health care, health systems, and/or health outcomes?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research and/or knowledge translation/commercialization approaches, methods and/or strategies are well-defined and justified in terms of being appropriate to accomplish the objectives of the project.</li> <li>Opportunities to maximize project contributions to advance health-related knowledge, health care, health systems and/or health outcomes should be proactively sought and planned for, but may also arise unexpectedly.</li> </ul>		
<i>Does the proposal describe how patient/public partners and other decision-makers will be engaged in the research process?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal should outline a clear plan for stakeholder engagement (including patients/public partners) in the research process.</li> </ul>		

# 2021 Seed Grant Funding Details



SPOR Evidence Alliance  
Strategy for Patient-Oriented Research

Alliance pour des données probantes de la SRAP  
Stratégie de recherche axée sur le patient

Strategy for Patient-Oriented Research



Are the timelines and related deliverables of the project realistic?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timelines for the project should be appropriate in relation to the proposed project activities. Key milestones and deliverables should be aligned with the objectives of the project, and be feasible given the duration of the project.</li> </ul>		
Does the proposal identify potential challenges and appropriate mitigation strategies?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critical scientific, technical, or organizational challenges should be identified, and a realistic plan to tackle these potential risks should be described. An exhaustive list is not expected.</li> </ul>		
<b>FEASIBILITY – Expertise, Experiences, and Resources (25%)</b>			
Does the applicant bring the appropriate expertise and experience to lead and deliver the proposed output(s), and to achieve the proposed contribution(s)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The applicant should demonstrate expertise and experience needed to execute the project (i.e., deliver the proposed outputs as well as achieve the proposed contribution(s)).</li> <li>The role and responsibility of the applicant should be clearly described, and linked to the objectives of the project.</li> </ul>		
Is there an appropriate level of engagement and/or commitment from the applicant?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The level of engagement (e.g., time and other commitments) of each applicant should be appropriate to the roles and responsibilities described.</li> </ul>		
Is the environment (academic institution and/or other organization) appropriate to enable the conduct and success of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project applicant should have access to the appropriate infrastructure, facilities, support personnel, equipment, and/or supplies to: (1) carry out their role, and; (2) manage and deliver the proposed output(s), and achieve the proposed contribution(s).</li> </ul>		
<b>Overall Score (please weight score according to section)</b>			
Based on your overall assessment, would you rate this application as competitive? (Competitive applications will be considered for funding)	<p>Yes, this application is competitive (top 50%) and should be considered for funding.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No, this application is not competitive (bottom 50%) and should NOT be considered for funding.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	

**Overall Score (office use only)** \_\_\_ OUT OF 4.9





## APPENDIX 2: Evaluation Worksheet – Patient/Public Reviewer

**REVIEWER NAME:** Click to enter your name.

**APPLICANT NAME:** Click to enter the applicant's name.

Please review your assigned applicant's research proposal carefully and complete the questionnaire below. Feel free to add comments to elaborate on your assessment as needed.

Research Impact and Relevance <sup>7</sup>	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Reviewer Comments
1. The proposal includes a clear description of the research being conducted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. The proposal includes a clear rationale for why this research is important.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. The proposal includes a clear description of what new information this research will add to knowledge dissemination and implementation with patient partnership, using an equity, diversity and social justice lens.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. The researcher has a plan to meaningfully engage patient/public partners and other decision-makers in the research conduct.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5. In my opinion, the results of this research will make a real difference in knowledge dissemination and implementation with patient partnership, using an equity, diversity and social justice lens.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**Overall Score (office use only)** \_\_\_ OUT OF 4.9

<sup>7</sup> Grading Criteria

4.5-4.9	Outstanding	The application excels in most or all relevant aspects. Any short-comings are minimal.
4.0-4.4	Excellent	The application excels in many relevant aspects, and reasonably addresses all others. Certain improvements are possible.
3.5-3.9	Good	The application excels in some relevant aspects, and reasonably addresses all others. Some improvements are necessary.
3.0-3.4	Fair	The application broadly addresses relevant aspects. Major revisions are required.
0.0-2.9	Poor	The application fails to provide convincing information and/or has serious inherent flaws or gaps.



## Appendix 3: Academic Reference Form

*NOTE: The Academic Referee must email this form directly to [SPOREA@smh.ca](mailto:SPOREA@smh.ca) by the application deadline of December 6, 2021 (11:59PM ET).*

Section A (to be completed by the Applicant)
Name: Click or tap here to enter text.
Contact Address: Click or tap here to enter text.
Email Address: Click or tap here to enter text.

Section B (to be completed by the Academic Referee)
Title and Name of Referee: Click or tap here to enter text.
Contact Address: Click or tap here to enter text.
Email Address: Click or tap here to enter text.
<p><i>Select as appropriate</i></p> <p><b>What is your relationship with the Applicant?</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Academic Supervisor      <input type="checkbox"/> Practicum Supervisor      <input type="checkbox"/> Other</p> <p><b>How well do you know the Applicant?</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Very well      <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonably well      <input type="checkbox"/> Not very well</p> <p><b>How long have you known the Applicant?</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> More than 3 years      <input type="checkbox"/> Between 2 and 3 year      <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 year</p>



# 2021 Seed Grant Funding Details



SPOR Evidence Alliance  
Strategy for Patient-Oriented Research

Alliance pour des données probantes de la SRAP  
Stratégie de recherche axée sur le patient

Strategy for Patient-Oriented Research



## Evaluation of Applicant – in comparison with similar candidates with whom you have interacted.

Tick (✓) as appropriate

	Excellent (top 5%)	Very Good (top 10%)	Good (top 30%)	Average (top 40%)	Poor (less than 60%)	Brief Justification
Intellectual Ability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Research Capability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Analytical Capability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Research Motivation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Originality and Innovation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Teamwork and Collaboration Capability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Ambition	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sense of Responsibility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Written/Oral Communication	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Ability to Complete Projects on Time	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

# 2021 Seed Grant Funding Details



**SPOR Evidence Alliance**  
Strategy for Patient-Oriented Research

**Alliance pour des données probantes de la SRAP**   
Stratégie de recherche axée sur le patient

Strategy for Patient-Oriented Research

**SPOR**  
Putting Patients First 

Statement on the Applicant's research potential with specific reference to recent knowledge of the Applicant's work and any specific support the Applicant may require (maximum 2 pages):

Signature:

Date: