A Guide for Assessing Health Research Knowledge Translation (KT) Plans

Developed as part of a research study being conducted by investigators from the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health and McMaster University, Canada:

Towards More Effective Peer Review of Knowledge Translation (KT) Plans in Research Grant Proposals

October 31, 2007

How to Use this Guide

This guide has been developed to support knowledge translation components of the health research grant application and funding process. The purpose of this guide is to:

1. Provide peer reviewers of health research grants with the conceptual tools they need to conduct fair assessments of the knowledge translation components of these grants.
2. Provide grant applicants with information about how the knowledge translation components of their grant applications will be assessed.

The guide has four parts:

1. *Foundations: Defining knowledge translation (KT)* – describes the model of knowledge translation that was used to develop the guide and suggests ways in which knowledge translation plans should be linked to the goals of a specific research project.
2. *Considerations for assessing a KT plan* – summarizes (in table format) key factors (KT goals, collaboration, research stage, participants, methods, and resources and implementation) that need to be taken into account when assessing a research grant's KT plan.
3. *Examples* – provides two examples of assessor comments to hypothetical KT plans using a rating form based on the guide.
4. *Rating Form and Checklist* – provides a blank copy of the KT rating form and a summary checklist of key questions for assessors.

All parts of the guide are interrelated so it is most helpful to review the full guide before considering how any one area might apply to a particular plan.

1. Foundations: Defining Knowledge Translation

Knowledge translation can be defined quite broadly as those activities that help the creation of new knowledge translate into beneficial applications. This guide focuses on knowledge translation activities conducted as part of the research process but acknowledges that knowledge translation activities linked directly to the research process cannot be the sole means of promoting beneficial research applications.

The guide assumes that knowledge translation activities need to be considered across the full research continuum and may include many possible goals, participants, and methods. In this respect, researchers[1] need to be highly strategic in formulating a knowledge translation plan that is logically linked to the type of research and the specific research context. Considering a research initiative in relation to its potential application and the nature of the needs it aims to address can help researchers identify the most appropriate KT goals around which to shape the KT plan. Where research falls on the application continuum between exploratory or developed, for example, will, in part, determine the appropriate KT goals**.** Similarly, how it might inform in the short or long term, broadly to contribute to conceptual understanding or more directly to determine procedural action, and whether it needs to be supplemented or considered in relation

---

[1] By "researchers" we mean producers of research knowledge whether or not they would describe themselves as researchers in the context of their primary work role.

to a broader range of knowledge to fully realize its potential application, will also help shape KT goals**.**

2.   Factors and Considerations for Assessing a Knowledge Translation Plan

The following table outlines different factors or components of a plan. For each factor, the table summarizes its key characteristics ('factor' column); considerations for selecting or developing different approaches to this component of the plan ('considerations' column); and questions for assessors to use to assess this component of a plan ('assessor questions' column).

Factor	Considerations	Assessor Questions

KT Goals
• To generate:
  o Awareness
  o Interest
  o Action
   - Practice change
   - Product Development
• To gain:
  o Knowledge about research setting or system context
  o A stakeholder perspective
  o Support for conducting the research
	• KT goal(s) are developed in relation to the nature of the research. A single research project may suggest multiple possible goals. In circumstances of limited resources, researchers will have to prioritize among these goals
	• Particularly when research is focused on external needs (versus researcher driven needs), plans usually include not only goals to *generate* outcomes but also goals to *gain knowledge or support*
	• Goals to generate outcomes range from seeking less targeted/defined responses (awareness) to more targeted/defined responses (creating interest) to very targeted/defined responses (promoting action)
	• Stakeholders may provide valuable perspectives throughout a research project; for example, when prioritizing research questions and interpreting the findings.
	• Support may include activities such as gaining access to research settings or providing assistance with data collection.
		• Does the plan identify clear goals?
		• Are the KT goals well justified in relation to the nature of the research?

Factor	Considerations	Assessor Questions

Collaboration
• Extent of Collaboration:
  o Completely participatory
  o Partial collaboration
• Control over decisions:
  o Shared equally among team members
  o Rests primarily with researchers
• Relationship dynamics:
  o Trust and respect
  o Reciprocity
	• Depending upon goals, an approach to collaboration with non-researcher participants can range from involving others as partners in knowledge generation to only involving others as recipients of project results.
	• In completely participatory approaches research goals may be integrated with KT goals since the process of research knowledge generation is intended to create change. The research plan *is* the KT plan.
	• More highly collaborative research may be suitable in situations where non-researchers need to assume full ownership of research outcomes in order to implement findings or develop products or when there is a history of power imbalances or distrust between researchers and stakeholder communities
	• Any research project requires a myriad of decisions to be made, e.g. decisions about study design, conduct, and data interpretation. There must be congruence between the extent of collaboration proposed and the structure and process of decision making.
	• Some attention should be paid to the development of trust and respect in relationships with non-researchers in all forms of collaboration. Expectations about any mutual benefits should be clear to all parties.
		• Is the approach to collaboration consistent with the stated goals ?
		• Do all proposed parties have the capabilities and competencies to carry out the collaboration?
		• Is the decision making structure appropriate for the collaboration approach?
		• Do the letters of support and other application materials demonstrate a sound base for project collaboration? For example, do they speak to a prior history of working together and do they reflect a specific understanding of the current project?

Factor	Considerations	Assessor Questions
Research Stage • Research initiation (prioritizing, defining, and proposing research) • Conducting research (data collection and analysis, interpreting research outcomes) • Research outcomes (interpreting research implications, message development, disseminating and communicating research outcomes)	• When developing a KT plan it is useful to think about needs and opportunities according to stages of the research process. • For example, in order to gain knowledge about the clinical "realities" of the area under investigation , it may be appropriate to involve selected providers when prioritizing research questions or interpreting results. Or, as another example, having the support of health system decision-makers responsible for a particular delivery setting may help shape and facilitate data collection activities. • Each stage of the project has the potential to generate useful products. For example a literature review might lead to fact sheets, annotated reference list or might point to resources for best practice development. • KT plans may not involve every stage of the research	• Does the plan consider the stages of the research necessary to achieving the stated goals?

Factor	Considerations	Assessor Questions
Participants • Defined by *sector role* —e.g., policy decision-maker, health services planner, clinician, biomedical researcher, client, patient advocate, public • Defined by *KT role* —e.g., partner, research team member, advisor, intermediary, or audience.	• The selection of *who* is involved in a project should be driven by the goals of the plan and the collaboration approach. • A single health research project may involve participants from several different sectors • Different KT participants may be involved in different stages of the research in order to address different goals. For example, clinical researchers may begin a research project at the behest of a consumer group that has noted a gap in practice. In order to gain interest in addressing the gap, researchers may need to involve not only clients and providers, but also health care decision-makers in conducting the research and promoting research outcomes. • A single health research project may have participants from the same sector serving different roles such as an identified group of clinical providers as a target audience, an individual clinician as a research team member, and a clinical professional body as an intermediary for reaching the target audience.	• Does the applicant clearly identify the sector(s) from which participants will be drawn? • Does the applicant clearly identify the role(s) participants will play? • Are strategies for accessing potential participants knowledgeably and realistically described, e.g., using established contacts, identified intermediaries, or networks? • Does the plan consider the involvement of all participants necessary to achieving the stated goals?

Factor	Considerations	Assessor Questions

Methods
• Interactive engagement and linkage and exchange (e.g., project advisory committee, stakeholder meetings to review findings)
• Dissemination and communication (e.g., website, brochure, presentation to practitioners)
	• Methods are determined by the plan's goals and participants. For example, a goal such as generating awareness for providers will require different methods than one oriented to promoting action by families and consumers.
	• Methods for more collaborative approaches involve interactive engagement with participants and are most appropriate when project goals seek particular stakeholder responses and expertise (e.g. defining research questions, considering research implications, gaining support from sector representatives for promoting research application).
	• Methods for engaging participants may take different forms and occur at different stages of the research process. For example, it may be useful to establish a project advisory committee (ongoing engagement) or there may be a need for other interactive strategies such as holding targeted meetings of selected stakeholders to discuss research implications before the completion of the project, or organizing face-to-face meetings for the sharing of results (targeted engagement).
	• Less collaborative approaches to generate awareness or gain interest may focus only on dissemination and communication directed to identified audiences
	• Methods should draw upon existing evidence of effectiveness
	• Methods for disseminating/communicating findings should consider the need to:
	  ▪ Identify and segment target audiences
	  ▪ Choose the most appropriate media/channels, venues and formats for the communication of results
	  ▪ Tailor the content for the target audience and formulate findings from the target audience perspective
	  ▪ Use plain language
	  ▪ Develop main messages, executive summary, provide a synthesis
	  ▪ Decide on timing (e.g., throughout, at the end)
	  ▪ Choose credible messengers
		• Are the methods identified appropriate to achieving the plan's goals?
		• Are the methods appropriate to the chosen collaboration approach?
		• Does the plan demonstrate a balance between evidence and innovation?

Factor	Considerations	Assessor Questions
Resources and Implementation • Human • Financial • Organizational and external supports	• The research team should be composed of individuals with the appropriate skills, experience, credibility, and protected time to carry out the plan • If there are partners, commitment and ability to participate needs to be demonstrated. • Some plans may require a budget to support personnel, supplies, travel and other expenses associated with implementation of the plan • There are services and supports that can be drawn upon within some research institutes and universities to support and complement the activities of the research team (e.g. KT or liaison staff, communication department). Having access to these kinds of supports will make a difference in the type of plan that is feasible. • Similarly for some research areas there are important external supports and *system* KT capacity that allow researchers to leverage their KT activities. This is true, for example, in many clinical areas where networks and organizing agencies have been established to provide a more cohesive, integrated approach to application development. Researchers can and should capitalize on these supports in their KT plans when they are available. • Tradeoffs between reach and feasibility are inevitable.	• Is there sufficient description of past knowledge translation activities to appraise the experience and skill level of the research team and, where appropriate, other KT participants? • Are knowledge translation activities included in the description of investigators' and other participants' roles and responsibilities? • Is the budget for KT activities convincingly justified? Does it include an appropriate level of financial support to implement the plan? • Does the plan take organizational and/or external system supports into consideration? If so, does it provide evidence for these supports (e.g. sufficiently specific letter of support from the sponsoring and partnering organizations)? • If there are no organizational supports or developed system supports, is the plan feasible and strategically focused on areas where limited efforts can achieve useful outcomes?

Factor	Considerations	Assessor Questions
Overall • Is the plan appropriate? Do the identified KT goals and collaboration approach make sense in relation to the research? • Is the plan coherent? Do the identified activities make sense in relation to the research context and KT goals? • Is the plan feasible? Does it identify the resources necessary to carry out the proposed activities?		

3. **Examples**

EXAMPLE 1: Examining Hemoglobin Markers for Paris Medley Disease	
KT Goals	
FACTORS	**ASSESSOR QUESTIONS**
- To generate: - Awareness - Interest - Action - Practice change - Product development - To gain: - Knowledge about research setting of system context - Expertise - Support for conducting the research	- Does the plan identify clear goals? - Are the KT goals well justified in relation to the nature of the research?

Comments:

The applicant provides a clear description of the nature of the research in relation to identified KT goals. This 'basic' research continues and builds upon exploratory investigations into physiological conditions associated with a particular disease process. Based on their work, investigators have a growing interest in the potential development of a new diagnostic tool (possibly able to identify the disease at an earlier and more treatable stage than current tests). For this reason they want to seek the expertise of clinical researchers in the area and generate interest in further research work.

Collaboration	
FACTORS	**ASSESSOR QUESTIONS**
- Extent of collaboration: - Completely participatory - Partial Collaboration - Control over decisions: - Shared equally among team members - Rests primarily with researchers - Relationship dynamics - Trust and respect - Reciprocity	- Is the approach to collaboration consistent with the stated goals? - Do all proposed parties have the capabilities and competencies to carry out the collaboration? - Is the decision making structure appropriate for the collaboration approach? - Do the letters of support and other application materials demonstrate a sound base for project collaboration? For example, do they speak to a prior history of working together and do they reflect a specific understanding of the current project?

Comments:

This partial collaboration focuses on decisions that will be made at the end of the project. Others will be asked for advice but the decisions about future research development will rest primarily in the research team.

Research Stage

FACTORS	ASSESSOR QUESTIONS
• Research initiation (prioritizing, defining, and proposing research) • Conducting research (data collection and analysis, interpreting research outcomes) • Research outcomes (interpreting research implications, message development, disseminating and communicating research outcomes)	• Does the plan consider the stages of the research necessary to achieving the stated goals?

Comments:

Applicants plan to seek input for targeted clinical researchers after study results are established but before publication. This makes sense. The current research is well defined – clinical researcher input will be useful for further research development not for helping to shape research activities for this study. The input will also be useful for considering whether to target at least one publication from the study to the translation research section of one of the clinical journals for the disease area.

Participants

FACTORS	ASSESSOR QUESTIONS
• Defined by *sector role* – e.g., policy decision-maker, health services planner, clinician, biomedical researcher, client, patient advocate, public • Defined by *KT role* – e.g., partner, research team member, intermediary, or audience	• Does the applicant clearly identify the sector(s) from which participants will be drawn? • Does the applicant clearly identify the role(s) participants will play? • Are strategies for accessing potential participants knowledgeably and realistically described, e.g., using established contacts, identified intermediaries, or networks? • Does the plan consider the involvement of all participants necessary to achieving the stated goals?

Comments:

KT participants are clearly identified. The PI consulted with a clinical colleague in her university who in turn linked the PI to a clinical research specialist in the US who is conducting research in a related area. This specialist was able to advise the PI about the most relevant professional clinical research group and the timing of future meetings and conferences. The identified professional clinical research group is a North American expert body and appears to be a highly appropriate group to serve as KT participants for this study.

Methods

FACTORS	ASSESSOR QUESTIONS
• Interactive engagement and linkage and exchange (e.g., project advisory committee, stakeholder meetings to review findings) • Dissemination and communication (e.g., website, brochure, presentation to practitioners	• Are the methods identified appropriate to achieving the plan's goals? • Are the methods appropriate to the chosen collaboration approach? • Does the plan demonstrate a balance between evidence and innovation?

Comments:

Again, KT methods are clearly defined and appropriate. To gain clinical research expertise, applicants plan to do two things: 1) present the results of previous related research and this study at a meeting of the targeted clinical research body; 2) host a dinner meeting, in conjunction with the same event, with interested clinical researchers to identify future research needs for assessing the feasibility of the development of a clinical diagnostic tool using the identified physiological markers.

To generate interest in further research (which will also result from the interactive methods described above), applicants will target a publication (if applicable based on study results and clinical researcher input) to the translational research section of one of the clinical journals for the disease area.

Resources and Implementation

FACTORS	ASSESSOR QUESTIONS
• Human • Financial • Organizational and external supports	• Is there sufficient description of past knowledge translation activities to appraise the experience and skill level of the research team and, where appropriate, other KT participants? • Are knowledge translation activities included in the description of investigators' and other participants' roles and responsibilities? • Is the budget for KT activities convincingly justified? Does it include an appropriate level of financial support to implement the plan? • Does the plan take organizational and/or external system supports into consideration? If so, does it provide evidence for these supports

	(e.g. sufficiently specific letter of support from the sponsoring and partnering organizations)? • If there are no organizational supports or developed system supports, is the plan feasible and strategically focused on areas where limited efforts can achieve useful outcomes?

Comments:

KT plans are modest and feasible. Requested resources for KT activities (conference travel and dinner meeting) are reasonable and appropriate.

Overall

ASSESSOR QUESTIONS

- Is the plan appropriate? Do the identified KT goals make sense in relation to the research?
- Is the plan coherent? Do the identified activities make sense in relation to the research context and KT goals?
- Is the plan feasible? Does it identify the resources necessary to carry out the stated activities?

Comments:

The KT plan is appropriate for the nature of the research (makes an explicit effort to consider the next steps in the application process beyond investigators' immediate research area), coherent (linked to well justified KT goals), and feasible (limited, well targeted informed activities)

EXAMPLE TWO: Advanced Nursing Practice in Anesthesia: A Systematic Review	
KT Goals	
FACTORS	**ASSESSOR QUESTIONS**
- To generate: - Awareness - Interest - Action - Practice change - Product development - To gain: - Knowledge about research setting of system context - Expertise - Support for conducting the research	- Does the plan identify clear goals? - Are the KT goals well justified in relation to the nature of the research?

Comments:

This research is a systematic review and synthesis of a defined delivery model (using advanced practice nursing to administer anesthesia for selected surgical procedures in selected delivery contexts). As such the applicants rightly characterize their health services research as being more developed than exploratory. Their overall KT goal, however, to "promote action to change practice" seems premature and expansive. Even assuming their hypothesis is correct (based on earlier research in this area) that the delivery model has the potential to save money and diffuse pressure on physician shortages with no or even positive impact on health outcomes, efforts to change practice without gaining further understanding of the delivery implications are inappropriate.

Collaboration	
FACTORS	**ASSESSOR QUESTIONS**
- Extent of collaboration: - Completely participatory - Partial Collaboration - Control over decisions: - Shared equally among team members - Rests primarily with researchers - Relationship dynamics - Trust and respect - Reciprocity	- Is the approach to collaboration consistent with the stated goals ? - Do all proposed parties have the capabilities and competencies to carry out the collaboration? - Is the decision making structure appropriate for the collaboration approach? - Do the letters of support and other application materials demonstrate a sound base for project collaboration? For example, do they speak to a prior history of working together and do they reflect a specific understanding of the current project?

Comments:

The applicants have described their project as participatory action research but neither the process nor the structure of the project match this designation. There is no evidence of participants being involved in the preparation of the application. Terms of reference for the research advisory group do not include shared decision making about the conduct of the research.

Research Stage

FACTORS	ASSESSOR QUESTIONS
- Research initiation (prioritizing, defining, and proposing research) - Conducting research (data collection and analysis, interpreting research outcomes) - Research outcomes (interpreting research implications, message development, disseminating and communicating research outcomes)	Does the plan consider the stages of the research necessary to achieving the stated goals?

Comments:

The applicants have proposed a rather elaborate process for involving KT participants throughout the research process but do not clearly outline their objectives for these activities. They propose to establish a research advisory group to meet at key points of the research process as well as two "working groups" – one focused on nursing practice and one on physician practice. It is not clear what these groups will add to the research process. The advisory group seems more intended as a "research check" when much more effective use of such a group would seem to be around considering implications and planning useful synthesis content.

The applicants also propose to involve what they term "designated opinion leaders" in the research communication stage to help promote change but because *what* change they aspire to is problematic this seems an unnecessary make-work project.

In short, although the applicants have considered all stages they have not done so with clear useful purpose.

Participants

FACTORS	ASSESSOR QUESTIONS
- Defined by *sector role* – e.g., policy decision-maker, health services planner, clinician, biomedical researcher, client, patient advocate, public - Defined by *KT role* – e.g., partner, research team member, intermediary, or audience	- Does the applicant clearly identify the sector(s) from which participants will be drawn? - Does the applicant clearly identify the role(s) participants will play? - Are strategies for accessing potential participants knowledgeably and realistically described, e.g., using established contacts, identified intermediaries, or networks? - Does the plan consider the involvement of all

	participants necessary to achieving the stated goals?

Comments:

KT participants are not well defined. Applicants indicate they will seek "nursing" and "physician" and "hospital" representatives but do not clarify more specific intermediary roles such as applicable professional bodies or organizations. They also do not relate appropriate preparatory work to demonstrate their knowledge and ability to access the right people and engage their interest and participation.

Methods

FACTORS	ASSESSOR QUESTIONS
• Interactive engagement and linkage and exchange (e.g., project advisory committee, stakeholder meetings to review findings) • Dissemination and communication (e.g., website, brochure, presentation to practitioners	• Are the methods identified appropriate to achieving the plan's goals? • Are the methods appropriate to the chosen collaboration approach? • Does the plan demonstrate a balance between evidence and innovation?

Comments:

My comments in the "research stage" section are applicable here. Methods are not thought out or convincingly strategic. The applicants do include a reasonable dissemination strategy that appropriately draws on product development and distribution support through the KT office of their research organization, and applicants supply appropriate documentation of this support.

As already discussed, however, the various interactive activities are less convincing. My own sense is that a single interactive meeting with well-chosen participants to discuss the implications and feasibility of potential changes and consider next steps for possible pilot experiments would be a feasible and useful KT plan. Depending on the results of this engagement, and the research itself, consideration could be given to applying for special funds to host a larger interactive workshop to review research findings and practice experiences and engage participants in further deliberation around delivery opportunities and challenges of such a model.

Resources and Implementation

FACTORS	ASSESSOR QUESTIONS
• Human • Financial • Organizational and external supports	• Is there sufficient description of past knowledge translation activities to appraise the experience and skill level of the research team and, where appropriate, other KT participants? • Are knowledge translation activities included in the description of investigators' and other participants' roles and responsibilities? • Is the budget for KT activities convincingly justified? Does it include an appropriate level of financial support to implement the plan?

Towards More Effective Peer Review of Knowledge Translation Plans in Research Grant Proposals

A research study being conducted by investigators from the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health and McMaster University, Canada

15

	• Does the plan take organizational and/or external system supports into consideration? If so, does it provide evidence for these supports (e.g. sufficiently specific letter of support from the sponsoring and partnering organizations)? • If there are no organizational supports or developed system supports, is the plan feasible and strategically focused on areas where limited efforts can achieve useful outcomes?

Comments:

I have already noted problems with feasibility and implementation. The budget should be re-considered and downsized. The largest budget item is related to the opinion leader strategy that is as I have indicated unwarranted. If this project is funded, I recommend final budget allocations for the KT component be confirmed only after a re-worked KT plan and budget is re-submitted.

Research KT Plan Overall

ASSESSOR QUESTIONS

- Is the plan appropriate? Do the identified KT goals make sense in relation to the research?
- Is the plan coherent? Do the identified activities make sense in relation to the research context and KT goals?
- Is the plan feasible? Does it identify the resources necessary to carry out the stated activities?

Comments:

This inappropriate plan is not coherent or feasible as proposed.

4.   Rating Form

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rating Form for Assessing Health Research
Knowledge Translation Plans</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">KT Goals</td></tr>
<tr><td>FACTORS</td><td>ASSESSOR QUESTIONS</td></tr>
<tr><td>

- To generate:
  - Awareness
  - Interest
  - Action
    - Practice change
    - Product development
- To gain:
  - Knowledge about research setting of system context
  - Expertise
  - Support for conducting the research

</td><td>

- Does the plan identify clear goals?
- Are the KT goals well justified in relation to the nature of the research?

</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Comments:

</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Collaboration</td></tr>
<tr><td>FACTORS</td><td>ASSESSOR QUESTIONS</td></tr>
<tr><td>

- Extent of collaboration:
  - Completely participatory
  - Partial Collaboration
- Control over decisions:
  - Shared equally among team members
  - Rests primarily with researchers
- Relationship dynamics
  - Trust and respect
  - Reciprocity

</td><td>

- Is the approach to collaboration consistent with the stated goals?
- Do all proposed parties have the capabilities and competencies to carry out the collaboration?
- Is the decision making structure appropriate for the collaboration approach?
- Do the letters of support and other application materials demonstrate a sound base for project collaboration? For example, do they speak to a prior history of working together and do they reflect a specific understanding of the current project?

</td></tr>
</table>

Towards More Effective Peer Review of Knowledge Translation Plans in Research Grant Proposals
A research study being conducted by investigators from the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health and McMaster University, Canada

17

Comments:

Research Stage

FACTORS	ASSESSOR QUESTIONS
- Research initiation (prioritizing, defining, and proposing research) - Conducting research (data collection and analysis, interpreting research outcomes) - Research outcomes (interpreting research implications, message development, disseminating and communicating research outcomes)	Does the plan consider the stages of the research necessary to achieving the stated goals?

Comments:

Participants

FACTORS	ASSESSOR QUESTIONS
- Defined by *sector role* – e.g., policy decision-maker, health services planner, clinician, biomedical researcher, client, patient advocate, public - Defined by *KT role* – e.g., partner, research team member, intermediary, or audience	- Does the applicant clearly identify the sector(s) from which participants will be drawn? - Does the applicant clearly identify the role(s) participants will play? - Are strategies for accessing potential participants knowledgeably and realistically described, e.g., using established contacts, identified intermediaries, or networks? - Does the plan consider the involvement of all participants necessary to achieving the stated goals?

Towards More Effective Peer Review of Knowledge Translation Plans in Research Grant Proposals
A research study being conducted by investigators from the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health and McMaster University, Canada

18

Comments:

Methods

FACTORS	ASSESSOR QUESTIONS
• Interactive engagement and linkage and exchange (e.g., project advisory committee, stakeholder meetings to review findings) • Dissemination and communication (e.g., website, brochure, presentation to practitioners	• Are the methods identified appropriate to achieving the plan's goals? • Are the methods appropriate to the chosen collaboration approach? • Does the plan demonstrate a balance between evidence and innovation?

Comments:

Resources and Implementation

FACTORS	ASSESSOR QUESTIONS
• Human • Financial • Organizational and external supports	• Is there sufficient description of past knowledge translation activities to appraise the experience and skill level of the research team and, where appropriate, other KT participants? • Are knowledge translation activities included in the description of investigators' and other participants' roles and responsibilities? • Is the budget for KT activities convincingly justified? Does it include an appropriate level of financial support to implement the plan? • Does the plan take organizational and/or external system supports into consideration? If so, does it provide evidence for these supports (e.g. sufficiently specific letter of support from

	the sponsoring and partnering organizations)? • If there are no organizational supports or developed system supports, is the plan feasible and strategically focused on areas where limited efforts can achieve useful outcomes?

Comments:

Research KT Plan Overall

ASSESSOR QUESTIONS

- Is the plan appropriate? Do the identified KT goals make sense in relation to the research?
- Is the plan coherent? Do the identified activities make sense in relation to the research context and KT goals?
- Is the plan feasible? Does it identify the resources necessary to carry out the stated activities?

Comments:

Checklist of Key Questions for Assessing Health Research Knowledge Translation Plans

KT Goals
- Does the plan identify clear goals?
- Are the KT goals well justified in relation to the nature of the research?

Collaboration
- Is the approach to collaboration consistent with the stated goals of the project?

Research Stage
- Does the plan consider the stages of the research necessary to achieving the stated goals?

Participants
- Does the applicant clearly identify the sector(s) from which participants will be drawn?
- Does the applicant clearly identify the role(s) participants will play?
- Does the plan consider the involvement of all participants necessary to achieving the stated goals?

Methods
- Are the methods identified appropriate to achieving the plan's goals?
- Are the methods appropriate to the chosen collaboration approach?

Resources and Implementation
- Does the description of investigators' and other participants' roles and responsibilities include reference to knowledge translation activities?
- Is the budget for KT activities convincingly justified? Does it include an appropriate level of financial support to implement the plan?

Overall Questions

- Is the plan appropriate? Do the identified KT goals and collaboration approach make sense in relation to the research?
- Is the plan coherent? Do the identified activities make sense in relation to the research context and KT goals?
- Is the plan feasible? Does it identify the resources necessary to carry out the proposed activities?