



1. JGS EVALUATION CRITERIA – BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH	2
OTHER RESEARCH ACTIVITY	2
TRAINING PLAN	3
RESEARCH PROJECT	4
REFERENCE LETTERS.....	5
ACADEMIC RECORD	6
TRAINING ENVIRONMENT	7
2. JGS EVALUATION CRITERIA – CLINICAL RESEARCH	8
OTHER RESEARCH ACTIVITY	8
TRAINING PLAN	9
RESEARCH PROJECT	10
REFERENCE LETTERS.....	11
ACADEMIC RECORD.....	12
TRAINING ENVIRONMENT	13
3. JGS EVALUATION CRITERIA – HEALTH SERVICES RESEARCH	14
OTHER RESEARCH ACTIVITY	14
TRAINING PLAN	15
RESEARCH PROJECT	16
REFERENCE LETTERS.....	17
ACADEMIC RECORD.....	18
TRAINING ENVIRONMENT	19
4. JGS EVALUATION CRITERIA – POPULATION HEALTH RESEARCH.....	20
OTHER RESEARCH ACTIVITY	20
TRAINING PLAN	21
RESEARCH PROJECT	22
REFERENCE LETTERS.....	23
ACADEMIC RECORD.....	24
TRAINING ENVIRONMENT	25

OTHER RESEARCH ACTIVITY	Weighting 20%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the Full Application/CCV and consider indications of the applicant's activities/contributions/most significant contributions and interest in research activity including: distinctions, awards (applied for and/or received) and credentials, presentations (regional, national and international), knowledge transfer and other academic and non academic achievements. For their level of training, has the applicant shown professional leadership and accomplishments in research and research related activities? Evidence of publications should increase the numeric score. For example, if the applicant has solid research experience (e.g. in the very good category), evidence of a publication should increase their numeric score (e.g. into the excellent range). 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding Applicant has exceptional research experience and a significant number of presentations, distinctions, awards and credentials for his/her stage of research career.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent Applicant has excellent research experience (e.g. honors thesis or co-op) and a number of presentations, distinctions, awards and credentials for his/her stage of research career.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good Applicant has solid research experience (e.g. summer placement), and has started to participate in formal presentations, distinctions, awards and credentials. The applicant is developing strong research skills through other activities.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good Applicant has moderate research experience (e.g. volunteering in a lab), and has yet to start to participate in formal presentations, distinctions, awards and credentials. The applicant is developing research skills through some other activities.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate Applicant's other research experience is derived only from undergraduate laboratory courses. There are a minimal number of other activities.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate Applicant's other research is not listed or very minimal in nature.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

TRAINING PLAN	Weighting 5%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project complement the applicant's training plan as described in the Training Expectations section? What is the rationale for the training plan and the pace of progress of the applicant? Is the training plan focused, clear and doable? What is the potential for future training? What is the potential for a career as an independent investigator? 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding Outstanding training plan at every step of training development. Progressing at an exceptional pace, and has positioned himself/herself strategically for future training. Strong potential to become an independent investigator.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent Excellent training plan at every step of training development. Progressing at an above average pace, potential for future training is much more focused than most at this level. Potential to become an independent investigator is likely.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good Very good training plan at every step of training development. Shows promise for future training development and potential as an independent investigator.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good Good training plan at every step of training development. Progressing and shows promise, but will require some support to move forward as an independent investigator.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate Moderate training development. Progressing at an acceptable pace, and will require strong support to move forward with future training and research.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate Training plan is inadequate, lacking direction and clarity. Future training is unlikely.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

RESEARCH PROJECT	Weighting 20%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the overall grantsmanship and the scientific merit of the proposal. • Is the proposal well written and relevant? • Has a reasonable hypothesis/research question been generated? • Are the ideas put forth original/innovative? • Are the proper descriptors used and is sufficient detail provided (e.g. hypothesis, research questions and methodologies)? • Is the project feasible, given the resources and support available? 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding The project embodies leading edge concepts. The description contains a clearly testable hypothesis/research question, appropriate methodology. The outcomes and timeline is of the caliber expected of an applicant who is at the forefront of the field.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent The project has the potential to contribute substantially to knowledge in this field. The description is clear and concise providing enough methodological detail to evoke confidence that the goals of the project will, in all likelihood, be achieved.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good The project will offer a challenging training program for the applicant, and will add to the existing knowledge in this area of research. It is well written and the hypothesis/methodologies provide sufficient rationalization.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good The project will offer good training for the applicant and will add to the existing knowledge in this area of research. Although the project information is present, it is not well integrated.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate The project description offers limited details.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate The description of research is less than adequate or no details of the research are given.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

REFERENCE LETTERS	Weighting 10%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the references provided by the letters and comments section of the Supervisor Form unanimously strong in their support of the applicant? • Are the references provided from diverse sources (e.g. not all from the same department)? • Do the references provide enough information to assess the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths and research abilities? 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding References are unanimously strong in their support of the applicant and provide considerably detailed assessments of the applicant's research strengths/capabilities, intellectual capacity & personal characteristics.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent References are very positive and specific details are provided regarding the recognized or potential research expertise/competence/abilities of the applicant.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good References provide predominantly positive support about the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths, and research abilities.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good References provide credible support about the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths, and research abilities. The information provided tends to be more general rather than specific.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate References provide limited support based on the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths, or research abilities.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate Reference letter(s) missing or do not adequately describe applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths or research abilities.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

ACADEMIC RECORD	Weighting 30%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish the overall grade level or standing and then consider the criteria for assigning the numeric score (an applicant's overall grade level could be an A-, but after considering the other criteria, their assessed achievement could be considered outstanding). What type of program and courses are pursued and how heavy is the course load? What levels of grades were obtained and what is the relative standing (if available)? Is there a trend? Give credit for steadily improving or consistently good performance. Is the applicant in receipt of any awards or distinctions due to academic performance? 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding Outstanding academic record throughout applicant's university level training period. Evidence of several prizes and awards related to academic achievement (some of these should be highly competitive). The expectation is an A+ level (first class standing).</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent Solid, consistently above average academic record throughout the undergraduate/graduate training period and/or applicant has demonstrated significant improvement in his/her academic record in the latter stages of training. Evidence of several prizes/awards (related to academic achievement). The expectation is an A/A- level.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good Applicant has attained above average grades during his/her undergraduate/ graduate training and/or applicant has demonstrated steady improvement in his/her grades in the latter stages of training. Applicant has received academic recognition (e.g. Dean's list) or a prize/award. The expectation is a B+ level.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good Applicant has attained good grades during his/her undergraduate/ graduate training and/or applicant has demonstrated steady improvement in his/her grades in the latter stages of training. Applicant has received little or no academic recognition or prize/award. The expectation is B/B- level.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate Applicant's academic record is adequate for admission to most graduate schools.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate No transcripts to judge or the transcripts are below adequate level.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

TRAINING ENVIRONMENT	Weighting 15%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the Supervisor Form(s), are there funds secured or pending to support the training environment? • Is there a fit between the applicant and the supervisor(s); does the proposed project relate to the supervisor's overall research program? • Are the research methods used by the supervisor(s) congruent with the applicant's? • Are the supervisor's publication record, distinctions, awards and credentials recent and consistent? • Does the supervisor(s) offer an intellectually challenging environment where the applicant will have exposure to other trainees? • How well is the supervisor(s) funded? Does he/she have consistent peer reviewed funding? • Is there consistent supervisory experience? • When reviewing the supervisor(s), keep in mind the expectations of a supervisor with the stated level of experience and discipline. 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding The peer-reviewed support that the supervisor has received, and continues to receive has established first-class facilities, and the level of training offered is exceptional in terms of potential interactions with other applicants. This provides for significant opportunities for contributions by the applicant as first author on quality peer-reviewed publications.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent The supervisor currently receives strong peer-reviewed funding from recognized agencies and the applicant will interact with numerous independently funded applicants who appear to receive strong mentoring as evidenced by their contributions as authors on peer-reviewed publications. Fit between the supervisor's area of research and the student's research project is very strong.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good The supervisor's projects are well funded by peer-review based agencies providing the applicant access to the appropriate resources within the immediate environment. The environment also includes a number of applicants having various degrees of research experience and track records of publications. Fit between the supervisor's area of research and the student's research is clear.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good The supervisor has funded projects by peer-review based agencies providing the applicant access to some resources within the immediate environment. The environment is suitable for the applicant and there is a good fit between the supervisor's area of research and the student's research project.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate The supervisor receives a basic level of funding and there are limited opportunities for interactions with other applicants.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate The supervisor receives an inadequate level of funding; there is no opportunity for interaction with other applicants.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

OTHER RESEARCH ACTIVITY	Weighting 20%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the proposed activities as outlined in the Training Expectations Section contribute to the overall research goals and to the development of the skills and the abilities of the applicant as an independent researcher? • Review the Full Application/CCV and consider indications of the applicant's activities/contributions/most significant contributions and interest in research activity including: distinctions, awards (applied for and/or received) and credentials, presentations (regional, national and international), knowledge transfer and other academic and non academic achievements. • For their level of training, has the applicant shown professional leadership and accomplishments in research and research related activities? • Evidence of publications should increase the numeric score. For example, if the applicant has solid research experience (e.g. in the very good category), evidence of a publication should increase their numeric score (e.g. into the excellent range). 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding Applicant has exceptional research experience and a significant number of presentations, distinctions, awards and credentials for his/her stage of research career.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent Applicant has an excellent degree of research activity and a significant number of presentations, distinctions, awards, and credentials for his/her stage of research career. The applicant has also demonstrated strong research skills through other activities.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good Applicant has solid research experience, and has started to participate in formal presentations, distinctions, awards, and credentials. The applicant is developing strong research skills through other activities.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good Applicant has moderate research experience, and has yet to start to participate in formal presentations, distinctions, awards, and credentials. The applicant is developing research skills through some other activities.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate Applicant's other research experience is derived only from undergraduate laboratory courses. There are a minimal number of other activities.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate Applicant's other research is not listed or very minimal in nature.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

TRAINING PLAN	Weighting 5%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project complement the applicant's training plan as described in the Training Expectations section? • What is the rationale for the training plan and the pace of progress of the applicant? • Is the training plan focused, clear and doable? • What is the potential for future training? • What is the potential for a career as an independent investigator? 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding Outstanding training plan at every step of training development. Progressing at an exceptional pace, and has positioned himself/herself strategically for future training. Strong potential to become an independent investigator.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent Excellent training plan at every step of training development. Progressing at an above average pace, potential for future training is much more focused than most at this level. Potential to become an independent investigator is likely.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good Very good training plan at every step of training development. Shows promise for future training development and potential as an independent investigator.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good Good training plan at every step of training development. Progressing and shows promise, but will require some support to move forward as an independent investigator.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate Moderate training development. Progressing at an acceptable pace, and will require strong support to move forward with future training and research.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate Training plan is inadequate, lacking direction and clarity. Future training is unlikely.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

RESEARCH PROJECT	Weighting 25%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the overall grantsmanship and the scientific merit of the proposal. • Is the proposal well written and relevant? • Has a reasonable hypothesis/research question been generated? • Are the ideas put forth original/innovative? • Are the proper descriptors used and is sufficient detail provided (e.g. hypothesis, research questions and methodologies)? • Is the project feasible, given the resources and support available? 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding The project embodies leading edge concepts. The description contains a clearly testable hypothesis/research question, appropriate methodology. The outcomes and timeline is of the caliber expected of an applicant who is at the forefront of the field.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent The project has the potential to contribute substantially to knowledge in this field. The description is clear and concise providing enough methodological detail to evoke confidence that the goals of the project will, in all likelihood, be achieved.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good The project will offer a challenging training program for the applicant, and will add to the existing knowledge in this area of research. It is well written, providing sufficient rationalization and methodological detail.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good The project will offer good training for the applicant, and will add to the existing knowledge in this area of research. Project information is present but not well integrated.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate The scope of the project appears to be commensurate with the level of the applicant's training. The description offers limited details.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate The scope of the project does not commensurate with the applicant's training. Description of research is less than adequate to no details of research are given.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

REFERENCE LETTERS	Weighting 10%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the references provided by the letters and comments section of the Supervisor Form unanimously strong in their support of the applicant? • Are the references provided from diverse sources (e.g. not all from the same department)? • Do the references provide enough information to assess the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths and research abilities? 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding References are unanimously strong in their support of the applicant and provide considerably detailed assessments of the applicant's research strengths/capabilities, intellectual capacity & personal characteristics.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent References are very strong and specific details are provided regarding the recognized or potential research expertise, competence, and abilities of the applicant.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good References provide predominantly positive support about the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths, and research abilities.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good References provide credible support about the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths, and research abilities. The information provided tends to be more general rather than specific.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate References provide limited support based on the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths, or research abilities.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate Reference letter(s) missing or do not adequately describe applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths or research abilities.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

ACADEMIC RECORD	Weighting 25%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What type of program and courses are pursued and how heavy is the course load? • What levels of grades were obtained and what is the relative standing (if available)? • Is there a trend? Give credit for steadily improving or consistently good performance. • Is the applicant in receipt of any awards or distinctions due to academic performance? 	
Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding Outstanding academic record throughout applicant's university level training period. Evidence of receipt of several prizes and awards, some of which are highly competitive (related to academic achievement).</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent Consistently above average academic record throughout the undergraduate/graduate training period and/or applicant has demonstrated significant improvement in his/her academic record in the latter stages of training. Evidence of receipt of several prizes/awards (related to academic achievement).</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good Applicant has attained above average grades during his/her undergraduate/graduate training and/or applicant has demonstrated steady improvement in his/her grades in the latter stages of training. Applicant has received academic recognition (e.g. Dean's list) or a prize/award.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good Applicant has attained good grades during his/her undergraduate/ graduate training and/or applicant has demonstrated steady improvement in his/her grades in the latter stages of training. Applicant has received little or no academic recognition or prizes/awards.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate Applicant's academic record is adequate for admission to most graduate schools.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate No transcripts to judge or the transcripts are below adequate level.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

TRAINING ENVIRONMENT	Weighting 15%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the Supervisor Form(s) are there funds secured or pending to support the training environment? • Is there a fit between the applicant and the supervisor(s); does the proposed project relate to the supervisor's overall research program? • Are the research methods used by the supervisor(s) congruent with the applicant's? • Are the supervisor's publication record, distinctions, awards and credentials recent and consistent? • Does the supervisor(s) offer an intellectually challenging environment where the applicant will have exposure to other trainees? • How well is the supervisor(s) funded? Does he/she have consistent peer reviewed funding? • Is there consistent supervisory experience? • When reviewing the supervisor(s), keep in mind the expectations of a supervisor with the stated level of experience and discipline. 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding The funding support that the supervisor has received, and continues to receive, has established first-class facilities and the level of training offered is exceptional in terms of potential interactions with other trainees. This provides for significant opportunities for contributions by the trainee. Fit between the supervisor's area of research and the student's research project is solid.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent The supervisor currently receives strong funding from recognized agencies and the trainee will interact with numerous independently funded trainees who appear to receive strong mentoring as evidenced by their contributions as authors on peer-reviewed publications. Fit between the supervisor's area of research and the student's research project is very strong.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good The supervisor's projects are well funded, providing the applicant access to the appropriate resources within the immediate environment. The environment also includes a number of trainees having various degrees of research experience and track records of publications. Fit between the supervisor's area of research and the student's research is strong.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good The supervisor has funded projects, providing the applicant access to some resources within the immediate environment. The environment is suitable for the Trainee and there is a good fit between the supervisor's area of research and the student's research project.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate The supervisor receives a basic level of funding and there are limited opportunities for interactions with other trainees. There is some fit between the supervisor's area of research and the student's research project.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate The supervisor receives an inadequate level of funding; there is no opportunity for interaction with other trainees. There is a poor fit between the supervisor's area of research and the student's research project.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

OTHER RESEARCH ACTIVITY	Weighting 15%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the Full Application/CCV and consider indications of the applicant's activities/contributions/most significant contributions and interest in research activity including: distinctions, awards (applied for and/or received) and credentials, presentations (regional, national and international), knowledge transfer and other academic and non academic achievements. For their level of training, has the applicant shown professional leadership and accomplishments in research and research related activities? Evidence of publications should increase the numeric score. For example, if the applicant has solid research experience (e.g. in the very good category), evidence of a publication should increase their numeric score (e.g. into the excellent range). 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding Applicant has an exceptional degree of research activity and a significant number of presentations, distinctions, awards, and credentials for his/her stage of research career. There is evidence that the applicant has participated in (or facilitated) knowledge transfer activities.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent Applicant has an excellent degree of research activity and a number of presentations, distinctions, awards, and credentials for his/her stage of research career. The applicant has also demonstrated strong research or knowledge transfer skills through other activities.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good Applicant has solid research experience and has started to participate in formal presentations, distinctions, awards, and credentials. The applicant is developing strong research skills through other activities.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good Applicant has moderate research experience and has yet to start to participate in formal presentations, distinctions, awards, and credentials. The applicant is developing research skills through some other activities.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate Applicant's other research experience is derived only from undergraduate laboratory courses. There are a minimal number of other activities.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate Applicant's other research is not listed or very minimal in nature.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

TRAINING PLAN	Weighting 5%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project complement the applicant's training plan as described in the Training Expectations Section? • What is the rationale for the training plan and the pace of progress of the applicant? • Is the training plan focused, clear and doable? • What is the potential for future training? • What is the potential for a career as an independent investigator? 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding Outstanding training plan at every step of training development. Progressing at an exceptional pace, and has positioned himself/herself strategically for future training. Strong potential to become an independent investigator.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent Excellent training plan at every step of training development. Progressing at an above average pace, potential for future training is much more focused than most at this level. Potential to become an independent investigator is likely.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good Very good training plan at every step of training development. Shows promise for future training development and potential as an independent investigator.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good Good training plan at every step of training development. Progressing and shows promise, but will require some support to move forward as an independent investigator.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate Moderate training development. Progressing at an acceptable pace, and will require strong support to move forward with future training and research.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate Training plan is less than adequate, lacking direction and clarity. Future training is unlikely.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

RESEARCH PROJECT	Weighting 25%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the overall grantsmanship and the scientific merit of the proposal. • Is the proposal well written and relevant? • Has a reasonable hypothesis/research question been generated? • Are the ideas put forth original/innovative? • Are the proper descriptors used and is sufficient detail provided (e.g. hypothesis, research questions and methodologies)? • Is the project feasible, given the resources and support available? 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding The research project embodies leading edge concepts. The description of the hypothesis/research question and methodology are of the caliber expected of an applicant who is at the forefront of the field.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent The research project has the potential to contribute substantially to knowledge in this field. It is clearly defined and is driven by the hypothesis or research question. The description provides enough methodological detail to evoke confidence that the goals of the project will, in all likelihood, be achieved.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good The project will offer a challenging training program for the applicant, and will add to the existing knowledge in this area of research. It is well written, providing sufficient rationalization and methodological detail.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good The project will offer good training for the applicant, and will add to the existing knowledge in this area of research. Project information is present but not well integrated.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate The scope of the project appears to be commensurate with the level of the applicant's training. The description offers limited details.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate The scope of the project does not commensurate with the applicant's training. Description of research is less than adequate to no details of research are given.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

REFERENCE LETTERS	Weighting 10%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the references provided by the letters and comments section of the Supervisor Form unanimously strong in their support of the applicant? • Are the references provided from diverse sources (e.g. not all from the same department)? • Do the references provide enough detailed information to assess the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths and research abilities? 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding References are unanimously strong in their support of the applicant and provide considerably detailed assessments of the applicant's research strengths/capabilities, intellectual capacity & personal characteristics.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent References are predominantly positive and specific details are provided regarding the recognized or potential research expertise, competence and abilities of the applicant.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good References provide predominantly positive support about the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths, and research abilities.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good References provide credible support about the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths, and research abilities. The information provided tends to be more general rather than specific.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate References provide limited support based on the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths, or research abilities.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate Reference letters do not adequately describe applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths or research abilities.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

ACADEMIC RECORD	Weighting 20%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the rigor of the program? • What type of program and courses are pursued and how heavy is the course load? • What levels of grades were obtained and what is the relative standing (if available)? • Is there a trend? Give credit for steadily improving or consistently good performance. • Is the applicant in receipt of any awards or distinctions due to academic performance? 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding Outstanding academic record throughout applicant's university level training period. There may be evidence of several prizes and awards, some of which are highly competitive and related to academic achievement (e.g. University Graduate Award).</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent Solid, consistently above average academic record throughout the undergraduate/graduate training period and/or applicant has demonstrated significant improvement in his/her academic record in the latter stages of training. There is evidence of several prizes/awards.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good Applicant has attained above average grades during his/her undergraduate/ graduate training and/or applicant has demonstrated steady improvement in his/her grades in the latter stages of training. Applicant has received academic recognition (e.g. Dean's list) or a prize/award.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good Applicant has attained good grades during his/her undergraduate/ graduate training and/or applicant has demonstrated steady improvement in his/her grades in the latter stages of training. Applicant has received little or no academic recognition or prize/award.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate Applicant's academic record is adequate for admission to most graduate schools.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate No transcripts to judge or the transcripts are below adequate level.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

TRAINING ENVIRONMENT	Weighting 25%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the Supervisor Form(s), are there funds secured or pending to support the training environment? • Is there a fit between the applicant and the supervisor(s); does the proposed project relate to the supervisor's overall research program? • Are the research methods used by the supervisor(s) congruent with the applicant's? • Are the supervisor's publication record, distinctions, awards and credentials recent and consistent? • Does the supervisor(s) offer an intellectually challenging environment where the applicant will have exposure to other trainees? • Is the infrastructure available to support the applicant and the research project? • How well is the supervisor(s) funded? Does he/she have consistent peer reviewed funding? • Is there consistent supervisory experience? • When reviewing the supervisor(s), keep in mind the expectations of a supervisor with the stated level of experience and discipline. 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding The peer-reviewed support that the supervisor has received, and continues to receive is solid. The level of training offered is exceptional in terms of opportunities for interaction with other researchers/trainees. This provides significant opportunities for the trainee as first author on quality presentations and on peer-reviewed publications. Fit between the supervisor's area of research and the applicant's research project is solid.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent The supervisor currently receives strong peer-reviewed funding from recognized agencies and the trainee has the potential to interact with numerous independently funded researchers/trainees. This provides significant opportunities for the trainee as first author on quality presentations. Fit between the supervisor's area of research and the applicant's research project is very strong.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good The supervisor's projects are well funded by peer-review based agencies providing the applicant access to the appropriate resources within the immediate and or networked environment. The environment also includes a number of researchers/trainees. Fit between the supervisor's area of research and the applicant's research is strong.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good The supervisor has funded projects providing the applicant access to appropriate resources within the immediate environment. The environment is suitable for the trainee and there is a good fit between the supervisor's area of research and the applicant's research project.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate The supervisor receives funding and there are some opportunities for interactions with other researchers/trainees.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate The supervisor receives an inadequate level of funding; there is no opportunity for interaction with other trainees.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

OTHER RESEARCH ACTIVITY	Weighting 15%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the Full Application/CCV and consider indications of the applicant's activities/contributions/most significant contributions and interest in research activity including: distinctions, awards (applied for and/or received) and credentials, presentations (regional, national and international), knowledge transfer and other academic and non academic achievements. For their level of training, has the applicant shown professional leadership and accomplishments in research and research related activities? Evidence of publications should increase the numeric score. For example, if the applicant has solid research experiences (e.g. in the very good category) evidence of a publication should increase their numeric score to the excellent range. 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding Applicant has an exceptional degree of research activity and a significant number of presentations, distinctions, awards, credentials and publications for his/her stage of research career. There is evidence that the applicant has participated in (or facilitated) knowledge transfer activities.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent Applicant has an excellent degree of research activity and a significant number of presentations, distinctions, awards, credentials and publications for his/her stage of research career. The applicant has also demonstrated strong research skills or knowledge transfer through other activities.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good Applicant has solid research experience, and has started to participate in formal presentations, distinctions, awards, credentials and publications. The applicant is developing strong research skills through other activities.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good Applicant has moderate research experience, and has yet to start to participate in formal presentations, distinctions, awards, credentials and publications. The applicant is developing research skills through some other activities.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate Applicant's other research experience is derived only from undergraduate courses. There are a minimal number of other activities.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate Applicant's other research is not listed or very minimal in nature.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

TRAINING PLAN	Weighting 5%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project complement the applicant's training plan as described in the Training Expectations Section? What is the rationale for the training plan and the pace of progress of the applicant? Is the training plan focused, clear and doable? What is the potential for future training? What is the potential for a career as an independent investigator? 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding Outstanding training plan at every step of training development. Progressing at an exceptional pace, and has positioned himself/herself strategically for future training. Strong potential to become an independent investigator.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent Excellent training plan at every step of training development. Progressing at an above average pace, potential for future training is much more focused than most at this level. Potential to become an independent investigator is likely.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good Very good training plan at every step of training development. Shows promise for future training development and potential as an independent investigator</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good Good training plan at every step of training development. Progressing and shows promise, but will require some support to move forward as an independent investigator.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate Moderate training development. Progressing at an acceptable pace, and will require strong support to move forward with future training and research.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate Training plan is inadequate, lacking direction and clarity. Future training is unlikely.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

RESEARCH PROJECT	Weighting 25%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the overall grantsmanship and the scientific merit of the proposal. • Is the proposal well written and relevant? • Has a reasonable hypothesis/research question been generated? • Are the ideas put forth original/innovative? • Are the proper descriptors used and is sufficient detail provided (e.g. hypothesis, research questions and methodologies)? • Is the project feasible, given the resources and support available? 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding The research project embodies leading edge concepts. The description of the hypothesis/research question and methodology is of the caliber expected of a trainee who is at the forefront of the field.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent The project has the potential to contribute substantially to knowledge in this field. It is clearly defined and is driven by the hypothesis or research question. The description provides enough methodological detail to evoke confidence that the goals of the project will, in all likelihood, be achieved.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good The project will offer a challenge for the applicant, and will add to the existing knowledge in this area of research. It is well written, providing sufficient rationalization and methodological detail.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good The project will offer some challenge for the applicant, and will add to the existing knowledge in this area of research. Project information present but not well integrated.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate The scope of the project appears to be commensurate with the level of the applicant's training. The description offers limited details.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate The scope of the project does not commensurate with the applicant's training. Description of research is less than adequate.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

REFERENCE LETTERS	Weighting 10%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the references provided by the letters and comments section of the Supervisor Form unanimously strong in their support of the applicant? • Are the references provided from diverse sources (e.g. not all from the same department)? • Do the references provide enough information to assess the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths and research abilities? 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding References are unanimously strong in their support of the applicant and provide considerably detailed assessments of the applicant's research strengths/capabilities, intellectual capacity & personal characteristics.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent References are predominantly positive and specific details are provided regarding the recognized or potential research expertise/competence/abilities of the applicant.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good References provide predominantly positive support about the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths, and research abilities.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good References provide credible support about the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths, and research abilities. The information provided tends to be more general rather than specific.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate References provide limited support based on the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths, or research abilities.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate Reference letter(s) do not adequately describe applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths or research abilities.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

ACADEMIC RECORD	Weighting 30%
Assessment Criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What type of program and courses are pursued and how heavy is the course load? • What levels of grades were obtained and what is the relative standing (if available)? • Is there a trend? Give credit for steadily improving or consistently good performance? • Is the applicant in receipt of any awards or distinctions due to academic performance? 	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
Outstanding Outstanding academic record throughout applicant's university level training period. Evidence of receipt of several prizes and awards, some of which are highly competitive and related to the academic achievement (e.g. University Graduate Award).	4.5 - 4.9
Excellent Solid, consistently above average academic record throughout the undergraduate/graduate training period and/or applicant has demonstrated significant improvement in his/her academic record in the latter stages of training. Evidence of receipt of several prizes/awards (related to academic achievement).	4.0 - 4.4
Very Good Applicant has attained above average grades during his/her undergraduate/ graduate training and/or applicant has demonstrated steady improvement in his/her grades in the latter stages of training. Applicant has received academic recognition (e.g. Dean's list) or a prize/award.	3.5 - 3.9
Good Applicant has attained good grades during his/her undergraduate/ graduate training and/or applicant has demonstrated steady improvement in his/her grades in the latter stages of training. Applicant has received little or no academic recognition or prize/award.	3.0 - 3.4
Adequate Applicant's academic record is adequate for admission to most graduate schools.	2.0 - 2.9
Less Than Adequate No transcripts to judge or transcripts are Less Than Adequate level.	1.0 - 1.9

TRAINING ENVIRONMENT	Weighting 15%
<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the Supervisor Form(s), are there funds secured or pending to support the training environment? • Is there a fit between the applicant and the supervisor(s); does the proposed project relate to the supervisor's overall research program? • Are the research methods used by the supervisor(s) congruent with the applicant's? • Are the supervisor's publication record, distinctions, awards and credentials recent and consistent? • Does the supervisor(s) offer an intellectually challenging environment where the applicant will have exposure to other trainees? • How well is the supervisor(s) funded? Does he/she have consistent peer reviewed funding? • Is there consistent supervisory experience? • When reviewing the supervisor(s), keep in mind the expectations of a supervisor with the stated level of experience and their discipline (e.g. consider how many students have graduated under the supervisor(s) relative to the stage of career)? 	
Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p>Outstanding The peer-reviewed support that the supervisor has received, and continues to receive is solid. The level of training offered is exceptional in terms of opportunities for interaction with other researchers/trainees. This provides significant opportunities for the trainee as first author on quality presentations and on peer-reviewed publications. Fit between the supervisor's area of research and the applicant's research project is solid.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p>Excellent The supervisor currently receives strong peer-reviewed funding from recognized agencies and the trainee has the potential to interact with numerous independently funded researchers/trainees. This provides significant opportunities for the trainee as first author on quality presentations. Fit between the supervisor's area of research and the applicant's research project is very strong.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p>Very Good The supervisor's projects are well funded by peer-review based agencies providing the applicant access to the appropriate resources within the immediate and or networked environment. The environment also includes a number of researchers/trainees. Fit between the supervisor's area of research and the applicant's research is strong.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p>Good The supervisor has funded projects providing the applicant access to appropriate resources within the immediate environment. The environment is suitable for the trainee and there is a good fit between the supervisor's area of research and the applicant's research project.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p>Adequate The supervisor receives funding and there are some opportunities for interactions with other researchers/trainees.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p>Less Than Adequate The supervisor receives an inadequate level of funding; there is no opportunity for interaction with other trainees.</p>	1.0 - 1.9