



Michael Smith Foundation for  
**Health Research**

2010 - 2011  
Research Trainee Program  
PDF Evaluation Criteria

---

<b>1. PDF EVALUATION CRITERIA – BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH .....</b>	<b>2</b>
OTHER RESEARCH ACTIVITY .....	2
CAREER DEVELOPMENT .....	3
RESEARCH PROJECT .....	4
REFERENCE LETTERS.....	5
PUBLICATION ACTIVITY .....	6
TRAINING ENVIRONMENT.....	7
<b>2. PDF EVALUATION CRITERIA – CLINICAL RESEARCH .....</b>	<b>8</b>
OTHER RESEARCH ACTIVITY .....	8
CAREER DEVELOPMENT .....	9
RESEARCH PROJECT .....	10
REFERENCE LETTERS.....	11
PUBLICATION ACTIVITY .....	12
TRAINING ENVIRONMENT.....	13
<b>3. PDF EVALUATION CRITERIA – HEALTH SERVICES RESEARCH .....</b>	<b>14</b>
OTHER RESEARCH ACTIVITY.....	14
CAREER DEVELOPMENT .....	15
RESEARCH PROJECT .....	16
REFERENCE LETTERS.....	17
PUBLICATION ACTIVITY .....	18
TRAINING ENVIRONMENT.....	19
<b>4. PDF EVALUATION CRITERIA – POPULATION HEALTH RESEARCH.....</b>	<b>20</b>
OTHER RESEARCH ACTIVITY.....	20
CAREER DEVELOPMENT .....	21
RESEARCH PROJECT .....	22
REFERENCE LETTERS.....	23
PUBLICATION ACTIVITY .....	24
TRAINING ENVIRONMENT.....	25

OTHER RESEARCH ACTIVITY	Weighting 15%
<p><b>Assessment Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>For their level of training, has the applicant shown professional leadership and accomplishments in research and research related activities?</li> <li>Has the applicant shown an interest in research through the development of other skills and additional research activity? Has the applicant worked in another research lab or research environment?</li> </ul>	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b> Applicant has achieved an exceptional number of other research activities. There are a high number of presentations (including national/international), distinctions, awards, credentials and funding awards for his/her stage of research career. Applicant's strong, original contributions to knowledge are widely recognized.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p><b>Excellent</b> Applicant has involvement in a significant number of other research activities including a number of presentations (including national/international), distinctions, awards, credentials and funding awards which demonstrates a level of excellence for his/her stage of research career. Applicant's strong, original contributions to knowledge are well recognized.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p><b>Very Good</b> Applicant has involvement in a number of other research activities including presentations (including regional/national), distinctions, awards, and credentials and funding awards which demonstrate the recognition of the applicant's research abilities.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p><b>Good</b> Applicant has other research experience, but has yet to start to participate in formal presentations. Has received limited awards (related to awards in support of research) and they are generally less competitive in nature.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p><b>Adequate</b> Applicant's research experience is highlighted by only a few presentations. The applicant has a very modest presentation record and minimal distinctions, awards and/or credentials.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p><b>Less Than Adequate</b> Applicant's other research is not listed or very minimal in nature. No presentations, distinctions, awards, or credentials have been listed.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

<b>CAREER DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>Weighting 20%</b>
<b>Assessment Criteria</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project complement the applicant's research career pathway?</li> <li>• Has the applicant exhibited diversity in their career path (e.g. pursuing research opportunities at different affiliations/organizations)?</li> <li>• What is the rationale for the career pathway and the pace of the progress of the applicant?</li> <li>• What is the potential of the individual to become an independent investigator?</li> </ul>	

<b>Assessment Descriptor</b>	<b>Numeric Score</b>
<b>Outstanding</b> Outstanding track record at every step of research pathway. Progressing at exceptional pace and has positioned himself/herself strategically to become an independent investigator.	<b>4.5 - 4.9</b>
<b>Excellent</b> Excellent track record at every step of research pathway. Progressing at above average pace and has positioned himself/herself well to become an independent investigator.	<b>4.0 - 4.4</b>
<b>Very Good</b> Very good track record at every step of research pathway. Progressing at very good pace and will likely become an independent investigator.	<b>3.5 - 3.9</b>
<b>Good</b> Good track record at every step of research pathway. Progressing at a good pace but will require support to become an independent investigator.	<b>3.0 - 3.4</b>
<b>Adequate</b> Moderate track record at every step of research pathway. Progressing at acceptable pace and will require strong support to become an independent investigator.	<b>2.0 - 2.9</b>
<b>Less Than Adequate</b> Track record inadequate and has not demonstrated ability to work independently.	<b>1.0 - 1.9</b>

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

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b> The project embodies leading edge concepts. The description of the hypothesis and methodology are clearly stated and are of the caliber expected of a trainee who is at the forefront of the field.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p><b>Excellent</b> 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><b>Very Good</b> The project will offer a challenging training program for the applicant, and will add to the existing knowledge in this area of research. It provides sufficient rationalization and methodological detail.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p><b>Good</b> The project will offer good training 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><b>Adequate</b> 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><b>Less Than Adequate</b> The scope of the project does not commensurate with the applicant's training. Description of research less than adequate to no details of research given.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

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

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b> References are unanimously strong in their support of the applicant and provide considerably detailed assessments of the applicant's research strengths/capabilities, intellectual capacity &amp; personal characteristics.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p><b>Excellent</b> References are very 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><b>Very Good</b> References provide predominantly positive support about the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths, and research abilities.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p><b>Good</b> 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><b>Adequate</b> References provide limited support based on the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths, or research abilities.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p><b>Less Than Adequate</b> Reference letter(s) do not adequately describe applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths or research abilities.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

PUBLICATION ACTIVITY	Weighting 20%
<p><b>Assessment Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the applicant published or contributed to original research articles, review articles, patents, books or book chapters, abstracts and/or monographs?</li> <li>• Consider the scientific impact factor or the rank in a sub-specialty of the journals that the applicant has been published in; has the applicant published in top level journals?</li> <li>• How frequent are the applicant's publications and what is the role of the applicant?</li> <li>• Does the publication record stated meet the expectations of an applicant at the applicant's level of experience?</li> <li>• When reviewing, take note of continuity of publication record and most recent publication history (e.g. papers in press).</li> <li>• Consider the quality and appropriateness (not just the quantity) of publications.</li> </ul>	
Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b> The applicant's publication record is outstanding and includes several publications as 1<sup>st</sup> author in a top rated journal and/or has publications in press or submitted. The record goes far beyond what is expected of an applicant at the level stated.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p><b>Excellent</b> The applicant's publication record is excellent and includes at least one publication as 1<sup>st</sup> author in a top rated journal and/or has publications in press or submitted. The record is much better than what is expected of an applicant at the level stated.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p><b>Very Good</b> The applicant's publication record is very good, and includes publication(s) in a mid to high impact or specialty journal of solid quality and/or has publications in press or submitted. The record is better than what is expected at the level stated.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p><b>Good</b> The applicant's publication record is good, and includes at least one publication in a mid level or specialty journal of solid quality and has publications in press or submitted. The record is slightly better than what is expected at the level stated.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p><b>Adequate</b> The applicant's publication record is good, and includes at least one publication in a low to mid-level journal appropriate for the area of research. No current publications have been submitted or are in press. The record is on par with what is expected at the level stated.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p><b>Less Than Adequate</b> The applicant has an inadequate publication record. Few to no publications, may have a publication submitted or in press with a low level journal. Record is below what is expected of an applicant at the level stated.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

TRAINING ENVIRONMENT	Weighting 10%
<p><b>Assessment Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the Supervisor Form(s), are there funds secured or pending to support the training environment?</li> <li>• Is there a fit between the applicant and the supervisor(s); does the proposed project relate to the supervisor's overall research program?</li> <li>• Are the research methods used by the supervisor(s) congruent with the applicant's?</li> <li>• Are the supervisor's publication record, distinctions, awards and credentials recent and consistent?</li> <li>• Does the supervisor(s) offer an intellectually challenging and supportive environment where the applicant will have exposure to other trainees?</li> <li>• How well is the supervisor(s) funded? Does he/she have consistent peer reviewed funding?</li> <li>• When reviewing the supervisor(s), keep in mind the expectations of a supervisor with the stated level of experience and discipline.</li> </ul>	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b> The peer reviewed support that the supervisor has received, and continues to receive is outstanding and has established first-class facilities. The level of training offered is exceptional in terms of potential interactions with other researchers/trainees. This training environment provides for significant opportunities for contributions by the trainee as first author on quality 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><b>Excellent</b> The supervisor currently receives strong peer-reviewed funding from recognized agencies and the trainee will interact with numerous researchers/trainees who appear to receive strong mentoring. Fit between the supervisor's area of research and the applicant's research project is very good.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p><b>Very Good</b> 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 trainees having various degrees of research experience and track records of publications. Fit between the supervisor's area of research and the applicant's research is strong.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p><b>Good</b> 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 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><b>Adequate</b> The supervisor receives a basic level of funding and there are some opportunities for interactions with other trainees.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p><b>Less Than Adequate</b> 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 10%
<p><b>Assessment Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do the proposed activities contribute to the overall research goals and to the development of the skills and the abilities of the applicant as an independent researcher?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>For their level of training, has the applicant shown professional leadership and accomplishments in research and research related activities?</li> </ul>	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b> 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.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p><b>Excellent</b> 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><b>Very Good</b> 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><b>Good</b> 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><b>Adequate</b> Applicant's other research experience is derived only from undergraduate and graduate laboratory courses. There are a minimal number of other activities.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p><b>Less Than Adequate</b> Applicant's other research is not listed or very minimal in nature.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

<b>CAREER DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>Weighting 5%</b>
<b>Assessment Criteria</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the applicant's long term career goals and their chosen environment conducive to becoming a health researcher?</li> <li>• Are the applicant's training and research achievements clinical in nature?</li> <li>• Is there potential for the applicant to contribute to clinical health research in their future career?</li> </ul>	

<b>Assessment Descriptor</b>	<b>Numeric Score</b>
<b>Outstanding</b> Outstanding track record at every step of research pathway. Progressing at exceptional pace and has positioned himself/herself strategically to become an independent investigator.	<b>4.5 - 4.9</b>
<b>Excellent</b> Excellent track record at every step of research pathway. Progressing at above average pace and has positioned himself/herself well to become an independent investigator.	<b>4.0 - 4.4</b>
<b>Very Good</b> Very good track record at every step of research pathway. Progressing at very good pace and will likely become an independent investigator.	<b>3.5 - 3.9</b>
<b>Good</b> Good track record at every step of research pathway. Progressing at a good pace but will require support to become an independent investigator.	<b>3.0 - 3.4</b>
<b>Adequate</b> Moderate track record at every step of research pathway. Progressing at acceptable pace and will require strong support to become an independent investigator.	<b>2.0 - 2.9</b>
<b>Less Than Adequate</b> Track record inadequate and has not demonstrated ability to work independently.	<b>1.0 - 1.9</b>

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

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b> 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><b>Excellent</b> The project has the potential to contribute substantially to knowledge in this field. It is clearly defined and is hypothesis driven. 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><b>Very Good</b> 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><b>Good</b> 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><b>Adequate</b> 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><b>Less Than Adequate</b> 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><b>Assessment Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the references provided by the letters and comments section of the Supervisor Form unanimously strong in their support of the applicant?</li> <li>• Are the references provided from diverse sources (e.g. not all from the same department)?</li> <li>• Do the references provide enough information to assess the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths and research abilities?</li> </ul>	
Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b> References are unanimously strong in their support of the applicant and provide considerably detailed assessments of the applicant's research strengths/capabilities, intellectual capacity &amp; personal characteristics.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p><b>Excellent</b> 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><b>Very Good</b> References provide predominantly strong support about the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths, and research abilities.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p><b>Good</b> 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><b>Adequate</b> References provide limited support based on the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths, or research abilities.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p><b>Less Than Adequate</b> Reference letter(s) do not adequately describe applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths or research abilities.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

PUBLICATION ACTIVITY	Weighting 30%
<p><b>Assessment Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the applicant published or contributed to articles, books or book chapters, monographs, and/or abstracts?</li> <li>• How frequent are the applicant's publications and what is the role of the applicant?</li> <li>• Consider the scientific impact factor or the rank in a sub-specialty of the journals that the applicant has been published in; has the applicant published in top level journals?</li> <li>• Does the publication record stated meet the expectations of an applicant at the applicant's level of experience?</li> <li>• When reviewing, take note of continuity of publication record and most recent publication history (e.g. papers in press).</li> <li>• Consider the quality and appropriateness (not just the quantity) of publications.</li> </ul>	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b> The applicant's publication record is outstanding and includes one or more publications as 1<sup>st</sup> author in a top rated journal and has publications in press or submitted or alternatively the applicant has 3 or more publications in top to mid level journals and other publications submitted and or in press. The record goes far beyond what is expected of an applicant at the level stated.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p><b>Excellent</b> The applicant's publication record is excellent and includes at least one publication as 1<sup>st</sup> author in a high - mid level journal and has publications in press or submitted or alternatively the applicant has 2 or more publications in top – mid level journals. The record is much better than what is expected at the level stated.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p><b>Very Good</b> The applicant's publication record is very good, and includes at least one publication in a mid to high impact or specialty journal of solid quality and has publications in press or submitted. The record is somewhat better than what is expected at the level stated.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p><b>Good</b> The applicant's publication record is good and includes at least one publication in a mid level or specialty journal of quality and has publications in press or submitted. The record is slightly better than what is expected at the level stated.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p><b>Adequate</b> The applicant's publication record is adequate, and includes at least one publication in a low to mid-level journal appropriate for the area of research. No current publications have been submitted or are in press. The record is on par with what is expected at the level stated.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p><b>Less Than Adequate</b> The applicant has an inadequate publication record. May have published a non-referred report or has a publication submitted or in press with a low level journal. The record is below what is expected at the level stated.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

<b>TRAINING ENVIRONMENT</b>	<b>Weighting 20%</b>
<p><b>Assessment Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the Supervisor Form(s) are there funds secured or pending to support the training environment?</li> <li>• Is there a fit between the applicant and the supervisor(s); does the proposed project relate to the supervisor's overall research program?</li> <li>• Are the research methods used by the supervisor(s) congruent with the applicant's?</li> <li>• Are the supervisor's publication record, distinctions, awards and credentials recent and consistent?</li> <li>• Does the supervisor(s) offer an intellectually challenging environment where the applicant will have exposure to other trainees?</li> <li>• How well is the supervisor(s) funded? Does he/she have consistent peer reviewed funding?</li> <li>• Is there consistent supervisory experience?</li> <li>• When reviewing the supervisor(s), keep in mind the expectations of a supervisor with the stated level of experience and discipline.</li> </ul>	

<b>Assessment Descriptor</b>	<b>Numeric Score</b>
<p><b>Outstanding</b> 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 as first author on quality peer-reviewed publications. Fit between the supervisor's area of research and the applicants' research project is solid.</p>	<b>4.5 - 4.9</b>
<p><b>Excellent</b> The supervisor currently receives strong peer-reviewed 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 applicant's research project is very strong.</p>	<b>4.0 - 4.4</b>
<p><b>Very Good</b> 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 trainees having various degrees of research experience and track records of publications. Fit between the supervisor's area of research and the applicants' research is strong.</p>	<b>3.5 - 3.9</b>
<p><b>Good</b> 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 Trainee and there is a good fit between the supervisor's area of research and the applicant's research project.</p>	<b>3.0 - 3.4</b>
<p><b>Adequate</b> The supervisor receives a basic level of funding and there are some opportunities for interactions with other trainees. There is somewhat of a fit between the supervisor's area of research and the applicant's research project.</p>	<b>2.0 - 2.9</b>
<p><b>Less Than Adequate</b> 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 applicant's research project.</p>	<b>1.0 - 1.9</b>

OTHER RESEARCH ACTIVITY	Weighting 10%
<p><b>Assessment Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do the proposed activities contribute to the overall research goals as described in the Training Expectations section and to the development of the skills and the abilities of the applicant as an independent researcher?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>For their level of training, has the applicant shown professional leadership and accomplishments in research and research related activities?</li> </ul>	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b> 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.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p><b>Excellent</b> 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><b>Very Good</b> 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><b>Good</b> 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><b>Adequate</b> Applicant's other research experience is derived only from undergraduate/graduate laboratory courses. There are a minimal number of other activities.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p><b>Less Than Adequate</b> Applicant's other research is not listed or very minimal in nature.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

<b>CAREER DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>Weighting 10%</b>
<b>Assessment Criteria</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project complement the applicant's research career pathway?</li> <li>• What is the rationale for the career pathway and the pace of the progress of the applicant?</li> <li>• What is the potential of the individual to become an independent investigator?</li> </ul>	

<b>Assessment Descriptor</b>	<b>Numeric Score</b>
<b>Outstanding</b> Outstanding track record at every step of research pathway. The applicant is progressing at exceptional pace and has positioned himself/herself strategically to become an independent investigator.	<b>4.5 - 4.9</b>
<b>Excellent</b> Excellent track record at every step of research pathway. The applicant is progressing at an above average pace and has positioned himself/herself well to become an independent investigator.	<b>4.0 - 4.4</b>
<b>Very Good</b> Very good track record at every step of research pathway. The applicant is progressing at very good pace and will likely become an independent investigator.	<b>3.5 - 3.9</b>
<b>Good</b> Good track record at every step of research pathway. The applicant is progressing at a good pace but will require support to become an independent investigator.	<b>3.0 - 3.4</b>
<b>Adequate</b> Moderate track record at every step of research pathway. The applicant is progressing at an acceptable pace and will require strong support to become an independent investigator.	<b>2.0 - 2.9</b>
<b>Less Than Adequate</b> Track record is inadequate and the applicant has not demonstrated ability to work independently.	<b>1.0 - 1.9</b>

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

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b> 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><b>Excellent</b> 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><b>Very Good</b> 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><b>Good</b> 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><b>Adequate</b> 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><b>Less Than Adequate</b> 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

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

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

PUBLICATION ACTIVITY	Weighting 20%
<p><b>Assessment Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the applicant published or contributed to articles, books or book chapters, monographs, and/or abstracts?</li> <li>• How frequent are the applicant's publications and what is the role of the applicant?</li> <li>• Consider the scientific impact factor or the rank in a sub-specialty of the journals that the applicant has been published in: has the applicant published in top level journals?</li> <li>• Does the publication record stated meet the expectations of an applicant at the applicant's level of experience?</li> <li>• When reviewing, take note of continuity of publication record and most recent publication history (e.g. papers in press).</li> <li>• Consider the quality and appropriateness (not just the quantity) of publications.</li> </ul>	
Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b> The applicant's publication record is outstanding and includes one or more publications as 1<sup>st</sup> author in a top rated journal and has publications in press or submitted. The record goes far beyond what is expected of an applicant at the level stated.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p><b>Excellent</b> The applicant's publication record is excellent and includes at least one publication as 1<sup>st</sup> author in a top rated journal and has publications in press or submitted. The record is better than what is expected at the level stated.</p>	4.0 - 4.4
<p><b>Very Good</b> The applicant's publication record is very good and includes at least one publication in a mid to high impact or specialty journal of solid quality and has publications in press or submitted. The record is somewhat better than what is expected at the level stated.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p><b>Good</b> The applicant's publication record is good and includes at least one publication in a mid level or specialty journal of quality and has publications in press or submitted. The record is slightly better than what is expected at the level stated.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p><b>Adequate</b> The applicant's publication record is adequate and includes at least one publication in a low to mid-level journal appropriate for the area of research. No current publications have been submitted or are in press. The record is on par with what is expected at the level stated.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p><b>Less Than Adequate</b> The applicant has an inadequate publication record. Nothing published, may have a publication submitted or in press with a low level journal. The record is below what is expected at the level stated.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

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

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b> 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><b>Excellent</b> 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><b>Very Good</b> 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><b>Good</b> 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><b>Adequate</b> The supervisor receives funding and there are some opportunities for interactions with other researchers/trainees.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p><b>Less Than Adequate</b> 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><b>Assessment Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do the proposed activities contribute to the overall research goals and to the development of the skills and the abilities of the applicant as an independent researcher?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>For their level of training, has the applicant shown professional leadership and accomplishments in research and research related activities?</li> </ul>	

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

<b>CAREER DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>Weighting 5%</b>
<b>Assessment Criteria</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the project complement the applicant's research career pathway?</li> <li>Has the applicant exhibited diversity in their career path (e.g. pursuing research opportunities at different affiliations/organizations)?</li> <li>What is the rationale for the career pathway and the pace of the progress of the applicant?</li> <li>What is the potential of the individual to become an independent investigator?</li> </ul>	

<b>Assessment Descriptor</b>	<b>Numeric Score</b>
<b>Outstanding</b> Outstanding track record at every step of research pathway. Progressing at exceptional pace and has positioned himself/herself strategically to become an independent investigator.	<b>4.5 - 4.9</b>
<b>Excellent</b> Excellent track record at every step of research pathway. Progressing at above average pace and has positioned himself/herself well to become an independent investigator.	<b>4.0 - 4.4</b>
<b>Very Good</b> Very good track record at every step of research pathway. Progressing at very good pace and will likely become an independent investigator.	<b>3.5 - 3.9</b>
<b>Good</b> Good track record at every step of research pathway. Progressing at a good pace but will require support to become an independent investigator.	<b>3.0 - 3.4</b>
<b>Adequate</b> Moderate track record at every step of research pathway. Progressing at acceptable pace and will require strong support to become an independent investigator.	<b>2.0 - 2.9</b>
<b>Less Than Adequate</b> Track record inadequate and has not demonstrated ability to work independently.	<b>1.0 - 1.9</b>

RESEARCH PROJECT	Weighting 30%
<p><b>Assessment Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the overall grantsmanship and the scientific merit of the proposal.</li> <li>• Is the proposal well written and relevant?</li> <li>• Has a reasonable hypothesis/research question been generated?</li> <li>• Are the ideas put forth original/innovative?</li> <li>• Are the proper descriptors used and is sufficient detail provided (e.g. hypothesis, research questions and methodologies)?</li> <li>• Is the project feasible, given the resources and support available?</li> </ul>	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b> The project embodies leading edge concepts. The description of the hypothesis and methodology is of the caliber expected of an applicant who is at the forefront of the field.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p><b>Excellent</b> The project has the potential to contribute substantially to knowledge in this field. It is clearly defined and is driven by the hypothesis or the 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><b>Very Good</b> 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><b>Good</b> The project will offer good training 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><b>Adequate</b> 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><b>Less Than Adequate</b> 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><b>Assessment Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the references provided by the letters and comments section of the Supervisor Form unanimously strong in their support of the applicant?</li> <li>• Are the references provided from diverse sources (e.g. not all from the same department)?</li> <li>• Do the references provide enough information to assess the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths and research abilities?</li> </ul>	

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b> References are unanimously strong in their support of the applicant and provide considerable details to assess the applicant's research strengths/capabilities, intellectual capacity &amp; personal characteristics.</p>	4.5 - 4.9
<p><b>Excellent</b> 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><b>Very Good</b> References provide predominantly positive support about the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths, and research abilities.</p>	3.5 - 3.9
<p><b>Good</b> 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. References are not from diverse sources.</p>	3.0 - 3.4
<p><b>Adequate</b> References provide limited support based on the applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths, or research abilities.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p><b>Less Than Adequate</b> Reference letter(s) do not adequately describe applicant's personal characteristics, academic strengths or research abilities.</p>	1.0 - 1.9

<b>PUBLICATION ACTIVITY</b>	<b>Weighting 25%</b>
<p><b>Assessment Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the applicant published or contributed to articles, books or book chapters, monographs, and/or abstracts?</li> <li>• How frequent are the applicant's publications and what is the role of the applicant?</li> <li>• Consider the scientific impact factor or the rank in a sub-specialty of the journals that the applicant has been published in; has the applicant published in top level journals?</li> <li>• Does the publication record stated meet the expectations of an applicant at the applicant's level of experience?</li> <li>• When reviewing, take note of continuity of publication record and most recent publication history (e.g. submitted and or papers in press).</li> <li>• Consider the quality and appropriateness (not just the quantity) of publications.</li> </ul>	
<b>Assessment Descriptor</b>	<b>Numeric Score</b>
<p><b>Outstanding</b> The applicant's publication record is outstanding and includes one or more publications as 1<sup>st</sup> author in a top rated journal and has publications in press or submitted. The record goes far beyond what is expected of an applicant at the level stated.</p>	<b>4.5 - 4.9</b>
<p><b>Excellent</b> The applicant's publication record is excellent and includes at least one publication as 1<sup>st</sup> author in a top rated journal. The record is much better than what is expected of an applicant at the level stated.</p>	<b>4.0 - 4.4</b>
<p><b>Very Good</b> The applicant's publication record is very good, and includes at least one publication in a mid to high impact or specialty journal of solid quality and has publications in press or submitted. The record is somewhat better than what is expected at the level stated.</p>	<b>3.5 - 3.9</b>
<p><b>Good</b> The applicant's publication record is good, and includes at least one publication in a mid level or specialty journal of quality and has publications in press or submitted. The record is slightly better than what is expected at the level of training stated.</p>	<b>3.0 - 3.4</b>
<p><b>Adequate</b> The applicant's publication record is adequate, and includes at least one publication in a low to mid-level journal appropriate for the area of research. No current publications have been submitted or are in press. The record is on par with what is expected of an applicant at the level stated.</p>	<b>2.0 - 2.9</b>
<p><b>Less Than Adequate</b> The applicant has an inadequate publication record. May have published a non-referred report or has a publication submitted or in press with a low level journal. The record is below what is expected at the level stated.</p>	<b>1.0 - 1.9</b>

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

Assessment Descriptor	Numeric Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b> 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><b>Excellent</b> 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><b>Very Good</b> 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><b>Good</b> 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><b>Adequate</b> The supervisor receives funding and there are some opportunities for interactions with other researchers/trainees.</p>	2.0 - 2.9
<p><b>Less Than Adequate</b> The supervisor receives an inadequate level of funding; there is no opportunity for interaction with other trainees.</p>	1.0 - 1.9