2022 Scholar Program

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Applicant Expertise and Experience	Weighting – 30%

Assessment Criteria
Please assess the applicant's potential as an independent researcher based on the following:

- Qualifications of the applicant, including research training and experience (and clinical training, where applicable), with consideration of how the applicant's research experience and training align with the proposed research area and methods.

- Expertise and research quality, productivity and leadership of the applicant as demonstrated by research and professional contributions, including awards and other forms of professional recognition.*

- Evidence of the applicant's ability to successfully implement knowledge translation (KT) strategies and activities and use KT tools to inform practice, policy and further research, as appropriate to their area of research.*

*productivity, leadership, and KT skills should be weighed with consideration of the applicant's career stage, and health profession and research area.

Assessment Descriptor	Score
Outstanding • The applicant's combined research training and experience (and clinical training, where applicable) provide the expertise needed to complete the proposed research. The research training and experience is well aligned with the proposed research area and methods. • The applicant has an established record of quality research outputs, demonstrating the applicant's proficiency as an independent researcher. The applicant demonstrates leadership in their field and among their peers. • The applicant demonstrates proficiency with KT strategies, activities and tools to inform practice, policy and further research, as appropriate to their area of research.	**4.5 – 4.9 may be funded**
Excellent • The applicant's combined research training and experience (and clinical training, where applicable) provide the expertise needed to complete the proposed research, with minimal gaps. The research training and experience is aligned with the proposed research area and methods. • The applicant has a record of quality research outputs, demonstrating the applicant's capability as an independent researcher. The applicant demonstrates some leadership in their field and among their peers. • The applicant demonstrates some expertise with KT strategies, activities and tools to inform practice, policy and further research, as appropriate to their area of research.	**4.0 – 4.4 may be funded**

Very Good	
• The applicant's combined research training and experience (and clinical training, where applicable) provide the expertise needed to complete the proposed research, with minimal gaps. The research training and experience is mostly aligned with the proposed research area and methods. • The applicant has a record of quality research outputs, demonstrating the applicant's potential as an independent researcher. The applicant demonstrates some leadership among their peers. • The applicant demonstrates capability with KT strategies, activities and tools to inform practice, policy and further research, as appropriate to their area of research.	**3.5 – 3.9** **may be funded** **(above 3.8)**
Fair	
• The applicant's combined research training and experience (and clinical training, where applicable) provide some of the expertise needed to complete the proposed research, but there are concerns of some unfilled knowledge gaps. The research training and experience is poorly aligned with the proposed research area and methods. • The applicant has a limited record of quality research outputs and/or the research outputs are of questionable quality. There is limited evidence of the applicant's potential to succeed as an independent researcher. The applicant does not demonstrate leadership in their field or among their peers. • The applicant demonstrates limited ability with KT strategies, activities and tools to inform practice, policy and further research, considering their area of research.	**3.0 – 3.4** **not fundable**
Less than Adequate	
• The applicant's combined research training and experience (and clinical training, where applicable) do not provide the expertise needed to complete the proposed research. The research training and experience is misaligned with the proposed research area and methods. • The applicant has a limited record of research outputs and/or the quality of their research outputs is poor. There is no evidence of the applicant's potential to succeed as an independent researcher. The applicant does not demonstrate leadership in their field or among their peers. • The applicant demonstrates poor understanding of KT strategies, activities and tools to inform practice, policy and further research, considering their area of research.	**0 – 2.9** **not fundable**

Program of Research	Weighting – 40%

Assessment Criteria

- Completeness of the background/literature review and relevance to the research question(s), research design, and methods.

- Clarity and originality* of the research question(s) and potential of the research to address important knowledge gaps.

- Clarity of rationale for the research design and methods.

- Appropriateness and feasibility of the research design and methods.

- Appropriateness and feasibility of the project timeline.

- Appropriateness and feasibility of the budget statement.

- Adequacy of the identification of risks and plans for management of potential difficulties that may be encountered during the term of the research.

- Appropriateness and adequacy of the proposed KT tools and/or activities.

- Appropriateness and adequacy of any proposed collaborations required to carry out the research (if applicable).

*Originality refers to research that will generate new knowledge that may be vital to the progress of a field. Originality does not necessarily require innovation in research methods or approaches. Reference: https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/39914.html

Assessment Descriptor	Score
Outstanding - The background/literature review is complete and relevant to the research question(s), research design, and methods. - The research proposal contains clear research question(s), is original, and will address important knowledge gaps. - The research design and methods are clearly described, feasible, and appropriate to address the research question(s). - The timeline is appropriate and feasible. - The budget statement is appropriate and feasible. - The research proposal identifies risks that may be encountered during the term of the research and how to manage/mitigate these risks. - The KT plan is clearly described and appropriate. - The proposed collaborations are complementary and will contribute to carrying out the research (if applicable).	**4.5 – 4.9 may be funded**

Excellent	
• The background and literature review is sufficient and provides adequate context on the research question(s), research design, and methods. • The research proposal contains clear research question(s). The proposed research proposal is very likely to be original, and very likely to address important knowledge gaps. • The research design and methods are clearly described, feasible, and appropriate to address the research question(s), with only a few minor details lacking. • The timeline is appropriate and feasible. • The budget statement is appropriate and feasible, with only a few minor details lacking. • The research proposal identifies risks that may be encountered during the term of the research and how to manage/mitigate these risks. • The KT plan is clearly described and appropriate. • The proposed collaborations are complementary and will contribute to carrying out the research. Some minor details may be lacking (if applicable).	**4.0 – 4.4** **may be funded**
Very Good	
• The background/literature review may lack some details, but the information is sufficient to support the research question(s), research design, and methods. • The research proposal contains clear research question(s) and has the potential to be original. It is likely that the proposed research will address knowledge gaps. • The research design and methods are feasible, and appropriate to address the research question(s), with only some details lacking. • The timeline is appropriate and feasible but may be missing some details. • The budget statement is appropriate and feasible, with some details lacking. • The research proposal identifies all major risks likely to be encountered during the term of the research and how to manage/mitigate these risks. Some minor risks and mitigation approaches may be missing. • The KT plan is largely appropriate but may lack some details. • The proposed collaborations will contribute to carrying out the research, with only a few minor gaps in expertise or resources (if applicable).	**3.5 – 3.9** **may be funded** **(above 3.8)**

Fair	
• he background/literature review does not provide adequate information to support on the research question(s), research design, and methods.	**3.0 – 3.4** **not fundable**
• The research question(s) are unclear and/or they require major revision. It is unclear whether the research will be original and/or whether the proposed research will address knowledge gaps.	
• The research design and methods have major flaws and/or is not appropriate to address the research question(s).	
• The timeline is of questionable feasibility and/or lacks key details.	
• The budget statement is of questionable feasibility, lacks key details, or has important inaccuracies.	
• The research proposal fails to identify important risks that are likely to be encountered during the term of the research propose actions to manage/mitigate these risks.	
• The KT plan is poorly described and/or not fully appropriate.	
• It is not clear how the proposed collaborations will contribute to carrying out the research or there are significant gaps in expertise or resources (if applicable).	
Less than Adequate	
• The background/literature review is missing and/or does not provide adequate information to support the research question(s), research design, and methods.	**0 – 2.9** **not fundable**
• The research proposal does not contain clear research question(s), the proposed research is not original, and/or the proposed research does not address knowledge gaps.	
• The research design and methods are poorly described, is not feasible, or is not appropriate to address the research question(s).	
• The timeline is inappropriate or not feasible.	
• The budget statement is incomplete, inaccurate or not feasible.	
• The research proposal is missing information on risk assessment and mitigation.	
• The KT plan is missing, poorly described and/or inappropriate.	
• The application lacks information on collaborations that are needed to carry out the research. There are major gaps in expertise or resources (if applicable).	

Environment and Support	Weighting – 30%

Assessment Criteria

- An adequate level of support from the applicant's department head (or equivalent) for the required appointment, protected research time and a commitment of continued support post-award.

- Availability and accessibility of personnel, facilities and infrastructure required to conduct the proposed research and perform the KT activities.

- Availability and accessibility of collaborators and mentors to advise and support research and KT activities where appropriate. (Note: Collaborators and mentors can be from within or external to the applicant's host institution.)

Assessment Descriptor	Score
Outstanding - Demonstrated commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required research appointment, protection of time, and continued support post-award. - The application describes how the applicant plans to access all of the necessary supports for the research and KT activities. - The letters of collaboration provide evidence that the applicant has established strong connections with mentors and/or collaborators to advise and support research and KT activities where appropriate.	**4.5 – 4.9** **may be fundable**
Excellent - Strong commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required research appointment, protection of time, and continued support post-award. - The application describes how the applicant plans to access the necessary supports for the research and KT activities, with only minor details missing. - The letters of collaboration provide evidence that the applicant has established connections with mentors and/or collaborators to advise and support research and KT activities where appropriate.	**4.0 – 4.4** **may be fundable**
Very Good - There is evidence of a commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required research appointment, protection of time, and continued support post-award. - The application describes how the applicant plans to access the necessary supports for the research and KT activities, with some details missing. - The letters of collaboration provide some evidence that the applicant has established connections with mentors and/or collaborators to advise and support research and KT activities where appropriate.	**3.5 – 3.9** **may be fundable** **(above 3.8)**

Fair • There is evidence of a commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required research appointment and protection of time, with some potential for continued support post-award. • The application is missing important details outlining how the applicant plans to access the necessary supports for the research and KT activities. • The letters of collaboration do not provide sufficient evidence that the applicant has established connections with mentors and/or collaborators to advise and support research and KT activities where appropriate.	**3.0 – 3.4** **not fundable**
Less than Adequate • The commitment from the host institution is inadequate and does not guarantee the required research appointment, protection of time, and continued support post-award. • The application is missing vital information on how the applicant plans to access the necessary supports for the research and KT activities. • The letters of collaboration from key mentors and/or collaborators are missing and it is unlikely that the applicant has sufficient support to complete the research and KT activities.	**0 – 2.9** **not fundable**

Mitacs Accelerate Application Proposal (if applicable)
Assessment Criteria
Refer to the Mitacs Accelerate application proposal upload, and the relevant section in Additional Information of the Scholar application form. The assessment of this information is not to be included in the overall score of the Scholar application, but rather considered separately. Please comment on the following elements as they relate to the Scholar project as a whole: • The proposed intern(s)'s role in the Scholar project is appropriate for their academic degree level, and beneficial to the intern(s)'s training and career development. • The proposed project involving the intern has no adverse effects on the environment.