

## **Mentee Scholarship Review Committee Review Criteria**

Please review the Mentee Scholarship Terms of Reference (ToR) and the [Call for applications](#) for full award application details. In brief, students were asked to submit:

- SK-IMN Mentee Award [Application form](#)
- SK-IMN [Registration form](#)
- Proof of Indigenous identity. Including but not limited to: a Status Card, a Metis card, a letter from community, a letter from an Elder.
- Academic reference letter
  - Highlighting how the student is progressing in their program and the timeline for their research project
- One-page research description highlighting:
  - The potential benefits and outcomes of the research
  - How mentorship will be incorporated into your research plan
- Curriculum Vitae
- Unofficial copies of transcripts

We will be following CIHR rating scale for the adjudication of this award and basing the reviews on CIHR criterion with adapted weighting accounting for our addition of *Criteria 3. Mentorship*. Please take into consideration as you are conducting the evaluation that the notes and comments present a mentorship opportunity for the applicants to learn through this process.

### **Criterion 1. Concept (25%)**

- Significance, Benefits and Impact of the Research *and relevance to Indigenous Health & Wellness (25%)*

### **Criterion 2. Feasibility (50%)**

- Approaches and Methods (25%)
- Expertise, Experience, and Resources (25%)

### **Criterion 3. Mentorship (25%)**

- How is mentorship integrated into the research plan/proposal? (25%)

---

*Please see the next few pages for further details on each criterion and adjudication scale.*

## Adjudication Criteria and Interpretation Guidelines<sup>1</sup>

### Criterion 1. Concept (25%)

- Significance, Benefits and Impact of the Research *and relevance to Indigenous Health & Wellness* (25%)

This sub-criterion is intended to assess the quality of what is being proposed. Each **Evaluation Checkpoint** is presented as a question and is followed by the **Evaluation Guideline(s)** for that Checkpoint.

- a. Is the project idea creative?
  - The project idea is among the best formulated ideas in its field, stemming from new, incremental, innovative, or high-risk lines of inquiry; new or adapted research in basic science, or health care, or health systems or health outcomes.
- b. Is the rationale of the project idea sound?
  - The project rationale is based on a logical integration of concepts.
- c. Are the overall goals and objectives of the project well-defined?
  - The overall goal and objectives of the project are well-defined and clear.
  - The goal states the purpose of the project, and what the project is ultimately expected to achieve.
  - The objectives clearly define the proposed lines of inquiry and/or activities required to meet the goal.
  - The proposed project outputs (i.e., the anticipated results of the project) are clearly described and aligned to the objectives.
- d. Are the anticipated project contributions likely to advance basic health-related knowledge (which includes basic science, model organisms, and other discovery research), health care, or health systems or health outcomes?
  - The context and needs (issues and/or gaps) of the project are clearly described.
  - The anticipated contribution(s) (e.g. publishing in peer-reviewed journals) are clearly described, and should be substantive and relevant in relation to the context of the issues or gaps.
  - The anticipated contribution(s) are realistic, i.e., directly stemming from the project outputs, as opposed to marginally related.

### Criterion 2. Feasibility (50%)

- Approaches and Methods (25%)
- Expertise, Experience, and Resources (25%)

This sub-criterion is intended to assess the quality of the Project's design and plan; including how and when the project will be completed. Each **Evaluation Checkpoint** is presented as a question and is followed by the **Evaluation Guideline(s)** for that Checkpoint.

- a. Are the approaches and methods appropriate to deliver the proposed output(s) and achieve the proposed contribution(s) to advancing health-related knowledge, health care, health systems, and/or health outcomes?
  - The research and/or knowledge translation/commercialization approaches, methods and/or strategies are well-defined and justified in terms of being appropriate to accomplish the objectives of the project.
  - Opportunities to maximize project contributions to advance health-related knowledge, health care, health systems and/or health outcomes should be proactively sought and planned for, but may also arise unexpectedly.

<sup>1</sup> Adapted from: <http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/49564.html#4.2.2.a>

- b. Are the timelines and related deliverables of the project realistic?
  - Timelines for the project should be appropriate in relation to the proposed project activities. Key milestones and deliverables should be aligned with the objectives of the project, and be feasible given the duration of the project.
- c. Does the proposal identify potential challenges and appropriate mitigation strategies?
  - Critical scientific, technical, or organizational challenges should be identified, and a realistic plan to tackle these potential risks should be described. An exhaustive list is not expected.

**Criterion 3. Mentorship (25%)**

- ***How is mentorship integrated into the research plan/proposal? (25%)***

Does the student explain how they will actively seek mentorship opportunities in their one-page description?

Does the students' CV reflect a commitment to learning and mentorship?

Does the letter of support speak to the integration of mentorship in the supervisor-student relationship and research project?

## Adjudication Rating Scale

Please use the following rating scale, as described on the CIHR website to adjudicate each application based on the outlined criteria.

To ensure consistency, reviewers must adhere to the following rating scale:

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