



Applicants to the Canadian Cancer Society's [Awards for Excellence](#) competition require one nomination letter and two letters of reference as part of their full application.

Letters must be received no later than **November 3, 2021** (5:00 p.m. Eastern) in order for the application to be considered. Please note that applicants cannot view reference letters attached to their submission.

For the **Lifetime Contribution, Robert L. Noble, O. Harold Warwick, Bernard and Francine Dorval, and William E. Rawls Prizes**, each nomination package must be uploaded in EGrAMS as one PDF file not to exceed 5 Mb, including the following:

1. **One nomination letter** from an appropriate authority from the nominee's host institution (*nominator*)
2. **A reference letter** from an individual from *outside* of the host institution who can attest to the impact of the nominee's research/contributions (*referee*)
Note: for the **Lifetime Contribution** prize, this letter may include testimonials from researchers who have benefitted from the nominee's contributions in order to support statements made by the referee. Testimonials must be cohesively presented (i.e. avoid snippets/blurbs) and will help present a complete picture of the nominees and the impact of their accomplishments.
3. **A reference letter** from a qualified expert in the nominee's field who can attest to the international significance and impact of the nominee's research program/contributions (*referee*)

The nomination letter (maximum 4 pages) and reference letters (maximum 2 pages each) must be submitted in PDF format, presented on official letterhead, dated and signed. Nominators and referees are to include a brief description of their credentials as well as their professional relationship with the applicant to put their recommendations into context.

The three (3) letters should collectively contain the following information:

- *for early career investigators* - the nominator's letter should include the start date of the candidate's first independent academic career (contact [CCS research staff](#) for questions regarding eligibility)



Canadian
Cancer
Society

- a concise description of the candidate's contributions which could be used in a public citation for the award
- a detailed description of the candidate's contributions to cancer/cancer research in Canada and internationally where relevant
- if the candidate's research/contributions have had a direct impact on the treatment or management of cancer, indicate the actual or potential benefits to the Canadian public, and internationally where applicable
- the candidate's research productivity in terms of scholarly contributions, research funding track record and forged collaborations in Canada and internationally where applicable. Highlight any publications in the individual's CV which you believe are particularly noteworthy
- highlight service to the research community and/or the Canadian Cancer Society and/or evidence of outreach efforts to the general public
- regarding consideration of circumstances which may have impacted the nominee's career progression (see [Evaluation criteria](#)) – where possible, any barriers should be explained
- awardees may be asked by CCS to function as spokespersons about the importance of cancer research to the public. The nominator should address the candidate's ability, preferably with concrete examples, to be an "ambassador" for cancer research generally, and for the Canadian Cancer Society as appropriate.

For the **Inclusive Excellence Prize**, each nomination package must be uploaded in EGrAMS as one PDF file not to exceed 5 Mb, by the nominator and must include:

1. **One nomination letter** from an individual who has firsthand knowledge of the nominee's efforts in the advancement of equity, diversity and inclusion in the cancer research ecosystem in Canada (*nominator*)
2. **Two reference letters** from individuals who have directly observed or benefitted from the nominee's leadership in fostering inclusive excellence (*referees*)

Note: one or more of the letters may include testimonials from individuals whose career trajectories, research programs, etc. have been impacted directly by the efforts of the individual in order to support the statements made by the referee. Testimonials must be cohesively presented (i.e. avoid snippets/blurbs) and will help present a complete picture of the nominees and what they have accomplished.



Canadian
Cancer
Society

The nomination letter (maximum 4 pages) and reference letters (maximum 2 pages each) must be submitted in PDF format, presented on official letterhead (as applicable), dated and signed. Nominators and referees are to include a brief description of their credentials as well as their professional relationship with the applicant to put their recommendations into context.

The letters should collectively contain the following information:

- a concise description of the candidate's contributions which could be used in a public citation for the award
- a detailed description of the candidate's efforts/actions towards fostering inclusive excellence in Canada's cancer research ecosystem
- a detailed account of the specific impact(s) on Canada's cancer research ecosystem diversity
- evidence (if applicable) that the candidate is viewed as an equity, diversity and inclusion leader in Canada
- note that the nominee does not have to be a cancer (or equity, diversity and inclusion) researcher, but if their program of research focuses on equity, diversity and inclusion this should be highlighted.

Renominations

We encourage renominations where eligible. For renominations, nominees must complete a nomination form in EGrAMS, indicate the submission is a renomination and provide an updated CV. Nominators must re-upload the nomination dossier in EGrAMS. Nomination dossiers may be updated as desired to reflect new contributions. but CCS will also accept letters provided within the past 4 years.

Please ensure that submissions for nominees to the early career investigator awards remain eligible within the 11-year award window. To account for the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the research community, please note that CCS has temporarily extended the eligibility window for early career investigators for another year – all those who began their independent research career after December 31, 2009 will be eligible for nomination.





Best Practices for Writing Letters of Reference

Multiple studies have revealed notable differences in the language used by referees in letters of recommendation depending on the subject's gender. For example, several research groups that compared letters written for male and female applicants found that those written for females were shorter and included 'communal' and 'grindstone' terminologies describing character (e.g. selfless, helpful, warm) and effort (e.g. tireless, diligent, committed), respectively. Conversely, letters written for males were generally longer, emphasized achievements and included 'standout' and 'agentic' descriptors associated with leadership and power (e.g. outstanding, excellent, independent, daring, intelligent).^{1,2,3,6,8} Similarly, albeit less studied, several groups have reported that the subject's race can influence the choice of words and tone used by referees when drafting letters, with fewer agentic terminologies used when describing individuals belonging to minority groups, despite similar credentials with non-minority applicants.^{1,4,5} Collectively, these studies attributed the differences observed to implicit biases that can positively and negatively affect an individual's perceptions, behaviours and decisions in an unconscious manner.

Implicit bias is the unconscious association of attributes and stereotypes to people based on characteristics such as race, age, education, ability/disability, religion, socioeconomic status, and appearance. These biases are developed over time through exposure to social norms and expectations. As previously reported,⁹ the effects of unconscious bias can negatively impact an applicant's overall success in obtaining research funding and reinforce further inequities in academia. It is, therefore, imperative to recognize when opportunities for bias occur and be vigilant in minimizing them.

Below, we offer best practices and resources from various sources¹⁻⁸ for nominators and referees to carefully consider when drafting their letters:

- Focus comments on the candidate's research skills and academic (and other award-related) achievements rather than their interpersonal attributes. Address the points requested and exclude personal information not relevant to the nomination.
 - Carefully consider the choice of words, tone and length of the letter and whether they would differ depending on the subject's demographics. Consider whether the same descriptors would be used for another candidate with equivalent credentials, but of a different demographic background.
 - Refer to the candidate's formal title and surname rather than their first name.
-



Canadian
Cancer
Society

- Avoid using language that could unintentionally raise doubt (e.g. hedges, ambiguous comments, faint praises, potentially negative language, and irrelevancies). Provide concrete examples, when applicable.

Additional resources:

- CIHR Unconscious Bias Training: <https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/lms/e/bias/>
- Harvard Implicit Association Test: <https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/takeatest.html>
- Gender bias calculator: <http://slowe.github.io/genderbias/>
- The University of Arizona Commission on the Status of Women: Avoiding gender bias in reference writing: https://csw.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/avoiding_gender_bias_in_letter_of_reference_writing.pdf
- Earth Science Women's Network: Guide to avoid racial bias in reference letter writing: <https://eswnonline.org/guide-to-avoid-racial-bias-in-reference-letter-writing/>

References:

1. Akos, P. & Kretchmar, J. Gender and Ethnic bias in Letters of Recommendation: Considerations for School Counselors. *Professional School Counseling*. (2016).
 2. Dutt, K., et al. Gender differences in recommendation letters for postdoctoral fellowships in geoscience. *Nature Geoscience*. (2016).
 3. Filippou, P., et al. The Presence of Gender Bias in Letters of Recommendations Written for Urology Applicants. *Urology*. (2019).
 4. Grimm, L., et al. Gender and Racial Bias in Radiology Residency Letters of Recommendation. *Journal of the American College of Radiology*. (2020).
 5. Houser, G. & Lemmons, K. Implicit bias in letters of recommendation for an undergraduate research internship. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*. (2018).
 6. Madera, J. et al. Gender and letters of recommendation for academia: agentic and communal differences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. (2009).
 7. Schmader, T. et al. A Linguistic Comparison of Letters of Recommendation for Male and Female Chemistry and Biochemistry Job Applicants. *Sex Roles*. (2007).
 8. Trix, F. & Psenka, C. Exploring the color of glass: Letters of recommendation for female and male medical faculty. *Discourse & Society*. (2003).
 9. Witteman, H. et al. Are gender gaps due to evaluations of the applicant or the science? A natural experiment at a national funding agency. *The Lancet*. (2019).
-



Instructions on submitting the Nomination Dossier

Access the website link included in your email notification. This page will be displayed:

7. Nominator Information	
*Last Name	Doe
*First Name	John
Department	Department of Molecular Biology
Institution	Queen's University

1. Enter your name, department, and institution (if applicable).
2. Press the **Save and proceed** button.
3. Click **Choose File** to upload your letter.
4. In the **Attachment Title** field, provide a title for the letter you are uploading. Use the following naming convention: applicant-name_your-name_reference e.g. *joe-smith_jane-doe_reference*
5. Press the **Save** button to save your attachment.

Attachment Title	File Name	View Del
Joe_Smith_Jane_Doe_reference	Choose File No file chosen	

Best practice tip: Check that your letter has been uploaded.

To confirm that your letter has been successfully uploaded, click the paperclip:

Attachment Title	File Name	View Del
Joe_Smith_Jane_Doe_reference	Choose File No file chosen	



Canadian
Cancer
Society

Troubleshooting tip: URL does not work.

If the website address included in your email is not taking you to the page shown in the illustration above, this may be due to the URL being broken into two lines in your email display. Ensure that you are copying the complete website link into your browser.

If you have any questions regarding this process, please contact egrams@cancer.ca





Canadian
Cancer
Society

Evaluation Criteria

Bernard and Francine Dorval / William E. Rawls Prizes (early career prizes):

Nominees will be evaluated according to the criteria described below.

Overall contributions to cancer research and potential to lead to (or evidence of having led to) improved cancer prevention, diagnosis, treatments, care, support or cancer control will be considered.

Circumstances which may have impacted the nominee's academic career progression and research productivity are taken into consideration, including but not limited to:

- Additional training requirements and career interruptions (personal (including 'two-body' problem¹ in academia), family responsibilities, medical leaves etc.) contributing to a non-linear or unconventional career trajectory
- Inequitable distribution of institutional resources including start-up packages, laboratory or office space and formal mentorship
- Historical policies and procedures that perpetuate biases in hiring, tenure and promotion
- Biases in assignment of authorship roles in publications (e.g. first and last author roles)
- Underrepresentation of individuals from the four designated groups (women, Indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities and members of visible minorities) among conference keynote speakers and/or panelists and invited lecturers

Expectations for excellence will be commensurate with the research discipline and relative career stage of the nominee.

Criteria:

- Research productivity: nominee's publication record in peer-reviewed journals, quality and type of scholarly work published, degree of contribution, number of citations, and continuity of publication production (barring any interruptions); other forms of research outputs including, but not limited to, conference proceedings, policy reports, patents, and commercialization products.

¹ Refers to dual-academic couples facing the challenge of both individuals obtaining desirable positions within a reasonable commuting distance.



- Research grant funding: as the lead investigator and as part of multi-investigator teams (noting that multi-investigator teams may require additional time/effort to generate successful outcomes); nominee's role(s) and potential impact of contribution(s) to the team will be considered.
- Fellowships, honours, and/or awards received by the nominee; scope and relevance (i.e. provincial, national, or international) of distinctions received will be considered.
- Training the next generation of researchers: relative to career stage and other considerations (career interruptions, for example), evidence of participation in a meaningful way and to an appropriate degree towards the mentorship and support of trainees and fellows; evidence that trainees and fellows have been subsequently recognized for excellence themselves.
- Contributions made to date to scientific discipline: details of these and how critical they are/have been for advancing the knowledge in their immediate research field and the general scientific body of cancer research; potential for future contributions based on track record will be considered.
- Evidence (potential) of (for) leadership on a national and international scale: senior author publications in high quality journals (and citations thereof); success in securing peer-reviewed research funding as a lead investigator; invitations to present at national and international conferences; participation on peer review panels and other professional contributions; community outreach; forging national and international collaborations; and importantly, impact (or likelihood of impact) on cancer prevention, diagnosis, treatment, care and/or support in the Canadian population and internationally.

Score	Nominee Rating Scale - Bernard and Francine Dorval & William E. Rawls Prizes (early career)
4.7-5.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Exceptional candidate who is extremely likely to become (or has already become) a leader in cancer research in Canada and internationally• Exceptional contributions made to date to their scientific discipline and potential impact of future contributions based on track record• Exceptional research productivity and track record in obtaining research grant funding relative to career stage• Exceptional track record in mentorship and/or potential to attract high quality personnel• Exceptional track record in obtaining fellowships, honours and/or awards
4.3-4.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Excellent candidate who is likely to become (or has already become) a leader in cancer research in Canada and internationally



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Excellent contributions made to date to their scientific discipline and potential impact of future contributions based on track record• Excellent research productivity and track record in obtaining research grant funding relative to career stage• Excellent track record in mentorship and/or potential to attract high quality personnel• Excellent track record in obtaining fellowships, honours and/or awards
3.9-4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Very good candidate who has the potential to become a leader in cancer research in Canada and internationally• Very good contributions made to date to their scientific discipline and potential impact of future contributions based on track record• Very good research productivity and track record in obtaining research grant funding relative to career stage• Very good track record in mentorship and/or potential to attract high quality personnel• Very good track record in obtaining fellowships, honours and/or awards
3.5-3.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Good candidate who has some potential to become a leader in cancer research in Canada and internationally• Good contributions made to date to their scientific discipline and potential impact of future contributions based on track record• Good research productivity and track record in obtaining research grant funding relative to career stage• Good track record in mentorship and/or potential to attract high quality personnel• Good track record in obtaining fellowships, honours and/or awards
3.0-3.4*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fair candidate who has limited potential to become a leader in cancer research in Canada• Fair contributions made to date to their scientific discipline and limited potential impact of future contributions based on track record• Fair research productivity and track record in obtaining research grant funding relative to career stage• Fair track record in mentorship and/or potential to attract high quality personnel• Fair track record in obtaining fellowships, honours and/or awards
Below 3.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Poor candidate who has low potential to become a leader in cancer research in Canada• Poor contributions made to date to their scientific discipline and low potential to yield impactful contributions in the future based on track record



Canadian
Cancer
Society

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Poor research productivity and track record in obtaining research grant funding relative to career stage• Poor track record in mentorship and/or potential to attract high quality personnel• Poor track record in obtaining fellowships, honours and/or awards
--	---

*Nominees scoring below 3.5 as an average of final scores will not be considered eligible to receive a prize.





Robert L. Noble / O. Harold Warwick Prizes (established career prizes):

Nominees will be evaluated according to the criteria described below.

Overall contributions to cancer research and the significance of their accomplishments to cancer prevention, diagnosis, treatment, care, support or cancer control in Canada and internationally will be considered.

Circumstances which may have impacted the nominee's academic career progression and research productivity are taken into consideration, including but not limited to:

- Additional training requirements and career interruptions (personal (including 'two-body' problem² in academia), family responsibilities, medical leaves, etc.) contributing to a non-linear or unconventional career trajectory
- Inequitable distribution of institutional resources including start-up packages, laboratory or office space and formal mentorship
- Historical policies and procedures that perpetuate biases in hiring, tenure and promotion
- Biases in assignment of authorship roles in publications (e.g. first and last author roles)
- Underrepresentation of individuals from the four designated groups (women, Indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities and members of visible minorities) among conference keynote speakers and/or panelists and invited lecturers

Criteria:

- Research productivity and outputs: nominee's publication record in peer-reviewed journals, quality and type of scholarly work published, degree of contribution, number of citations, and continuity of publication production (barring any interruptions); other forms of research outputs including, but not limited to, conference proceedings, policy reports, patents, and commercialization products.
- Research grant funding: as the lead investigator and as part of multi-investigator teams (noting that multi-investigator teams may require additional time/effort to generate successful outcomes); nominee's role(s) and potential impact of contribution(s) to the team will be considered.
- Honours, and/or awards received by the nominee: scope and relevance (i.e. provincial, national, or international) of distinctions received will be considered.

² Refers to dual-academic couples facing the challenge of both individuals obtaining desirable positions within a reasonable commuting distance.



- Training the next generation of researchers: relative to career stage and other considerations (career interruptions, for example), evidence of participation in a meaningful way and to an appropriate degree towards the mentorship and support of trainees and fellows; evidence that trainees and fellows have been subsequently recognized for excellence themselves and/or gone on to realize cancer research impacts themselves
- Contributions/discoveries made to cancer research: details of these and how critical they have been for advancing knowledge both in their immediate research field and for the general scientific body of cancer research; the importance of resulting impacts on cancer prevention, diagnosis, treatment, care, support or cancer control in Canada and internationally will be considered.
- Evidence of leadership on a national and international scale: recognition as an expert by peers, senior author publications in high quality journals, success in securing peer-reviewed research funding as a lead investigator, invitations to present at national and international conferences, participation on peer review panels, editorial boards and other professional contributions, community outreach, national and international collaborations will be considered; and importantly, demonstrated impact on cancer prevention, diagnosis, treatment, care and/or support in the Canadian population and internationally.

Score	Nominee Rating Scale – Robert L. Noble & O. Harold Warwick Prizes (established career)
4.7-5.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Exceptional evidence of scientific leadership on a national and international scale• Exceptional contributions/discoveries made to date in their scientific discipline• Exceptional research productivity and track record in obtaining research grant funding• Exceptional and relevant recognition through honours and awards• Exceptional track record in mentorship/training of the next generation of cancer researchers• Exceptional impact on cancer prevention, diagnosis, treatment, care and/or support in the Canadian population and internationally
4.3-4.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Excellent evidence of scientific leadership on a national and international scale• Excellent contributions/discoveries made to date in their scientific discipline• Excellent research productivity and track record in obtaining research grant funding



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Excellent and relevant recognition through honours and awards• Excellent track record in mentorship/training of the next generation of cancer researchers• Excellent impact on cancer prevention, diagnosis, treatment, care and/or support in the Canadian population and internationally
3.9-4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Very good evidence of scientific leadership on a national and/or international scale• Very good contributions/discoveries made to date in their scientific discipline• Very good research productivity and track record in obtaining research grant funding• Very good recognition through honours and awards• Very good track record in mentorship/training of the next generation of cancer researchers• Very good impact on cancer prevention, diagnosis, treatment, care and/or support in the Canadian population and/or internationally
3.5-3.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Good evidence of some scientific leadership in Canada• Good contributions/discoveries made to date in their scientific discipline• Good research productivity and track record in obtaining research grant funding• Good recognition through honours and awards• Good track record in mentorship/training of the next generation of cancer researchers• Good impact on cancer prevention, diagnosis, treatment, care and/or support in the Canadian population and/or internationally
3.0-3.4*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fair candidate who has limited evidence of scientific leadership in Canada• Fair contributions made to date to their scientific discipline• Fair research productivity and track record in obtaining research grant funding• Fair recognition through honours and awards• Fair track record in mentorship/training of the next generation of cancer researchers• Limited impact on cancer prevention, diagnosis, treatment, care and/or support in the Canadian population or internationally
Below 3.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Poor candidate who has no evidence of scientific leadership in Canada• Poor contributions made to date in their scientific discipline• Poor research productivity and track record in obtaining research grant funding• Poor recognition through honours and awards



Canadian
Cancer
Society

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Poor track record in mentorship/training of the next generation of cancer researchers• Limited to no impact on cancer prevention, diagnosis, treatment, care and/or support in the Canadian population or internationally
--	--

*Nominees scoring below 3.5 as an average of final scores will not be considered eligible to receive a prize.





Canadian Cancer Society Lifetime Contribution Prize (established career prize):

Nominees will be evaluated according to the criteria described below.

Primary consideration will be given to the nominee's contributions to cancer research that extend beyond traditional research accomplishments and outputs to have a significant impact on the Canadian cancer research ecosystem.

Circumstances which may have impacted the nominee's academic career progression and research productivity are taken into consideration, including but not limited to:

- Additional training requirements and career interruptions (personal (including 'two-body' problem³ in academia), family responsibilities, medical leaves, etc.) contributing to a non-linear or unconventional career trajectory
- Inequitable distribution of institutional resources including start-up packages, laboratory or office space and formal mentorship
- Historical policies and procedures that perpetuate biases in hiring, tenure and promotion
- Biases in assignment of authorship roles in publications (e.g. first and last author roles)
- Underrepresentation of individuals from the four designated groups (women, Indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities and members of visible minorities) among conference keynote speakers and/or panelists and invited lecturers

Criteria:

- Contributions to the Canadian cancer research ecosystem, and internationally, as applicable: vision and leadership in building networks, fostering collaborations, developing resources and infrastructure, and other contribution(s) that have/has significantly enhanced the cancer research ecosystem in Canada and internationally. The degree to which these contributions have impacted those affected by cancer, in Canada and internationally, as applicable, will be considered.
- Other considerations (to a lesser degree) include:
 - research productivity and outputs: publication record in peer-reviewed journals, quality and type of scholarly work published, degree of contribution, number of citations, and continuity of publication produc-

³ Refers to dual-academic couples facing the challenge of both individuals obtaining desirable positions within a reasonable commuting distance.



tion (barring any interruptions); other forms of research outputs including, but not limited to, conference proceedings, policy reports, patents, and commercialization products

- research grant funding: as the lead investigator and as part of multi-investigator teams (noting that multi-investigator teams may require additional time/effort to generate successful outcomes); the nominee's role(s) and potential impact of contribution(s) to the team.
- honours, and/or awards: scope and relevance (i.e. provincial, national, or international) of distinctions received will be considered.
- training the next generation of researchers: relative to career stage and other considerations (career interruptions, for example), evidence that the nominee participates in a meaningful way and to an appropriate degree towards the mentorship and support of trainees and fellows; evidence that trainees and fellows have been subsequently recognized for excellence themselves, including securing academic positions in cancer research
- participation on peer review panels, editorial boards and other professional contributions, as well as community outreach and advocacy

Score	Nominee Rating Scale – Lifetime Contribution Prize (established career)
4.7-5.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Exceptional evidence of visionary leadership that has enhanced the cancer research ecosystem on a national and international level• Exceptional impact on cancer prevention, diagnosis, treatment, care and/or support in the Canadian population and internationally• Excellent research productivity, including publications and other outputs, grant funding, training the next generation of researchers and professional contributions• Excellent and relevant recognition through honours and awards
4.3-4.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Excellent evidence of visionary leadership that has enhanced the cancer research ecosystem on a national and/or international level• Excellent impact on cancer prevention, diagnosis, treatment, care and/or support in the Canadian population and/or internationally• Very good research productivity, including publications and other outputs, grant funding, training the next generation of researchers and professional contributions• Very good and relevant recognition through honours and awards





3.9-4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Very good evidence of leadership that has contributed to the cancer research ecosystem on a national and/or international level• Very good impact on cancer prevention, diagnosis, treatment, care and/or support in the Canadian population and/or internationally• Good research productivity, including publications and other outputs, grant funding, training the next generation of researchers and professional contributions• Good and relevant recognition through honours and awards
3.5-3.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Good evidence of leadership that has contributed to the cancer research ecosystem on a national and/or international level• Good impact on cancer prevention, diagnosis, treatment, care and/or support in the Canadian population and/or internationally• Fair research productivity, including publications and other outputs, grant funding, training the next generation of researchers and professional contributions• Fair recognition through honours and awards
3.0-3.4*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fair evidence of leadership that has contributed to the cancer research ecosystem on a national and/or international level• Fair impact on cancer prevention, diagnosis, treatment, care and/or support in the Canadian population and/or internationally• Minimal research productivity, including publications and other outputs, grant funding, training the next generation of researchers and professional contributions• Minimal recognition through honours and awards
Below 3.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited to no evidence of leadership that has contributed to the cancer research ecosystem on a national and/or international level• Limited to no impact on cancer prevention, diagnosis, treatment, care and/or support in the Canadian population and/or internationally• Limited to no research productivity, including publications and other outputs, grant funding, training the next generation of researchers and professional contributions• Limited to no recognition through honours and awards

*Nominees scoring below 3.5 as an average of final scores will not be considered eligible to receive a prize.



Canadian
Cancer
Society

Canadian Cancer Society Inclusive Excellence Prize (any career stage prize):

Nominees will be evaluated according to the criteria described below.

Demonstrated leadership in the advancement of equity, diversity and inclusion leading to significant, measurable improvements in the diversity of Canada's cancer research ecosystem will be considered.

Circumstances which may have impacted the nominee's career progression and research productivity (where applicable) are taken into consideration, including but not limited to:

- Additional training requirements and career interruptions (personal (including 'two-body' problem⁴ in academia), family responsibilities, medical leaves, disruptions brought by the COVID-19 pandemic, etc.) contributing to a non-linear or unconventional career trajectory
- Inequitable distribution of institutional resources including start-up packages, laboratory or office space and formal mentorship
- Historical policies and procedures that perpetuate biases in hiring, tenure and promotion
- Biases in assignment of authorship roles in publications (e.g. first and last author roles)
- Underrepresentation of individuals from the four designated groups (women, Indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities and members of visible minorities) among conference keynote speakers and/or panelists and invited lecturers

Criteria:

- Demonstrated leadership in the advancement of equity, diversity and inclusion as it relates to the Canadian cancer research ecosystem including but not limited to: administrative/committee work; development and implementation of programs/strategies/policies; and/or recruitment, training and mentorship activities
- Evidence of impact: measurable (i.e. tangible) improvements in the diversity of Canada's cancer research landscape as a result of nominee's efforts in fostering inclusive excellence. Reviewers may also take into consideration a nominee's research program if that program contributes to equity, diversity and inclusion.

⁴ Refers to dual-academic couples facing the challenge of both individuals obtaining desirable positions within a reasonable commuting distance.



Score	Nominee Rating Scale – Inclusive Excellence Prize (any career stage)
4.7-5.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Exceptional evidence of visionary leadership in the advancement of equity, diversity and inclusion as it relates to the Canadian cancer research ecosystem• Exceptional (measurably demonstrated) impact on the diversity of Canada’s cancer research landscape• Strongly recognized as an equity, diversity and inclusion leader in Canada
4.3-4.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Excellent evidence of visionary leadership in the advancement of equity, diversity and inclusion as it relates to the Canadian cancer research ecosystem• Excellent (measurably demonstrated) impact on the diversity of Canada’s cancer research landscape• Recognized as an equity, diversity and inclusion leader in Canada
3.9-4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Very good evidence of leadership in the advancement of equity, diversity and inclusion as it relates to the Canadian cancer research ecosystem• Very good (measurably demonstrated) impact on the diversity of Canada’s cancer research landscape• Acknowledged as an equity, diversity and inclusion leader in Canada
3.5-3.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Good evidence of leadership in the advancement of equity, diversity and inclusion as it relates to the Canadian cancer research ecosystem• Good (measurably demonstrated) impact on the diversity of Canada’s cancer research landscape• Some recognition as an equity, diversity and inclusion leader in Canada
3.0-3.4*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fair evidence of leadership in the advancement of equity, diversity and inclusion as it relates to the Canadian cancer research ecosystem• Fair (measurably demonstrated) impact on the diversity of Canada’s cancer research landscape• Limited recognition as an equity, diversity and inclusion leader in Canada
Below 3.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited to no evidence of leadership in the advancement of equity, diversity and inclusion as it relates to the Canadian cancer research ecosystem• Limited to no (measurably demonstrated) impact on the diversity of Canada’s cancer research landscape



Canadian
Cancer
Society

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited to no recognition as an equity, diversity and inclusion leader in Canada
--	--

*Nominees scoring below 3.5 as an average of final scores will not be considered eligible to receive a prize.

