



CCS Research Training Awards

Overall Scoring:

Criteria	Master's	Doctoral
Research Project - Scale 1	25%	25%
Relevance to Cancer - Scale 2	25%	25%
Potential (Personal) Impact in Cancer - Scale 2	50%	50%

There are two rating scales to be used by reviewers to score applications. A Research Rating (Scale 1) and a Relevance and Potential Impact Rating (Scale 2) should be provided **separately, resulting in two scores.**

Only applications with final scores for both Research Rating and Relevance and Potential Impact of **>3.5** will be eligible for funding.

Once submitted into the grants management system, an **Overall Score** will automatically be calculated (with 25% weighting for Research Rating and 75% weighting for Relevance and Potential Impact). **The Overall score for a given application (post-meeting) will be used in the rank ordering of applications within each panel.**

Research Rating – Scale 1

The Research Training Awards research rating scale is to be used by reviewers to assess the merit of an application's proposed research project. Assigned reviewers are asked to assign a preliminary **Research** score (0-5) based on the criteria below, and to record this score in EGrAMS prior to the panel meeting. *Note that guidance has been provided to indicate which criteria may be deemed most relevant by reviewer type, particularly for interpreting score descriptions below, however reviewers are free to assess based on their own personal (and intersectional) expertise/experience.*

Review Criteria	Sci	PSC	End-User
Research Project (25% overall)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale and evidence for the proposed work is thorough and compelling Scientific approach, including theories and frameworks, is well-described and feasible High likelihood that the project, as described, will result in new discoveries or knowledge Aims are clearly articulated (research question clearly articulated when relevant) and feasible within the project timeline 	✓		



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The public summary clearly spells out the need, goal, methods (including co-creation methods) and expected outcomes of the project and is written in non-technical language • Sex, gender, and other dimensions of diversity (e.g. race, ethnicity) and their intersectionalities are appropriately addressed throughout the project, including the study design, methods, analysis, interpretation, and dissemination/implementation of findings/outcomes • There is thoughtful consideration of barriers to project success • The research proposal includes how knowledge may be shared with the community in a relevant, accessible, feasible and culturally appropriate way 	✓	✓	✓
---	---	---	---

***Note:** Please be aware that the initial scores given during the review process may not be the final scores, as some reviewers may need more information to evaluate scientific merit (i.e., whether the proposed study has a sound design and can answer the research questions.) Additionally, **not all reviewers will rate every aspect of the study.** It's important to check which criteria are relevant to each reviewer type, as scientific expertise is only necessary for evaluating the scientific approach of the study.

Score descriptions

When interpreting score descriptions, the proportion of criteria addressed (all, majority, most, etc.) should pertain only to those that are relevant to a given reviewer. For example, if PSCs are scoring based on 4 (of the possible 8 points above), then 4 is the denominator for the descriptions below.

Description	Score range	Funding priority
All scoring criteria have been met and some exceeded. Each item has been appropriately and thoroughly addressed. Very minor improvements are recommended.	4.5 – 5.0	Highest
The majority (>80%) of scoring criteria have been met and some exceeded. The majority of items have been appropriately addressed. Some minor changes are recommended.	4.0 - 4.5	High
Many (60-80%) scoring criteria have been met. Most items have been appropriately addressed. There are several minor or moderate areas for improvement, but no major weaknesses.	3.5 - 4.0	Medium
Some (40-60%) scoring criteria have been met. Some items have been addressed but there are notable gaps. There is at least one major weakness or many moderate weaknesses.	3.0 – 3.5	Low
Not enough (<40%) scoring criteria have been met. The proposal needs further development before being competitive in this program.	Below 3.0	None



Relevance and Potential Impact Rating – Scale 2

The Research Training Awards Relevance and Potential Impact rating scale is to be used by reviewers to assess the relevance and potential impact of an application. Assigned reviewers are asked to assign a preliminary **Relevance and Potential Impact** score (0-5) based on the criteria below, and to record this score in EGrAMS prior to the panel meeting.

Criteria	Sci	PSC	End-User
Relevance to Cancer (25% overall; 33% of Relevance & Potential Impact Rating)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application is relevant to one or more of the following CCS Research Goals: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preventing cancer in Canada 2. Detecting and diagnosing cancer earlier in Canada 3. Enhancing the duration and quality of life for people diagnosed with cancer in Canada 4. Increasing the number of people in Canada who have equitable access to timely, affordable, and high-quality cancer prevention and/or care *Note: may be indirectly related or relevant to cancer and still receive full marks (i.e., exploration of Indigenous health and wellness) • Impact on patients/affected communities have been appropriately considered - project will not exacerbate or place undue hardship and/or mitigating strategies have been described • The cross-disciplinary training described brings new knowledge or perspective to the trainee’s cancer research or offers other key experiences to support growth and future innovation • The training described is commensurate with award level 	✓	✓	✓
Potential (Personal) Impact in Cancer (50% overall; 67% of Relevance & Potential Impact Rating)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence of supervisor commitment and inclusive support (i.e., EDI actions described) • The environment where the research will take place is inclusive and supportive, as described in the supervisor’s letter • Answers to the 2 questions (Why am I the right candidate for this award? What do I envision as my (long-term) contribution to cancer research?) strongly suggest the candidate’s enthusiasm and experience create a position for success and potential impact in cancer research, from a holistic view of the person • Relevant lived experience, community engagement, work experience, other skills or experience with community, cancer, or healthcare is described and supports growth and innovation in cancer research • Statement of support from the community member / patient / caregiver is suggestive of a strong or meaningful connection or collaboration presently or in the future • Statement of support describes strong potential for impact in cancer • Transcripts indicate a satisfactory academic record • Mentorship plan includes more than one mentor for the trainee, in different focus areas, that supports growth within their field • The described responsibilities and expected benefits (i.e., specific skills or opportunities gained) of each mentoring relationship is detailed and supports the trainee’s growth 	✓	✓	✓



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Optional: Statements of support from potential mentors show commitment and enthusiasm for the mentorship (if applicable) • The provided mentorship plan is commensurate with award level • Postdoctoral fellows: There is evidence of leadership qualities and a career trajectory to suggest future leadership in the field 			
--	--	--	--

Score descriptions

Description	Score range	Funding priority
All scoring criteria have been met and some exceeded. Each item has been appropriately and thoroughly addressed. Very minor improvements are recommended.	4.5 – 5.0	Highest
The majority (>80%) of scoring criteria have been met and some exceeded. The majority of items have been appropriately addressed. Some minor changes are recommended.	4.0 - 4.5	High
Many (60-80%) scoring criteria have been met. Most items have been appropriately addressed. There are several minor or moderate areas for improvement, but no major weaknesses.	3.5 - 4.0	Medium
Some (40-60%) scoring criteria have been met. Some items have been addressed but there are notable gaps. There is at least one major weakness or many moderate weaknesses.	3.0 – 3.5	Low
Not enough (<40%) scoring criteria have been met. The proposal needs further development before being competitive in this program.	Below 3.0	None