



Canadian
Cancer
Society

CCS Workplace Cancer Research Grants Evaluation Criteria

Overall Scoring

Overall Score:	
Merit (M) Score	50%
Relevance & Potential Impact (RPI) Score	50%

There are two rating scales reviewers will use to score applications. A Merit rating and a Relevance & Potential Impact (RPI) rating should be provided separately, resulting in two scores. Ratings should be given on a scale of 0-5, to 1 decimal place. Only applications with final scores for **each** rating (Merit and RPI) of **>3.5** will be eligible for funding. Once these scores are submitted into EGrAMS (CCS's grants management system), an overall score will be automatically calculated using the above percentages of the two scores.

Preliminary overall scores (pre-panel meeting) will be used to rank order applications to allow for sorting applications to be discussed at the panel or triaged (not discussed). Applications with an average Merit and/or RPI score of **<3.5** will be triaged. For more details, please refer to the reviewer handbook.

The final overall score for a given application (post-panel meeting) will be used in the rank ordering of applications within the panel.

Note: Initial/preliminary scores given during the review process may not be the final scores, as reviewers may need more information (that can be clarified during the panel discussion) to evaluate certain aspects of an application. **Reviewers are free to assess based on their own personal/intersectional expertise/experience and are expected to take the panel discussion into consideration and evaluate the application holistically to determine their final scores.**



Score Descriptions

Descriptor	Score range	Definition	Outcome
Outstanding	4.5 - 5.0	<u>All scoring criteria</u> have been met and some exceeded. Each item has been appropriately and thoroughly addressed. Very <u>minor improvements</u> are recommended.	Priority for funding
Excellent	4.0 - 4.5	<u>The majority (>80%)</u> of scoring criteria have been met and some exceeded. The majority of items have been appropriately addressed. Some <u>minor changes</u> are recommended.	
Good	3.5 - 4.0	Many (60-80%) scoring criteria have been met. Most items have been appropriately addressed. There are <u>several minor or one moderate</u> areas for improvement, but no major weaknesses.	Fundable
Fair	3.0 - 3.5	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 <u>or</u> many moderate weaknesses.	Not fundable
Poor	2.0 - 3.0	Not enough (20-40%) scoring criteria have been met. Some items have been addressed but there are notable gaps. There is at least one major weakness <u>and</u> many moderate weaknesses.	
Incomplete	Below 2.0	Few (<20%) scoring criteria have been met. Multiple major weaknesses. The proposal needs significant development before being competitive in this program.	



Merit (M) Rating Scales

The Merit rating scales are to be used by all reviewers to assess the merit of an application. The lists below show the criteria to be evaluated, and reviewers are asked to use these criteria to help them holistically assess each application. For example, weaknesses in some areas may be compensated for by strengths in other areas.

Assigned reviewers are asked to assign a preliminary **Merit** score (0-5) based on the criteria below, and to **record this score in EGrAMS prior to the panel meeting**. If any major weaknesses are identified, this rating should **not** be above 3.5.

Merit Criteria (Proposal)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Scientific rationale and evidence are clear, thorough, and compelling (consider critical and balanced review and analysis of preliminary data and/or published literature).
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Aims are positioned to generate meaningful data/information that will fill existing gaps related to workplace cancer risk and/or potential cancer prevention approaches.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approach(es) and methods are well-described, feasible and aligned with aims, and potential challenges and alternatives are described.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is a high likelihood that anticipated outcomes will be realized – i.e., key milestones, timelines and budget are clearly defined and realistic.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The public summary clearly spells out the need, goal, methods, and expected outcomes of the project and is written in non-technical language.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Where relevant, the proposed research describes the inclusion of people at risk of cancer (or people diagnosed with cancer) in the research in appropriate, thoughtful, and ethical ways.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sex, gender, and other dimensions of diversity/social determinants of health (e.g. race, ethnicity, education, economic status) and their intersectionalities are appropriately <u>addressed and incorporated</u> in the study design, methods, analysis, interpretation, and dissemination/implementation of findings/outcomes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The term and amount of support requested is appropriate for the work proposed. Relevant costs are accounted for, including remuneration of team members where eligible.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Data management plan clearly and thoroughly addresses all the necessary components to ensure data integrity, support transparency, and facilitate reuse.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ownership of data and other products resulting from the research are described and appropriate. For projects involving First Nations, Inuit, Métis or Urban Indigenous communities – there is evidence of alignment with Indigenous principles of self-determination and self-governance such as the First Nations Principles of OCAP® (Ownership, Control, Access and Possession), the CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance, or other relevant principles of Indigenous self-determination in research.



Merit Criteria (Team & Environment)

- The qualifications and expertise of the investigator(s) and other team members (including end-users/decision makers) are appropriate, particularly as they relate to the potential for (eventual) implementation of prevention efforts (i.e., guidelines, policies, regulations, or other interventions). Note that career stage of investigator(s) should be taken into consideration, including any career interruptions.
- The environment(s) where the research will take place is/are appropriate (e.g. contain the required equipment, expertise, and support, including any collaborations, when relevant).
- Meaningful involvement has been demonstrated with all members of the research team in the development of the research proposal (described in the Terms of Reference). This ideally includes people affected by or at risk of cancer as well as end-users of the research. The Terms of Reference also appropriately describes how the team will operate and make decisions.
- Accessibility, equity, diversity, and inclusion principles are evident in team composition, recruitment processes, and training, mentorship, and development opportunities.
- For applications involving First Nations, Inuit, and Metis Peoples, the Principal Investigator or co-Principal Investigator self-identifies as Indigenous, **and/or** the project involves meaningful participation and direction as determined by Indigenous organizations, groups, or individuals related to the project's focus area. Examples of Indigenous participation could include Elders, Knowledge Keepers, governments, health centres, or community organizations/groups related to the project's focus.

Note: *The goal of varying types of reviewers is to bring multiple perspectives and balance to the review process. Reviewers are free/encouraged to assess based on their own personal and intersectional expertise/experience for their preliminary scores. Reviewers are then expected to take into consideration the panel discussion in order to evaluate the application holistically to determine their final scores.*



Relevance and Potential Impact (RPI) Rating Scale

The Workplace Cancer Research Grants Relevance and Potential Impact (RPI) rating scale is used by all reviewers to assess the relevance and potential impact of an application. Assigned reviewers are asked to assign a preliminary **Relevance and Potential Impact** score (between 0 and 5, to 1 decimal place) based on the criteria below, and to record this in EGrAMS prior to the panel meeting. If any major weaknesses are identified, this rating should **not** be above 3.5.

Relevance and Potential Impact Criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The proposed project focuses on one or more risk factors related to workplace exposure with clear and/or compelling relevance to cancer.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The application demonstrates a specific and defined potential for impact on the prevention of workplace exposure.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The application describes and has a high potential to ultimately lead to a reduced incidence of workplace-related cancer(s).
<ul style="list-style-type: none">There is evidence that people at risk and/or patients/survivors/caregivers and clinicians/end-users have been and will be engaged throughout the life of the research project to support uptake and implementation. Where relevant, attention has been given to engaging a diversity of perspectives from patient/survivor/caregiver participants.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The knowledge translation and mobilization plan is well described, integrated into the proposed research, and involves relevant partners at the outset (including at risk and/or patient representatives) to ensure utility of the proposed solution. Public and/or patient engagement strategies are encouraged.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Equitable access to project results is considered (where relevant), including publication in open access journals and/or other methods of dissemination.

Note: *The goal of varying types of reviewers is to bring multiple perspectives and balance to the review process. Reviewers are free/encouraged to assess based on their own personal and intersectional expertise/experience for their preliminary scores. Reviewers are then expected to take into consideration the panel discussion in order to evaluate the application holistically to determine their final scores.*