

## 2021 WCHRI Graduate Studentship Grant Grading Grid

All applications will be reviewed by the WCHRI Graduate Studentship Advisory Committee and ranked according to merit. Applications will be reviewed based on the following criteria:

- Student Factors
  - Academic record: GPA (3 point maximum).
  - Academic achievements: awards and prizes (3 point maximum).
  - Applicant's research publications and/or research outputs (3 point maximum).
  - Past experience and personal statement (4 point maximum), and
  - Reference letters (4 point maximum).

A maximum of 17 points may be awarded in this section.
- Supervisor Factors
  - Supervisor/ Co-supervisor research outputs and publication record (4 point maximum),
  - Evaluation of the training environment and the role of the trainee (4 point maximum), and
  - Additional point for faculty at the Assistant Professor level (1 point).

A maximum of 9 points may be awarded in this section.
- Research Project Factors
  - Feasibility and overall quality of the research project (4 point maximum).
  - Evidence of sufficient research resources for this work (3 point maximum), and
  - Additional point for peer-reviewed (national, provincial funding) research resources supporting this work (1 point maximum).

A maximum of 8 points may be awarded in this section.
- Relevance criteria alignment
  - Application must meet WCHRI relevance criteria (as assessed by committee to be eligible for funding).

A total maximum of 34 points are available.

### **Student Factors**

#### **Academic record: GPA (score of 1 to 3)**

Points for GPA The GPA calculation is provided to WCHRI by FGSR through the Waiver to Disclose GPA.	point allocation (maximum)
GPA of less than or equal to 3.59	1
GPA between 3.60 and 3.85	2
GPA between 3.86 and above	3

**A maximum of 3 points may be allocated for the applicant's GPA.**

#### **Academic achievements: awards and prizes (score of 0 to 3)**

Points for previous awards and prizes Assessment of awards and prizes is based on expectations given level of training	point allocation (maximum)
Modest track record of obtaining awards and/or prizes	0
Solid track record of obtaining awards and/or prizes	1
Excellent track record of obtaining awards and/or prizes	2
Outstanding track record of obtaining awards and/or prizes	3

**A maximum of 3 points may be allocated to the applicant's academic achievements.**

**Academic record: publications and/or research outputs (score of 0 to 3)**

Consider relative productivity in terms of research products, given the candidate's training level and engagement in research to date. Consider refereed papers, conference abstracts, Research Day participation, etc.	point allocation (maximum)
Modest publications and research outputs.	0
Solid track record of publications and research outputs.	1
Excellent track record publications and research outputs. The trainee clearly exceeds expectations in terms of productivity.	2
Outstanding track record publications and research outputs. The trainee very clearly has exceeds all expectations in terms of productivity.	3

**A maximum total of 3 points may be allocated to the applicant's publications and/or research outputs.**

**Past experience and personal statement (score of 1 to 4)**

Consider the candidate's past research and work experience and their personal motivation, interest and drive to engage in women's and/or child health research. The applicant's personal statement must evidence alignment with <a href="#">WCHRI relevance criteria</a> .	Point allocation (maximum)
Personal statement provides <i>general information</i> about the applicant's experience and personal motivation and drive to participate in research.	1
Personal statement provides specific details about the applicant's experience and personal motivation and commitment to research.	2
Personal statement and experience evidences a strong personal motivation, commitment and engagement in research. The applicant has a clear rationale for engagement in this research project and the learning goals associated with the proposed supervisor.	3
Personal statement and experience articulates excellent personal motivation, The applicant has a clear and compelling rationale for engagement in this research project and the learning goals associated with the proposed supervisor. The project offers the applicant a unique opportunity to advance their career/ research interests.	4

**A maximum of 4 points may be allocated for the quality of the applicant's past experience and personal statement.**

**Letters of reference (score of 1 to 4)**

Points for quality of the applicant's letters of reference	point allocation (maximum)
Letters provide <i>general information</i> about the candidate's personal characteristics and/or academic strengths.	1
Letters are <i>supportive of the candidate</i> , and speak in general terms, with few details regarding his/her personal characteristics (motivation, intellectual capacity, maturity, etc.) and academic strengths.	2
Letters are <i>very positive</i> and provide <i>considerable details</i> about the candidate's relative strengths. Candidate has accumulated some research experience, and the letters comment on the candidate's competence/abilities in this area.	3
Letters are <i>very positive and strongly supportive</i> of the candidate and communicate an element of excitement about his/her future prospects in conducting research. The letters clearly detail the candidate's research successes and accomplishments and highlights, giving examples, the candidate's strengths, competencies and abilities. The candidate will have had significant experience in research which may have resulted in publication.	4

**A maximum total of 4 points may be allocated for the quality of the applicant's letters of reference.**

## **Supervisor and co-supervisor factors**

### **Supervisor & co-supervisor research outputs and publications (score of 1 to 4)**

The supervisor, and where applicable, the co-supervisor's, research track record will be evaluated with reference to faculty level, research productivity and impact, and publication history.

<b>Quality of the supervisor's/ co-supervisor's research outputs and publication record</b>	<b>point allocation (maximum)</b>
The supervisor's/co-supervisor's level of productivity in the recent past is modest.	1
The supervisor/ co-supervisor has a good/solid record of outputs, including co-publications with trainees (as appropriate).	2
The supervisor/ co-supervisor has a very good/strong and consistent track record of outputs including co-publications with trainees (as appropriate).	3
The supervisor's/ co-supervisor publication record is excellent in terms of outputs and research publications including publications with trainees (as appropriate), and may have received national/international recognition.	4

**A maximum of 4 points may be allocated for the Supervisor(s) publication track record.**

### **Overall impression of the training environment and the role of the trainee (score of 1 to 4)**

Describe the training research environment, the resources available to support the student and the types and number of trainees the investigator has supervised and published with.

<b>The role of the supervisor(s) must be clearly relevant to fostering the trainee's success in the research environment.</b>	<b>point allocation (maximum)</b>
It is not clear that adequate research resources are available to support the candidate's work.	1
The proposed research project will enable the trainee to obtain new methodological expertise. Some research resources support the project.	2
The proposed research project and the candidate's role are clearly defined. The trainee is expected to make intellectual and methodological contributions. Research resources are clearly available to support the project.	3
The proposed research has been developed to capitalize on the trainee's abilities and interests. The research 'fit' will clearly result in an excellent trainee experience. Research resources are not a concern.	4

**A maximum of 4 points may be allocated for the overall impression of the training environment and the role of the trainee.**

### **Additional bonus for Assistant Professor (1 point maximum)**

<b>If primary supervisor is an Assistant Professor, add one bonus point.</b>	<b>point allocation (additive)</b>
If the primary supervisor is at the Assistant Professor faculty level, then an additional point is allocated.	1

**A maximum of 1 point may be allocated.**

## Research project factors

### **Overall impression of proposed research project and fit with the WCHRI mandate**

This section must include specific details of the relevance of the proposed research with the WCHRI mandate of providing benefit to women and/or children's research.

### **Overall impression of proposed research project (score of 1 to 4)**

<b>Impression of proposed research</b>	<b>point allocation (maximum)</b>
The project appears to be commensurate with the level of the candidate's training.	1
The project is relevant to health and is well written, providing sufficient rationalization and methodological details.	2
The project is relevant to health and is well written, providing sufficient rationalization and methodological details. In addition, this work will potentially produce an original contribution to existing knowledge in this field.	3
The project is clearly defined and is well written. The description provides enough methodological details to evoke confidence that the goals of the project will, in all likelihood, be achieved. The project is related to an important area of health research and has the potential to contribute substantially to the knowledge in this field.	4

**A maximum of 4 points may be allocated for the proposed research project.**

### **Evidence of sufficient research funding for this work (score of 1 to 3)**

<b>Evidence of research funding support</b> Reviewers are asked to consider the availability of project funding to support this work specific to the term of the WCHRI Graduate studentship award (September 2020 - August 2022).	<b>point allocation (maximum)</b>
It is unclear that research funding is in place to support this project.	1
Some research funding is in place but may not be sufficient to support the project for the full WCHRI GSA award term.	2
Sufficient details have been provided to evidence that research resources exist to carry out this research. There are no concerns with respect to the level of research funding/ support available during the WCHRI GSA award term to support this work.	3

**A maximum of 3 points may be allocated for sufficient research funding.**

### **Evidence of peer-reviewed (national or provincial agency funding) research resources supporting this work (1 point maximum).**

<b>If this project is supported through a peer-reviewed grant by a national or provincial funding agency an additional point may be allocated.</b>	<b>point allocation (additive)</b>
This project is supported by a peer-reviewed grant through a national or provincial funding agency.	1

**A maximum of 1 point may be allocated for evidence of national or provincial research support for this work.**

**A maximum total of 34 points are available.**

**Relevance criteria assessment (eligibility)**

**This section determines eligibility to hold WCHRI funding.**

<p><b>Application relevance to WCHRI’s vision, mission and strategic plan</b>  All applications to WCHRI must align with our <a href="#">vision</a>, <a href="#">mission</a> and <a href="#">strategic plan</a>; as well as to our relevance criteria. Applications must be highly aligned with our relevance criteria in order to be eligible for funding.</p> <p>To establish relevance, all applications must clearly address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The research question must specifically target improving outcomes for women and/or children through health research.</li> <li>• The primary research question must address the unique and distinct health needs of women and/or children. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stating that a particular disease or risk factor is higher in women or in children is not sufficient rationale; the study must explore why prevalence is higher in women or children.</li> <li>• If a study is exploring sex/gender comparisons, the comparison must be embedded as the primary research question, not as a secondary outcome.</li> <li>• Methodology must clearly demonstrate direct applicability to women and/or children’s health outcomes. The application must provide rationale for their chosen research model, including factors such as sex and age.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The above items are some common considerations; alternative or additional factors may need to be included depending upon the proposed research.</p> <p>Applications must meet <a href="#">WCHRI relevance criteria</a> (as assessed by committee) to be eligible for funding consideration. Applications that are assessed as low relevance are not eligible for WCHRI funds regardless of scientific merit. Relevance may be imbedded throughout the application form, however all applicants must address relevance in their personal statement and in the research proposal.</p>	<p><b>Eligibility</b></p>
<p>Low relevance to WCHRI</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>High relevance to WCHRI</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Concerns with relevance</p>	<p>detail</p>