

Just in case you are asked to do a re-review, keep the applications and your working notes on file until competition results have been announced.

Return 

Annex 1: Criteria

Overview of the Three Selection Criteria for CIHR Master's Awards

The raw scores that you submit via ResearchNet for each criterion on the 0 to 4.9 scale will be weighted automatically by CIHR in the calculation of an overall score.

The Three Criteria and their Weights in the Overall Score:

Criterion	Weights for each criterion	
Achievements and Activities of the Candidate		
Research Experience and Achievement	15 %	40 %
Academic Performance	25 %	
Characteristics and Abilities of the Candidate		
Critical thinking Independence Perseverance Originality Organizational skills Interest in discovery Communication skills	40 %	40 %
The Research Training Environment		
Training program for the candidate	20 %	20 %
	100%	100%

Return 

Annex 2: Rating Scales and Notes to Reviewers

Variable Assessed	Information Source	Rating Scale	Notes to Reviewers
Achievements and Activities of the Candidate			
Research Experience and Achievement Review information on the candidate's research experience (summer research projects, research honours and awards, etc.) and achievements such as conferences, presentations, research prizes or publications.	Common CV completed by the candidate and Sponsors' Assessments	4.5 - 4.9 outstanding 4.0 - 4.4 excellent 3.5 - 3.9 very good 3.0 - 3.4 good 2.0 - 2.9 average 1.0 - 1.9 below average 0 not acceptable	Assess the research activity and achievements of the candidate relative to your expectations of someone with their academic experience. Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extent of previous involvement in research; • complexity of research accomplished;

<p>Academic performance</p> <p>Review undergraduate academic transcripts and, if available, graduate transcripts</p>	<p>Academic transcripts of the candidate</p>	<p>4.5 - 4.9 outstanding 4.0 - 4.4 excellent 3.5 - 3.9 very good 3.0 - 3.4 good 2.0 - 2.9 average 1.0 - 1.9 below average 0 not acceptable</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attendance at research conferences; • presentation of results at conferences or other meetings; • importance of results; • research honours or awards; • the extent of publication; • and the scientific impact of the journals involved. <p>In considering the candidate's input to any publication, take into account the number of co-authors and the prominence of the candidate's name on the list of authors.</p> <p>Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Type of program and courses pursued • Course load • Grades obtained • Relative standing (if available) • Overall average • Trend (give credit for a steadily improving or consistently good performance)
<p>Characteristics and Abilities of the Candidate</p>			
<p>Critical thinking</p> <p>Independence</p> <p>Perseverance</p> <p>Originality</p> <p>Organizational skills</p> <p>Interest in discovery</p> <p>Communication skills</p>	<p>Sponsors' Assessments</p>	<p>4.5 - 4.9 outstanding 4.0 - 4.4 excellent 3.5 - 3.9 very good 3.0 - 3.4 good 2.0 - 2.9 average 1.0 - 1.9 below average 0 not acceptable</p>	<p>Assess the extent to which the box scores and narratives provided by the sponsors are consistent and provide a score based on your overall impression.</p>
<p>The Research Training Environment</p>			
<p>Training program for the candidate</p> <p>Review the candidate's training expectations and proposed master's research program, including project and planned non-research activities.</p>	<p>Training module completed by the candidate</p>	<p>4.5 - 4.9 outstanding 4.0 - 4.4 excellent 3.5 - 3.9 very good 3.0 - 3.4 good 2.0 - 2.9 average 1.0 - 1.9 below average 0 not acceptable</p>	<p>The candidate's proposed research may be outside your research specialty. From a non-specialist's perspective, assess the intellectual challenge and excitement of the research in which the candidate will be involved.</p>