

Alberta Innovates has a two-stage review process in place to ensure that the values of excellence and impartiality are met. The review process involves a scoring system that uses a 9-point category scale to determine the overall and individual category scores for each application using defined assessment criteria for each award competition. The 9-point category scale is further defined on the next page.

The first stage of the review process involved each application being sent for review by two review committee members, who used the reviewer assessment form to score applications. Applications sent out for review were scored, in whole numbers only, in the following Assessment Criteria areas:

- Academic Record¹
- Relevant Work and/or Research Experience
- Career Development Plan
- Research Training and Mentorship Environment
- Research Proposal

Each application was given an overall score by averaging the whole number scores in each Assessment Criteria area, with the score weighted towards the applicant (Academic Record, Relevant Work and/or Research Experience and Career Development Plan). As a result of the first-stage of the review process, the overall application score was used to determine an initial rank order. This was then used to select applications for consideration during the second stage of review. Discrepancies between reviewer scores of two points or greater were noted and these discrepancies were considered when determining the applications selected for the second stage of the review process.

The second stage of the review process was conducted with a review meeting of a subset of the committee members. At the meeting, the review committee was instructed on confidentiality, conflict of interest and process; and to consider the five principles identified for the Alberta Innovates Training and Early Career Development Programs (please see the program guide for additional information). The review committee members were asked to provide a summary of the application and the stage 1 reviews. Following an open discussion by the committee, a consensus category score was determined and individual private ratings were given by each committee member within the full range of the consensus category score (between .0 and .9). The average review committee ratings from the meeting determined the final rank order of the applications for funding consideration.

¹ Only for Graduate Studentships and MD-PhD Studentships

Category Scoring System

We use the following 9-point category scale to provide individual scores for the defined assessment criteria.

High Score

1. **Exceptional** Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
2. **Outstanding** Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
3. **Excellent** Very strong with only some minor weaknesses

Medium Score

4. **Very Good** Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
5. **Good** Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
6. **Satisfactory** Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses

Low Score

7. **Fair** Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
8. **Marginal** A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
9. **Poor** Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses

Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen the application

Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens the application

Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits the application