



Canadian Pediatric Endocrine Group  
Groupe canadien d'endocrinologie pédiatrique

## CPEG FELLOWSHIP REVIEWER ASSESSMENT FORM FOR FELLOWSHIPS TO BE AWARDED IN 2025

<b>Name of Applicant:</b>
<b>Name of Supervisor:</b>
<b>Name of Reviewer:</b>
<b>Title of Research Proposal:</b>

### CONSIDERATIONS:

#### 1) Past performance of trainee

##### Publications

- Order of authorship (First? Co-author?)
  - Were these completed prior to medical school?
- Impact of journals
- Record compared to others at same level

##### Research, academic or professional development

- Research or professional experience compared to others at same level
- Ability for independent investigation
- Quantity & quality of awards, prizes, etc.

#### 2) Letters of reference

##### Characteristics and abilities

- Critical thinking, independence, perseverance, originality, organizational skills, interpersonal skills, leadership, communication skills, initiative, motivation, interest in discovery, research ability

#### 3) Track record of supervisor

##### Training environment

- Supervisor's training record
- Supervisor's research record
- Supervisor's funding
- Are there resources clearly identified for this project

#### 4) Trainee-driven

##### Role of applicant in this proposal

- Trainee has had substantial input into the **design** and writing of the proposal
  - Trainee will influence how the project is implemented
  - Trainee's role in the project
  - Trainee will not just undertake analyses
  - Trainee has obtained funding for project

#### 5) Career plan

- How does the project and the year of extra training mesh with the long term career goals of the resident
- Does the resident plan on undertaking additional training that will likely enhance a future academic career
- Does the trainee explain how this year will increase their chances of being recruited to an academic centre (should this be their goal)

#### 6) Research Proposal

- Scientifically rigorous
- Background/preliminary data to support the hypothesis
- Clear hypothesis and objectives
- Appropriate approach
  - proposed 'experiments' specifically address the hypothesis and objectives
- Data collection and analysis can be completed in the proposed time frame
- Detailed sample size presented
- Detailed statistical plan described
- Original
- Well written proposal with data/previous work necessary to assess the project be included in the 3-page proposal
- The scope of the project is feasible for a 1-year fellowship

## CPEG FELLOWSHIP AWARD APPLICATION ASSESSMENT RATING GRID

### Notes to reviewers:

- Use the full range of scores
- Keep considerations in mind when scoring
- **Double check *candidate type* for appropriate column**

CANDIDATE TYPES AND POSSIBLE RANGE OF SCORES			
VARIABLES	RATING	A. 1 <sup>st</sup> -YEAR APPLICATION TO CPEG	B. 2 <sup>nd</sup> -YEAR APPLICATION TO CPEG
		Range	Range
<b>PAST PERFORMANCE</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research, academic or professional development</li> <li>• Experience</li> <li>• Awards, prizes</li> <li>• Presentations</li> </ul>	• None–very low	0–3	0–2
	• Low	3–6	2–3.5
	• Moderate	6–10	3.5–5
	• High	10–13	5–6.5
	• Very high	13–16	6.5–8
	• Outstanding	16–20	8–10
<b>PUBLICATIONS</b>	• None–very low	0–1	0–2
	• Low	1–1.5	2–3.5
	• Moderate	1.5–2.5	3.5–5
	• High	2.5–3.5	5–6.5
	• Very high	3.5–4.5	6.5–8
	• Outstanding	4.5–5	8–10
<b>LETTERS OF REFERENCE</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Characteristics and abilities</li> <li>• Letters from referees</li> <li>• Letters from Program Director</li> </ul>	• None–very low	0–2	0–2
	• Low	2–3.5	2–3.5
	• Moderate	3.5–5	3.5–5
	• High	5–6.5	5–6.5
	• Very high	6.5–8	6.5–8
	• Outstanding	8–10	8–10
<b>TRACK RECORD</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training environment</li> </ul>	• None–very low	0–2.5	0–2.5
	• Low	2.5–4.5	2.5–4.5
	• Moderate	4.5–7.5	4.5–7.5
	• High	7.5–10	7.5–10
	• Very high	10–12.5	10–12.5
	• Outstanding	12.5–15	12.5–15

<b>TRAINEE-DRIVEN</b> • Role of applicant in this proposal	• None–very low	0–2	0–2.5
	• Low	2–3.5	2.5–4.5
	• Moderate	3.5–5	4.5–7.5
	• High	5–6.5	7.5–10
	• Very high	6.5–8	10–12.5
	• Outstanding	8–10	12.5–15
<b>CAREER PLAN</b>	• None–very low	0–2	0–2
	• Low	2–3.5	2–3.5
	• Moderate	3.5–5	3.5–5
	• High	5–6.5	5–6.5
	• Very high	6.5–8	6.5–8
	• Outstanding	8–10	8–10
<b>RESEARCH PROPOSAL</b>	• None–very low	0–5	0–5
	• Low	5–10	5–10
	• Moderate	10–15	10–15
	• High	15–20	15–20
	• Very high	20–25	20–25
	• Outstanding	25–30	25–30
<b>TOTAL SCORE (out of 100)</b>			

**COMMENTS**

- Is this project fundable?
- How does this candidate rank compared to all other candidates this year?