



Canadian Pediatric Endocrine Group
Groupe canadien d'endocrinologie pédiatrique

CPEG FELLOWSHIP REVIEWER ASSESSMENT FORM FOR FELLOWSHIPS TO BE AWARDED IN 2027

Name of Applicant:
Name of Supervisor:
Name of Reviewer:
Title of Research Proposal:

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 st -YEAR APPLICATION TO CPEG	B. 2 nd -YEAR APPLICATION TO CPEG
		Range	Range
PAST PERFORMANCE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research, academic or professional development • Experience • Awards, prizes • Presentations 	• 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
PUBLICATIONS	• 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
LETTERS OF REFERENCE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Characteristics and abilities • Letters from referees • Letters from Program Director 	• 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
TRACK RECORD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training environment 	• 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

TRAINEE-DRIVEN • 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
CAREER PLAN	• 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
RESEARCH PROPOSAL	• 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
TOTAL SCORE (out of 100)			

COMMENTS

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