

ULRF Score Sheet (2019/2020)

To ensure consistency, the ULRF Review Panel must adhere to the following rating scale:

Descriptor	Range	Definition
Outstanding	4.5-4.9	The application excels in most or all relevant aspects. Any short-comings are minimal.
Excellent	4.0-4.4	The application excels in many relevant aspects, and reasonably addresses all others. Certain improvements are possible.
Good	3.5-3.9	The application excels in some relevant aspects, and reasonably addresses all others. Some improvements are necessary.
Fair	3.0-3.4	The application broadly addresses relevant aspects. Major revisions are required.
Poor	0.0-2.9	The application fails to provide convincing information and/or has serious inherent flaws or gaps.

Summary of the Research Proposal

Reviewers provide a summary of the project to demonstrate their understanding of the research work that is being proposed.

Scores per Evaluation Category

In advance of the ULRF panel Meeting, reviewers provide their initial scores for each evaluation category to one decimal place, based on the scoring convention above.

Strength and Weaknesses of the Project

Reviewers also highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the project based on the evaluation criteria. Reviewers are encouraged to provide comments for each evaluation criterion; strengths and weaknesses that contributed to the application ratings **must be clearly articulated**, as they will be used to:

- provide the other reviewers assigned to the application with a justification for the ratings given to the application; and
- provide applicants with feedback that will assist them with future funding applications to external agencies.

Adjudication Criteria and Interpretation Guidelines

1. **Quality and Originality of Proposal (40%)** – Reviewers will comment on the clarity of purpose/objectives; potential significance of proposed work; suitability of research methods/strategies; and feasibility of proposed timeline.
2. **Research/Scholarly/Creative Achievements of Applicant and Potential Impact of Award (40%)** – Reviewers will assess the applicant's track record and the impact and significance of their previous research activity, taking into account the stage of career. Reviewers will also assess the potential significance of the proposed work to the applicant's overall program of research, including the potential to leverage external funding and the plans for dissemination. The results of previous ULRF awards will also be considered.
3. **Justification of Proposed Budget (20%)** – Reviewers will assess the budget based on the information provided by the applicant. It is the responsibility of the applicant(s) to provide adequate information and justification for activities, team composition (ie. More than one applicant) and expenditures included in the application package.

Review Type	Reviewer 1
Name of Applicant	
Title	

Adjudication Criteria

Quality and originality of the proposal score (0.0-4.9):

Research/Scholarly/Creative Achievements of Applicant and Potential Impact of Award (0.0-4.9):

Justification of Proposed Budget score (0.0-4.9):

Overall assessment score (0.0-4.9):

Summary of the Application – *reviewer to provide summary of proposal to demonstrate understanding of the work proposed.*

Strengths and Weaknesses *Reviewer to provide justification for the scores provided related to the strengths and weaknesses of the quality/originality score, productivity score, and budget score.*

Recommendations *Reviewer will provide recommendations that can include fund, do not fund, discuss at meeting, budget reductions, etc.*

Review Type	Reviewer 2
Name of Applicant	
Title	

Adjudication Criteria

Quality and originality of the proposal score (0.0-4.9):

Research/Scholarly/Creative Achievements of Applicant and Potential Impact of Award (0.0-4.9):

Justification of Proposed Budget score (0.0-4.9):

Overall assessment score (0.0-4.9):

Summary of the Application – *reviewer to provide summary of proposal to demonstrate understanding of the work proposed.*

Strengths and Weaknesses *Reviewer to provide justification for the scores provided related to the strengths and weaknesses of the quality/originality score, productivity score, and budget score.*

Recommendations *Reviewer will provide recommendations that can include fund, do not fund, discuss at meeting, budget reductions, etc.*
