

Guidelines for Internal Peer Review

- The best practices for internal review suggest having at least two reviewers. One will be an expert in the research area and will likely be the student's supervisor. Additional reviewers will be at "arm's length", scientists in the student's general area, but not experts in the field and representative of the peer review committees. As internal peer reviewers this will likely be your role in the process.
- Students requesting internal peer review and the reviewer will receive a matching letter from the GSE scholarship office. How you work together is up to you and the applicant: face to face meetings or working together via email.
- We ask you to provide comments to students about their application, but not to rewrite it for them. The application must be written by the student.
- Students will provide you with their research proposal, and are encouraged to submit their training expectations, resources and publications sections for review.
- You have a right to set deadlines and say no to unreasonable requests.

The Application

The agencies want to see a well-integrated application package. They fund the student, not just the research project. Students need to sell themselves to the agency as to why they should be funded.

Points to assess in the proposal

- Is the work in the proposal clear and easily understood?
- Is the proposal free of jargon? Are acronyms defined?
- Is the proposal well written, and lacking grammatical and spelling errors?
- Are page limits and formatting correct?
- The introduction should be at a high (newspaper article) level and explain motivation/rationale for the study
- The proposal should have a clearly defined, testable hypothesis or research objective/question
- Methods should include enough detail to convince you that the student can perform the research
- The student should highlight key outcomes/deliverables from their study and discuss its significance.

Training Expectations

- This is the main place where the student's voice is heard. The student should tell a coherent story that shows their passion about their career goals, and how their training (both past and current) will help them achieve those goals.

- The best written Training Expectations contain a clear vision of the student's goals.
- Other points to consider
 - Why U. Calgary?
 - Why the supervisor?
 - Program?
 - Where do trainees from the lab go/what do they do?
 - Who can they collaborate with?
 - What extracurricular opportunities will they have?
 - How is this concordant with the agency/U. Calgary Strategies?
 - Show intangibles –
 - Access to leadership/mentorship?
 - Access to editorial/reviewing?
 - Committee membership?
 - Linked in one cohesive document

Publications and Research Contributions

- Both CIHR and NSERC provide the opportunity for students to list their publications. The strongest applications use this to provide descriptions of their publications
- These include:
 - The student's role in the publication
 - The significance/impact of the work in their field
 - Prominence of journal
 - If a conference presentation, whether this was a local, national or international conference.