



Alberta Ingenuity Graduate Student Scholarship Evaluation Criteria

>PROGRID EVALUATION CRITERIA

Alberta Ingenuity uses the ProGrid® evaluation methodology in the review of Graduate Scholarship applications. ProGrid® provides a software tool that helps reviewers evaluate applications in a consistent manner and enables an appropriate discrimination between ‘outstanding’, ‘excellent’, ‘very good’ and ‘good’ candidates.

The values, priorities and expectations of Alberta Ingenuity have been assembled as a matrix of performance criteria with a set of calibrated performance levels established for each criterion. The ProGrid® Evaluation Matrix developed for the Graduate Scholarship competition is as follows:

	A – THE CANDIDATE	C – THE PROJECT
1	Academic Record	The Research Project
2	Awards/Scholarships	The Project Plan
3	Productivity	The Learning Experience
4	Academic/Industrial Experience	
5	Letters of Reference	

Reviewers are asked to select their ratings for each criterion based on the information provided by the candidates and their supervisors. These ratings are selected through the identification of one of four statements (A to D) that most accurately reflect specific information in the application.

The Reviewers’ assessments and comments are input into the ProGrid® software for analysis. The software provides an automatic output record, in both chart and text form, containing the following information:

- The grid position of the application with respect to the ProGrid® Evaluation Matrix;
- Specific comments by the Reviewers regarding individual criteria or the application as a whole;
- A comparison of the various ratings of each application with the average rating for each criterion in the overall competition; and
- A customized report providing constructive feedback to the applicant.

>A1 – CANDIDATE’S ACADEMIC RECORD

NOTE: Evaluation is made within norms for the particular field and the stage and context of the candidate’s career.

- A. Candidate has, as a minimum, *above average* academic standing in the last two years of undergraduate or graduate training.
- B. Candidate has consistently attained an *excellent* academic standing in *most aspects* of their undergraduate/graduate training, **OR** the candidate has demonstrated *steady improvement* to this level, and maintained it, in the latter stages of training.
- C. Candidate has an *excellent* academic record *throughout* the undergraduate/graduate training, **OR** the candidate has demonstrated *continuing significant improvement* in the academic record in the latter stages of training.
- D. Candidate has an *outstanding* academic record (top 5% in their class) throughout the candidate’s university level training.

>A2 – CANDIDATE’S AWARDS/SCHOLARSHIPS

NOTE: Evaluation is made within norms for the particular field and the stage and context of the candidate’s career.

Students who have not had opportunities for scholarships, due to timing, citizenship, etc, should be considered on their potential to receive such awards in Canada. These considerations include: academic excellence, research ability or potential, communication, interpersonal and leadership abilities.

- A. Candidate has received academic recognition such as a prize/award.
- B. Candidate has received academic recognition through *several prizes/awards*.
- C. Candidate has received *one or more competitive university level prizes/awards*.
- D. Candidate has received *highly competitive national premier awards*

>A3 – CANDIDATE’S PRODUCTIVITY

NOTE: Evaluation is made within norms for the particular field and the stage and context of the candidate’s career.

- A. Candidate has *minimal* research productivity, such as only from undergraduate laboratory courses.
- B. Candidate has *some research productivity* such as participation in a summer research project or demonstrated through a *modest level* of publications or presentations at their home institution or at regional meetings.

- C. Candidate has developed a *foundation of research skills* through multiple summer research programs, and/or graduate research. The candidate has *contributed to publications, abstracts and/or presentations* at regional, national or international meetings.
- D. Candidate *has completed or has been a key participant* in a number of important research projects. There is evidence of a *significant publication and/or presentation record* for the candidate's stage of research training career.

>A4 – CANDIDATES CAREER TRACK RECORD

NOTE: Evaluation is made within norms for the particular field and the stage and context of the candidate's career.

- A. Candidate has minimal research and/or industry experience, such as only from undergraduate courses or summer employment.
- B. Candidate has some experience such as employment in a research assistant position or a co-op position.
- C. Candidate has strong academic and/or industrial experience through multiple research assistantships, networking opportunities and/or collaborations with industry.
- D. Candidate has an outstanding record of academic performance and/or industrial experience demonstrating a substantive increase in responsibility through multiple research assistantships and/or creation and maintenance of pivotal industry collaborations and partnerships.

>A5 – LETTERS OF REFERENCE

NOTE: Letters of reference will be strengthened if they are current and include clear examples of the candidate's skills based on the criteria description.

- A. The content of the letters of reference provide *limited information* about the candidate's personal characteristics (motivation, intellectual capacity, maturity, etc.) or research abilities.
- B. The content of the letters of reference provide *credible support* about the candidate's personal characteristics (motivation, intellectual capacity, maturity, etc.), and the candidate's recognized or potential research abilities. The content of the letters tends to be *general* rather than specific.
- C. The content of the letters of reference is *predominantly positive* with *specific information* about the candidate's personal characteristics (motivation, intellectual capacity, maturity, etc.), and the candidate's recognized or potential research competence and abilities.
- D. The content of the letters of reference are *unanimously strong* in their support of the candidate and provide a *detailed assessment* of the candidate's personal characteristics (motivation, intellectual capacity, maturity, etc.) and the candidate's recognized or potential research competence and abilities.

>C1 – THE RESEARCH PROJECT (IMPACT)

NOTE: The research project description written solely by the candidate or with supervisor's input is viewed more favourably over those written solely by the supervisor.

- A. The project description is *limited in its explanation* and/or the project does not appear to provide sufficient detail.
- B. The project will likely *add to the existing knowledge* in this area of research. The project is based on an appropriate rationale and proposal structure. There is *evidence of a good understanding* of the scientific principles for the research.
- C. The project will likely make a *significant advancement in knowledge* for the chosen area of research and the rationale for conducting the research is provided. The research proposal is well written and *clearly explains* the scientific principles involved.
- D. The research outcomes have a *high likelihood for a major advancement* in the chosen area of research and the project embodies *leading edge concepts*. The rationale for conducting the research is logical and clearly presented. The research project is *superbly written for general and expert audiences*.


>C2 – THE PROJECT PLAN (IMPLEMENTATION)

- A. The project plan is *limited* and does not appear to be well thought out. The project includes *vague objectives and goals*.
- B. The project plan *includes goals, milestones, timelines and methodologies*. The feasibility of completing the project on schedule and on target is not demonstrated.
- C. The project plan is *concise with well-defined objectives*. The methodologies are clearly described with *attainable goals, milestones and timelines*. The feasibility of completing the project on schedule and on target is demonstrated.
- D. The project plan is *clear and concise with appropriate and justifiable objectives*. It includes *leading edge methodologies* with detailed realistic goals, milestones and timelines. Completion of the project on schedule and on target is clearly demonstrated.

>C3 – THE TRAINING EXPERIENCE

NOTE: Evaluation is made on the basis of what may be norms for the particular field and the stage of the candidate's career.

- A. Candidate will have *access to the supervisor and other trainees/researchers*, as appropriate.

- 
- B. Candidate will have clearly defined *opportunities to interact* with other researchers/trainees, as appropriate. The candidate will receive *mentoring and guidance* in order to complete the research project and to acquire additional skills.
 - C. Candidate will have *opportunities to network and collaborate* with other researchers as well as industrial associates across related disciplines. The candidate will receive *guidance and mentoring* that are relevant to success in his or her career.
 - D. Candidate will have *excellent opportunities to network and collaborate* with other researchers at their institution as well as industrial associations at regional, national and international levels. The candidate will receive *excellent guidance and mentoring* to complete the research project and to acquire additional skills to extend the scope of the research training and to add major career-building capabilities