**CFI John Evans Leadership Fund (JELF) Reviewer Report Form**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Name: |   |
| Applicant(s): |   |
| Title of Study: |   |
| Date of Review: |   |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Does this application effectively incorporate the best practices of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) as defined in the grant and institutional guidelines?:**<https://research.unityhealth.to/equity-diversity-and-inclusion/edi-resources/>. | Yes or No *If not, what can be done to improve the EDI component of this grant or research program?* |

|  |
| --- |
| *Please email this form to the Principal Applicant.*        ***The purpose of this form is to provide the reviewers with CFI JELF adjudication criteria. You can directly append your detailed comments to the draft application (instead of using this form) and send both to the Principal Applicant.*** |

CFI has provided the following assessment scale:



All JELF proposals are evaluated against five criteria (as outlined below). CFI reviewers are asked to provide a rating (e.g., *Not satisfied; Partially satisfied; Fully satisfied; Fully satisfied and exceeded in one or more key aspects*) and to justify the rating by stating the strengths and weaknesses for each criterion.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Research or technology development**
 |
| The proposed research or technology development activities are innovative, feasible, and meet international standards. *The applicants were instructed to address all of the following:** *Describe the proposed research or technology development activities conducted in an area of institutional priority*
* *Demonstrate the innovativeness and feasibility of the proposed activities by positioning them within the international context, describing the proposed approach and including references*
 | **Rating:** |
| **Strengths:** |
| **Weaknesses:** |
| 1. **Researchers**
 |
| The researchers demonstrate excellence and leadership at a level appropriate for the stage of their career. The researchers have the expertise or relevant collaborations to conduct the research or technology development activities *The applicants were instructed to address all of the following:**• Describe the researchers’ track record, including scientific and technical expertise relevant to conduct the proposed abilities* *• Describe the collaborators’ and partners’ contributions essential to the success of the proposed activities* | **Rating:** |
| **Strengths:** |
| **Weaknesses:** |
| 1. **Infrastructure**
 |
| The infrastructure is necessary and appropriate to conduct the research or technology development program. In cases where the infrastructure will not be fully used by the candidate(s), the institution has developed plans to maximize its utilization within and/or outside the institution.*The applicants were instructed to address all of the following:**• Describe each item and justify its need to conduct the proposed activities**• For construction or renovation, provide a description of the space including its location, size and nature. A detailed cost breakdown, timeline and floor plans must be provided in a separate document as part of the Finance module* *• Use the item number, quantity, cost and location found in the “Cost of individual items” table. Provide a cost breakdown for any grouping of items* *• Describe the value added of an additional award in cases where a candidate has previously received a CFI award.* | **Rating:** |
| **Strengths:** |
| **Weaknesses:** |
| 1. **Institutional commitment and sustainability**
 |
| The infrastructure is optimally used and sustainable through tangible and appropriate commitments over its useful life *The applicants were instructed to address all of the following:**• Present a management plan that addresses the optimal use (i.e. user access and level of use), and the operation and maintenance of the infrastructure* *• Provided detailed information on operation and maintenance costs and revenue sources, including institutional commitment.* Refer to the tables in the section entitled Financial resources for operation and maintenance. | **Rating:** |
| **Strengths:** |
| **Weaknesses:** |
| 1. **Benefits to Canadians**
 |
| The research or technology development results will be transferred through appropriate pathways to potential end users and are likely to generate social, health, environmental and/or economic benefits to Canadians including better training and improved skills for highly qualified personnel (i.e. technicians, research associates, undergraduate students, graduate students and post-doctoral fellows). *The applicants were instructed to address all of the following:**• Briefly describe potential socio-economic benefits, including better training and improved skills for highly qualified personnel* *• Outline the knowledge mobilization plan and/or technology transfer pathways, including partnerships with end users*  | **Rating:** |
| **Strengths:** |
| **Weaknesses:** |
| **Recommendation, budget and general comments** |
| The reviewer recommends funding | Yes or No |
| The reviewer recommends funding for all budget items | Yes or No |
| If applicable, budget items that should not be funded |  |
| **General comments on the proposal:** |