

Grant Application Review Process

Last Approved:	NOAMA Board	February 25, 2025
----------------	-------------	-------------------

1. Background

The Northern Ontario Academic Medicine Association (NOAMA) Board, with the support of the Physician Clinical Teachers' Association (PCTA), provides granting opportunities for PCTA members. The Grant Review Teams oversee the process and formulate recommendations for the NOAMA Board.

2. Purpose

This document outlines the guidelines for the review of NOAMA grant applications.

3. Principles

The review process will adhere to the following principles:

- Fairness;
- Reproducibility;
- Confidentiality;
- Transparent process;
- Effective management of conflicts of interest.

4. Review Team Recruitment Processes

The Review Team is distinct from other Committees. Members of the Review Team will be selected based on the following criteria:

- a) Review of past grant submissions and outcomes;
- b) Relevant experience with academic grant reviews;
- c) Demonstrated research background;
- d) Geographical representation across Northern Ontario;
- e) A strong complement of medical disciplines, ensuring both generalist and specialist perspectives.

The Review Team will evaluate applications submitted for funding opportunities, score them on their merit using defined evaluation criteria, and rank them in order of priority for funding.

5. Project Review Procedures

- a) All eligible submissions will be reviewed by the Review Team.
- b) Members of the Review Team cannot apply for funding opportunities during their term of service.
- c) Conflicts of interest must be disclosed, and members with conflicts will recuse themselves from related discussions.
- d) Reviewers will evaluate assigned projects based on the established evaluation criteria.
- e) Each project will be evaluated by at least two reviewers.

6. Evaluation Criteria

NOAMA uses the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) evaluation criteria. These criteria assess:

- Project Impact;
- Project Merit;
- Project Team;
- Overall Feasibility and Assessment.

Each criterion will be scored out of 5, with the average of these scores providing a final score between 0-5 for each grant submission.

7. Ranking and Funding

Upon receiving the completed evaluations, NOAMA will produce a ranked list of scored grant submissions. Grants scoring 3.5 or higher will be considered for funding.

8. Scoring Issues

Scoring discrepancies will be addressed as follows, unless The Chair determines otherwise:

Scoring Discrepancy:	Next Steps:
Discrepancy ≥ 2	Reviewed by the Chair, who may determine if an additional review is necessary.
Discrepancy ≥ 1 and < 2	The grant will be made available to all Review Team members for discussion at the meeting.
Discrepancy ≥ 0.5 and < 1	The grant will may be discussed during the Review Team meeting

- The Chair retains the authority to review any scores that appear significantly out of place and decide if another review should be conducted.
- Not all grants will be made available for general review; only those meeting specific criteria for discussion will be considered.

9. Review Team Meetings

Grants will be discussed based on the following guidelines:

Discussed:	
	Grants with a scoring discrepancy of ≥ 0.5 and < 1 , where the average score exceeds 3.5 and funding might be impacted;
	Grants with a scoring discrepancy of ≥ 1 where the average score exceeds 3.0 and funding might be impacted.
Not Discussed:	
	Grants with a discrepancy < 0.5 ;
	Grants with all scores < 3.5 , where funding is not feasible;
	Grants where the average score clearly determines the outcome (e.g., high likelihood of funding or rejection).

The goal is to focus discussions on grants where further deliberation may affect the outcome while minimizing unnecessary conversations.

10. Funding Process

Notification of funding decisions will be communicated in writing to applicants following the NOAMA Board meeting.

DO NOT REMOVE THIS VERSION RECORD FROM THIS DOCUMENT

Version	Date	Authors/Comments
1.0	2017.11.13	Original policy
2.0	2018.12.18	
3.0	2020.03.30	
4.0	2022.06.21	Combine AFP/CIOF review process
5.0	2025.02.25	Updates to review and meeting process