One of the major goals of the Medical Student Scholarship Program is to provide medical students a meaningful research experience. It is worth noting that these applications are from medical students, some of who may be engaging in their first research endeavor. One of your major decisions should be whether or not the proposed research will provide the applicant with a meaningful experience.

The criteria for review have been adapted from the guidelines established by the National Institutes of Health for the review of pre-doctoral research fellowships. Reviewers provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood that the fellowship will provide the medical student with a meaningful research experience. Reviewers consider each of the five review criteria below in determining scientific and technical merit and will give a separate score for each. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged fundable.

**Review Criteria**

**Mentor Commitment:** Research mentor supervision and commitment to providing a quality research experience for the medical student is a pre-requisite of the application and has been committed through review of Phase I documents.

**Research Environment and Resources:** The availability of facilities and resources for the proposed training have been committed in advance through Mentor Compact agreement submitted in Phase I documents.

**Applicant:** The quality of the applicant's academic record, any prior research experience, and the potential to contribute to the success of his/her own research training.

**Research Project:** The merit and quality of the scientific proposal and its relationship to the candidate's research experience and proposed training plan.

**Training Plan:** The quality, value, and consistency of the training plan with the student's stage of research development.

Overall Scholarship Research Training Potential: The value of the proposed scholarship experience as it relates to the potential to provide the student with individualized and supervised experiences that will develop his/her research skills and impact the student's career development. This may include preparation of the student's competitiveness for future extramural research applications/career development awards.

1 = Superior proposal, in the top 10%
2 = Good proposal, in the top 30%
2.5 = Average proposal, at the 50% level
3 = Below average proposal, in the bottom 50%
4 = Weak proposal, in the bottom 30%
5 = Poor proposal, in the bottom 10%

Each application is reviewed independently by at least two reviewers. And students should NOT submit a research training proposal in which their role is primarily technical or clerical (e.g., recruiting patients), primarily passive (e.g., shadowing a clinician). Such projects may provide a learning experience but are not considered valuable research experiences.