

2024 Banting Selection Criteria Guide

Adapted from 2024 Banting Selection committee guide section 4.1.4 B) Selection Criteria found here: [Selection Committee guide – Banting Postdoctoral Fellowships \(fellowships-bourses.gc.ca\)](#)

Applications are evaluated and selected based on the following three criteria, weighted equally:

1. Applicant's research excellence and leadership in the research domain
2. Quality of the applicant's proposed research program
3. Institutional commitment and demonstrated synergy between applicant and institutional strategic priorities

Note: The [Application guide](#) summarizes the steps applicants should follow to complete and submit their application, and includes information on how each component of the application relates to the selection criteria. Applicants and supervisors were instructed to meet the assessment criteria when completing their documents.

Members should base their reviews only on the information included in the application. **Please note that candidates do not need to fulfill all items under each criterion to be ranked highly in that criterion.**

Criterion #1

Applicant's research excellence and leadership in the research domain

Demonstrated capacity for research excellence based on track record as defined by the quality of the applicant's research contributions, and demonstrated capacity for leadership in the research domain as defined by the sphere of influence achieved to date by the applicant.

The indicators to assess this criterion are found in the applicant's proposal, applicant's CV, and the supervisor's statement.

Criterion	Indicators	Score
Applicant's research excellence and leadership in the research domain society at large (e.g., regional, national)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly demonstrated capacity for research excellence based on track record as defined by quality research contributions and demonstrated capacity for leadership in the research domain. • Applicant has already made identifiable contributions to their research field and can be expected to make significant contributions to the research program, institution, research community, and society at large. • A likely recipient of prestigious fellowships or scholarships. 	7.5-9.0 (Recommended)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good demonstrated capacity for research excellence and for leadership in the research domain. 	5.1-7.4 (Could be recommended)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A contributor to major publications in prestigious journals. • Good potential for contributing to the research program, institution, research community, and society at large. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal demonstration of research excellence and capacity for leadership. • Does not demonstrate strong potential for contributing significantly to the research program, institution, research community, or society at large or whose competence and/or expected contribution to the institution is not clearly evidenced. 	0.1-5.0 (Not recommended)

Notes:

The agencies have signed the [San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment](#) (DORA), which recognizes that research contributions are not limited to published journal articles but can include a broader range of contributions (e.g., research publications, reports, books, guidelines, datasets, code, tools, standards, software and commercialized products, article preprints, protocols, knowledge mobilization activities) and impacts (e.g., influence on policy and practice, societal outcomes, distinctions-based, meaningful and culturally safe research). In alignment with DORA, reviewers should:

1. Assess excellence and productivity broadly (i.e., not just based on publications). Consider individual workstyles, contributions, commitments, variations in disciplines, and community and cultural standards. Collaboration, teamwork and mentoring are important and valid contributions to research and to training highly qualified personnel.
 - The gender of the applicant should not have an impact on how these contributions are valued.
 - Similar expectations apply to single-authored and multi-authored publications.
 - The applicant's track record should be reviewed in the context of research/leadership opportunities available to the applicant. Research/leadership opportunities refer to how an applicant's productivity and contributions correspond to the opportunities that have been available to them.
 - If applicable, consideration of the merit of non-academic contributions for research respectfully involving Indigenous Peoples must be taken into consideration.
2. Assess excellence and productivity commensurate with the applicant's context and personal circumstances (e.g., career stage, parental leave, child rearing, illness, disability, cultural, community or family responsibilities, socio-economic factors, access to research/leadership opportunities or relocation of research environment) that may have led to delays in research or in results dissemination. These personal circumstances must be considered on a case-by-case basis.
 - In the case of health professionals, standards of research productivity should be considered in relation to the applicant's level of experience and qualifications, and comparisons with applicants who have obtained a PhD should reflect these differences in standards. For applicants who have relevant work experience, scientific productivity prior to graduate school should be considered.

3. Guard against placing too much value on the number of contributions; focus must be on the impact and significance of the contributions. Reviewers should not use journal-based metrics such as the Journal Impact Factor as surrogate measures of quality and/or excellence as they introduce bias into the review process. Citation rates vary between disciplines and contexts; members must be mindful of this when considering them as part of their evaluation. As stated in DORA, the "scientific content of a paper is much more important than publication metrics or the identity of the journal in which it was published".

Criterion #2

Quality of applicant's proposed research program

Potential of the proposed research program, executed in the proposed institutional environment, to position the applicant to have significant impact through a research-intensive career.

The indicators to assess this criterion are found in the applicant's proposal, and the supervisor's statement.

Criterion	Indicators	Score
Quality of the applicant's proposed research program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strength and potential of the proposed research program are clearly demonstrated and supported by excellence of proposed research environment. Strong potential of the proposed research to impact and advance knowledge in the field. Research environment positions the applicant for significant impact through a research-intensive career. The supervisor is an outstanding researcher leading one of Canada's top groups in the proposed area of research. If applicable, research respectfully involves Indigenous Peoples and community engagement. 	7.5-9.0 (Recommended)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good potential of the proposed research program to contribute to the advancement of knowledge in that field. The program has merit and will be important for the institution and will contribute to on-going research. The supervisor is developing a strong track record and working with a research group that shows promise and support. 	5.1-7.4 (Could be recommended)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program will serve a useful function and be of good value, but not likely result in national or international breakthroughs. • The supervisor has an adequate track record. 	0.1-5.0 (Not recommended)
--	--	----------------------------------

Notes:

1. Sex- and Gender Based Analysis Plus (SGBA+): In assessing the quality of the applicant's research proposal, consideration of sex, gender and diversity in the research design must be considered, if applicable:
 - rationale and methodology for including sex, gender and diversity in the research (from its design to the analysis of research findings) are clearly described;
 - should be evaluated in terms of scientific rigour and usefulness of the proposed research.

2. Applications involving Indigenous communities must be assessed by its academic merit as usual, with additional review on the Indigenous research component. In order to be funded, these applications must fulfill the pillars for respectful research engaging with Indigenous Peoples. See the [Equity, Diversity and Inclusion](#) page for more information.

Criterion #3**Institutional commitment and demonstrated synergy between applicant and institutional strategic priorities**

The indicators to assess this criterion are found in the supervisor's statement.

Criterion	Indicators	Score
Demonstrated synergy between applicant and institutional strategic priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly demonstrated commitment of the institution to support the development of the applicant's research and leadership capacity through institutional support and professional development. • Demonstrated research capacity in the area of the proposed research, which will enable the institution to provide an intellectually stimulating environment to position the applicant as a research leader. • Demonstrated alignment with the institution's strategic priorities and potential benefit to the institution from engagement with the applicant. 	7.5-9.0 (Recommended)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonable demonstration of commitment of the institution to support the applicant and position him/her as a research leader. • Good capacity to develop applicant's research and leadership capacity, but additional institutional support and professional development opportunities recommended for success. • Well aligned to the institution's strategic priorities and some foreseeable benefit to the institution. 	5.1-7.4 (Could be recommended)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Synergy between applicant and institutional strategic priorities not clearly evidenced. • Facilities and professional development insufficient to position the candidate as a research leader. • Alignment with institutional strategic priorities and potential benefit to the institution are limited. 	0.1-5.0 (Not recommended)

Notes:

The evaluation on this criterion should not be based on an assessment of the institution per se but on the institution's:

- commitment to the applicant;
- capacity to enable the applicant to become a future leader in their chosen field;
- potential to build upon its own strategic priorities through engagement with the applicant; and
- awareness and support of any collaborations involved in the proposed research (e.g., research respectfully involving and engaging Indigenous communities).