

Grant Application Review Process

Last Approved:	NOAMA Board	June 23, 2026
----------------	-------------	---------------

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;
- Consistency;
- Confidentiality;
- Transparent process;
- Effective management of conflicts of interest.

4. Review Team Governance

Authority

The Review Team operates under the authority of the NOAMA Board. The Review Team is responsible for evaluating applications and formulating funding recommendations. Final funding decisions remain the responsibility of the NOAMA Board.

Chair

The NOAMA Board shall appoint a Chair of the Grant Review Team.

The Chair is responsible for:

- overseeing the review process;
- ensuring adherence to approved guidelines;
- managing conflicts of interest;
- facilitating review meetings;
- determining whether additional reviews are required where scoring discrepancies exist;
- facilitating the development of funding recommendations for consideration by the NOAMA Board;

The Chair shall serve until resignation, removal by the Board, or appointment of a successor, to a maximum term of six (6) years unless extended by the Board.

Assistant Chair

The NOAMA Board may appoint an Assistant Chair to support the Chair and strengthen succession planning.

The Assistant Chair may:

- support reviewer recruitment;
- assist with conflict management;
- facilitate meetings when delegated by the Chair;
- act in the Chair's absence.

The Assistant Chair shall serve until resignation, removal by the Board, or appointment of a successor, to a maximum term of six (6) years unless extended by the Board.

Review Team Members

Review Team Members shall be recruited by NOAMA Administration in consultation with the Chair and approved by the Chair. Members shall serve for the duration of the applicable competition cycle.

Members are selected based on one or more of the following:

- previous successful participation in NOAMA-funded research;
- prior experience serving on a NOAMA Review Team;
- demonstrated research experience;
- academic and scholarly expertise;
- demonstrated interest in research, scholarly activity, or innovation;
- geographic representation across Northern Ontario;
- disciplinary diversity.

The Chair may recommend additional reviewers where specialized expertise is required.

Confidentiality

All Review Team members shall maintain strict confidentiality regarding:

- applications and supporting materials;
- reviewer comments and scoring;
- Review Team discussions and deliberations; and
- funding recommendations prior to Board approval.

Review Team materials shall not be shared outside of the review process unless authorized by NOAMA.

Conflict of Interest

Review Team members:

- may not participate as an applicant, co-investigator, collaborator, or team member in the competition they are reviewing;
- must disclose actual, perceived, or potential conflicts;
- must recuse themselves from any review where a conflict exists.

The Chair shall determine appropriate mitigation measures for actual, perceived, or potential conflicts of interest. Where the Chair has an actual, perceived, or potential conflict of interest, the Assistant Chair shall assume responsibility for conflict management and related decisions. The Assistant Chair is subject to the same confidentiality and conflict-of-interest requirements as all Review Team members.

5. Project Review Procedures

- a) All eligible submissions will be reviewed by the Review Team.
- b) Reviewers will evaluate assigned projects based on the established evaluation criteria.
- c) 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 Recommendations

Upon receiving the completed evaluations, NOAMA will produce a ranked list of scored grant submissions. Grants scoring 3.5 or higher may be considered for funding, subject to available funding and Board approval.

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 or Assistant Chair, who may determine if an additional review is necessary.
Discrepancy ≥ 1 and < 2	Reviewed by the Chair or Assistant Chair.
Discrepancy ≥ 0.5 and < 1	Potentially reviewed by the Chair or Assistant Chair if the grant will be discussed at 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

Discussion is intended to improve consistency in scoring and ensure common interpretation of evaluation criteria. Final scores remain the responsibility of the reviewers unless modified through an agreed consensus process.

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. Reporting

Following completion of the review process, the Review Team shall provide a ranked list of applications and funding recommendations to the NOAMA Board. The Board retains final authority regarding funding decisions.

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
6.0	2026.06.23	Added Review Team Governance section, Chair and Assistant Chair roles, conflict-of-interest provisions, confidentiality requirements, and reporting framework.