

FRAN*6510 Nutrition in the Community COURSE OUTLINE – WINTER 2026

Land Acknowledgement: Guelph

The University of Guelph resides on the ancestral lands of the Attawandaron people and the treaty lands and territory of the Mississaugas of the Credit. We recognize the significance of the Dish with One Spoon Covenant to this land and offer our respect to our Anishinaabe, Haudenosaunee and Métis neighbours as we strive to strengthen our relationships with them. Acknowledging them reminds us of our important connection to this land where we learn and work.

1. GRADUATE CALENDAR DESCRIPTION

This course covers concepts and knowledge of nutrition as applied in community and public health nutrition. It will also examine current programs in applied nutrition. Students will learn best practices for developing evidence-based community nutrition programs and apply critical analysis, evaluation, and communication skills to prepare a grant proposal.

Credit Weight: 0.5 credits

Course Hours: 3-0 (36 lecture; 0 lab/seminar)

Pre-Requisite(s):

Co-Requisites(s):

Restriction(s): Restricted to Family Relations and Applied Nutrition students

2. COURSE DESCRIPTION

Welcome to Nutrition in Community! I hope you find this course engaging, practical and directly relevant to your professional development. This course explores the foundations and application of community nutrition program planning, with an emphasis on evidence-informed decision making for effective intervention design. Community nutrition practice plays a critical role in promoting population health, reducing nutrition-related inequities, and supporting the well-being of diverse population groups.

Throughout this course, you will learn how to apply a structured program planning model to design community nutrition initiatives; develop theory-driven explanations of health behaviour; and write clear, measurable objectives for interventions. You will also gain experience creating both process and outcome evaluation plans, preparing a grant proposal, and strengthening your critical analysis, written, and oral communication skills. By the end of the course, you will be equipped with practical tools to plan, justify, and evaluate community nutrition programs that are responsive to real world needs.

Instructional Format: This course will include two primary forms of instructions: 1) Lecture and 2) In-class activities and discussion. Classes will be interactive and may include small group discussions, group work, videos, case studies and guest lectures. These in-class activities will supplement the lecture by allowing you to think about and apply course material.

3. TIMETABLE

Lecture: Monday, 8:30 - 11:20 am
Location: UNKNOWN

4. INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT

Course Instructor: Alyssa Ramuscak, RD, MHSc, MSc, PhD (c)
Email: aramusca@uoguelph.ca
Office: UNKNOWN
Office Hours: By appointment

5. LEARNING RESOURCES

Required Resource(s):

There is no textbook for this class. Links to required readings will be provided here on the course outline or on CourseLink. All the readings are free of charge to access.

Recommended Resource(s):

Links to resources are provided in the class schedule below. All the resources are free of charge to access.

Course Website:

There is a course website at <http://courselink.uoguelph.ca>. All components of this course will be housed on the CourseLink site including this course outline, assignments, and links to further resources. Your assignments will be submitted through the Dropbox function. Marks and feedback will also be released on the site. Please familiarize yourself with this website as soon as possible and visit it regularly throughout the semester.

Campus Resources

General Resources: If you are concerned about any aspect of your academic program: Make an appointment with a Program Counsellor in your degree program. If you are struggling to succeed academically: There are numerous academic resources offered by the [Learning Commons](#) including, Supported Learning Groups for a variety of courses, workshops related to time management, and general study skills.

Writing Services: Support for clear and concise writing and proofreading. For more information about writing consultations and workshops, check out the library website here:

<https://www.lib.uoguelph.ca/writing-studying/writing-resources-workshops/>

Citation Software: Proper citations are integral to academic writing. Avoid citation mistakes by using citation software. You can find more information about available software here:
<https://guides.lib.uoguelph.ca/ManageYourSources/CompareTools>

Student Wellness: Being a graduate student can be a busy time of your life; taking care of yourself is vital to your health, well-being, and academic success. Student wellness resources are available to you. Visit: <https://wellness.uoguelph.ca/>

6. COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES

At the completion of the course, successful students will be able to:

- i. Apply a program planning model to develop a community nutrition program.
- ii. Create a theory-driven conceptual model of health behaviour.
- iii. Write clear and measurable intervention objectives.
- iv. Develop process and outcome evaluation plans for a community nutrition program.
- v. Prepare a grant proposal for a community nutrition program.
- vi. Further develop critical analysis skills.
- vii. Further develop written and oral communication skills.

7. TEACHING AND LEARNING ACTIVITIES/CLASS SCHEDULE

Week	Topics, Assigned Readings & Guest Speakers	Notes & Due Dates
1 Jan 5	<p>Topic(s): Introduction to the course Introduction to grant writing</p> <p>Assigned Reading(s): Kanji, S. Turning Your Research Idea into a Proposal Worth Funding. Can J Hosp Pharm. 2015; 68(6): 458-64. https://PMC4690671/</p>	
2 Jan 12	<p>Topic(s): Grant writing continued</p>	
3 Jan 19	<p>Topic(s): How does community nutrition differ from individual diet counselling? Step 1 in Intervention Design: Identify a behaviourally-based health problem Step 2 in Intervention Design: Identify determinants of the behaviour</p> <p>Assigned Reading(s): Rose G. Sick individuals and sick populations. Int J Epidemiol 1985;14:32-8. https://academic.oup.com/ije/article/30/3/427/736897</p> <p>Doyle YG, Furey A, Flowers J. Sick individuals and sick populations: 20 years later. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2006; 60(5): 396–398. https://PMC2563964/</p> <p>Glanz K, Bishop DB. The Role of behavioral science theory in development and implementation of public health interventions. Annual Review of Public Health. 2010; 31: 399-418. (Online access through UofG Library website)</p> <p>Lytle LA, Perry CL. Applying research and theory in program planning: An example from a nutrition education intervention. Health Promotion Practice. 2001;2(1):68-80. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26741165</p>	

Week	Topics, Assigned Readings & Guest Speakers	Notes & Due Dates
4 Jan 26	<p>Topic(s): Grant review session Engaging the community: formative assessment</p> <p>Assigned Reading(s): Leask, C.F., Sandlund, M., Skelton, D.A. et al. Framework, principles and recommendations for utilising participatory methodologies in the co-creation and evaluation of public health interventions. Research Involvement and Engagement. 2019;5:2. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-018-0136-9</p>	Grant Review due Jan 23 by 11:59pm; submit via CourseLink's Dropbox.
5 Feb 2	<p>Topic(s): Step 3: Intervention design</p> <p>Assigned Reading(s): Michie S, van Stralen MM, West R. The behaviour change wheel: A new method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions Implementation Science. 2011;6:42 https://PMC.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3096582/</p> <p>Ojo, S.O., Bailey, D.P., Brierley, M.L. et al. Breaking barriers: Using the behavior change wheel to develop a tailored intervention to overcome workplace inhibitors to breaking up sitting time. BMC Public Health 19, 1126 (2019). https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-019-7468-8</p>	
6 Feb 9	<p>Topics: Writing objectives Letter of Intent (LOI) work session</p>	LOI due on Feb 11 by 11:59pm; submit via CourseLink's Dropbox.
Feb 16	WINTER BREAK	
7 Feb 23	<p>Topics: Step 4: Process and outcome evaluation plan data analysis</p> <p>Assigned Readings: Perry CL, Sellers DE, Johnson C. The Child and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health (CATCH): Intervention, implementation, and feasibility for elementary schools in the United States. Health Education and Behavior. 1997; 24: 716-735. (Online access through UofG Library website)</p>	
8 Mar 2	<p>Topic(s): Budgets Logic models</p>	
9 Mar 9	<p>Topics: Full grant work session – Optional in class or on your own. Instructor will be in class answering questions.</p>	

Week	Topics, Assigned Readings & Guest Speakers	Notes & Due Dates
10 Mar 16	<u>Topic(s):</u> Knowledge mobilization Full grant work session	Submit the full grant draft for class review to Alyssa's email by Mar 13 at 11:59pm.
11 Mar 23	<u>Topic(s):</u> Grant review: Class grants	Grant Review: Class Grants due March 20 by 11:59pm; submit via CourseLink's Dropbox.
12 Mar 30	<u>Topic(s):</u> Group presentations Course review and evaluation	Group Presentations: Slides due March 27 by 11:59pm; submit via CourseLink's Dropbox. Final Grant due: April 8 by 11:59pm; submit via CourseLink's Dropbox.

Note: This is a tentative schedule; however, due to various unknown factors there may be changes. Any changes will be announced during class and an announcement will be posted on the CourseLink site.

8. ASSESSMENT BREAKDOWN

Assessment*	LOs Addressed	Due Date	% of Final
Grant Review: Sample Grant; individual via CourseLink	5, 6, 7	Jan 23 by 11:59pm	15%
Letter of Intent; group via CourseLink	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7	Feb 11 by 11:59pm	25%
Full Grant Application Draft; group via instructors' emails	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	Mar 13 by 11:59pm	Not graded
Grant Review: Class Grants; individual via CourseLink	5, 6, 7	Mar 20 by 11:59pm	15%
Group Presentation slides; group via CourseLink	7	Mar 27 by 11:59am	5%
Full Grant Application; group via CourseLink	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	April 8 by 11:59pm	40%
Total:			100%

*Only one submission is required from each group for group assignments.

9. ASSESSMENT DETAILS

*All assignments are due at 11:59pm to CourseLink Dropbox on their respective due dates, with the exception of the Full Grant Application Draft, which will be sent to the Instructor's email (aramusca@uoguelph.ca).

For assignment descriptions and rubrics, please see the Course Outline Appendix A located in CourseLink.

10. LAST DAY TO DROP COURSE

The final day to drop Winter 2026 courses without academic penalty is the last day of classes: Monday, April 6th.

After this date, a mark will be recorded, whether course work is completed or not (a zero is assigned for missed tests/assignments). This mark will show on the student's transcript and will be calculated into their average.

11. COURSE GRADING POLICIES

Grading of Assignments:

After you receive a grade on CourseLink, please review your feedback. Any inquiry or dispute over the grade must be made within one week from the date they are posted. If you fail to protest any grade during this time limit, changes to the grade will not be considered.

Late Assignments:

All assignment deadlines will have a 48-hour grace period. Assignments submitted during the grace period will be accepted without penalty; these assignments will receive a grade, but no feedback. **Do not treat the grace period as the deadline as it is not. The due date is a hard deadline.** All assignments are due at 11:59pm on their respective deadlines; the grace period extends until 48 hours later. If you submit your assignment during the grace period, CourseLink will say that it is late; however, if it is within 48-hours of the deadline (Within the grace period), it is not late.

- Questions regarding the assignment will not be answered during the grace period. Please ask any question you may have about the assignment before the deadline.
- Emails asking for late submission during the grace period are not needed and will not be answered; simply submit your assignment to CourseLink.
- Requests for additional time beyond the 48-hour grace period MUST be requested before the assignment deadline and be assessed on an individual basis. Please email me, and we will create a timeline for submitting your assignment.

Please note: Late assignments will be accepted up to 3 days following the 48-hour grace period and will receive a penalty of 10% per day EXCEPT under documented grounds for compassionate considerations. After the 3-days, access to the Dropbox folder will be closed.

Extensions will be considered for medical reasons or other extenuating circumstances. If you require an extension, discuss this with the instructor as soon as possible and well before the due date. Barring exceptional circumstances, extensions will not be granted once the due date has passed. These rules are not designed to be arbitrary, nor are they inflexible. They are designed for fairness to keep you organized, to ensure that all students have the same amount of time to work on assignments, and to help return marked materials to you in the shortest possible time.

12. COURSE STANDARD STATEMENTS

Your Role in FRAN*6510:

Your success in class and understanding of course material is largely dependent on your active involvement in each class and assignments.

- Be on time for class and stay until the end.
- Complete the required readings and pre-class activities before each class. This will make for interesting and engaging class discussions.
- Class attendance is mandatory. Lectures will not be recorded.
- If you are having difficulty understanding the material or the assignments, please be proactive and ask questions. It is likely to your peers share the same questions.
 - When emailing me, please ensure your email clearly states the course code (FRAN*6510)
- Complete course assignments with integrity. Submitting work that is not your own, including in the case of using AI-generated material, is academic misconduct and will not be tolerated.

- In addition to the formal evaluation at the end of the semester, I encourage you to connect with me at any point to discuss your feedback, thoughts, and ideas on how the course could be improved.

Alyssa's Role in FRAN*6510:

- Create engaging course material and lecture environments that enhance your learning experience.
- Respond to email inquiries within 48 hours, Monday-Friday. I will only respond to emails sent from uoguelph email account. I will not be responding to emails during weekend hours.
- Monitor and respond to questions on CourseLink in a timely manner (Within 48-hours, Monday-Friday). Your peers may have similar questions related to course content that you do. Please post these questions on CourseLink's Discussion board so we can all learn.
- Meet with students as requested, either virtually or in-person at a mutually agreeable time.

Turnitin Software:

We will be using Turnitin software in this course, integrated with the CourseLink Dropbox tool, to detect possible plagiarism, unauthorized collaboration or copying as part of the ongoing efforts to maintain academic integrity at the University of Guelph.

You may screen your own assignments through Turnitin as many times as you wish before your final submission. You will be able to see and print reports that show you exactly where you have properly and improperly referenced sources and materials in your assignment.

FRAN*6510 Specific Policy on Academic Integrity and the Use of Artificial Intelligence:

All assignments should reflect your own work and thoughts. The use of Generative Artificial Intelligence tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, or similar AI software, is NOT permitted in this course.

You are permitted to use AI tools to check spelling, grammar and support writing clarity, provided your own ideas remain unchanged. Permitted tools may include Microsoft Editor in Word, Grammarly (basic), and Hemingway Editor (basic). Advanced AI features that rewrite or generate text are not allowed.

Please note the [University of Guelph Policy on Artificial Intelligence](#): “Students’ work must reflect their unique intellectual capacity and demonstrate the application of critical thinking and problem solving. Unauthorized use of AI to complete assessments violates the fundamental intellectual purposes of the University and does not demonstrate student achievement of course learning outcomes. Submission of materials completed by AI, without permission of the instructor, constitutes an offence under the University’s academic misconduct policies, either as a form of plagiarism or the use of unauthorized aids.”

Intellectual Property Rights and Course Policy Regarding Posting Course Material on Third-Party Sites

The material developed for FRAN*6510, including but not limited to lectures slides, handouts, assignment instructions and rubrics, are the intellectual property of the Family Relations and Applied

Nutrition department and Alyssa Ramusak. These materials have been developed for students in this course only and are not intended for broader distribution. Posting course documents or assignments you complete for FRAN*6510 on third-party websites such as CourseHero directly violates copyright laws and academic integrity. Participation in FRAN*6510 constitutes an agreement that instructors and students will abide by the relevant University of Guelph policies and respect intellectual property rights during and after their association with the University of Guelph.

13. CSAHS ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT POLICY

The [Academic Misconduct Policy](#) is outlined in the Graduate Calendar.

The University of Guelph is committed to upholding the highest standards of academic integrity and **it is the responsibility of all members of the University community – faculty, staff, and students – to be aware of what constitutes academic misconduct** and to do as much as possible to prevent academic offences from occurring. University of Guelph students have the responsibility of abiding by the University's policy on academic misconduct regardless of their location of study; faculty, staff and students have the responsibility of supporting an environment that discourages misconduct. Students need to remain aware that instructors have access to and the right to use electronic and other means of detection.

Please note: Whether or not a student intended to commit academic misconduct is not relevant for a finding of guilt. Hurried or careless submission of assignments does not excuse students from responsibility for verifying the academic integrity of their work before submitting it. Students who are in any doubt as to whether an action on their part could be construed as an academic offence should consult with a faculty member or faculty advisor.

Instructors **shall not** determine if academic misconduct has occurred. This is up to the Associate Dean Academic's office. Instructors shall not assign a grade of zero even if they believe that the student has committed some form of academic misconduct (e.g., copied material from a website like CourseHero) on an assignment or exam.

Instructors **can** determine if a student has poorly paraphrased and/or improperly cited material and can provide a grade accordingly as long as this is clearly identified as part of the assessment criteria via a rubric or other assessment tools.

For more information about Academic Integrity resources and how to prevent Academic Misconduct see: <https://csahs.uoguelph.ca/faculty-research/hub-teaching-learning-excellence/academic-integrity>

APPENDIX A: COURSE RESOURCES AND ASSIGNMENT DESCRIPTIONS

COURSE RESOURCES

Resources to help you succeed in FRAN*6510:

- [Writing Services at the University of Guelph Library:](#) Support for clear and concise writing. You may take your assignments to Writing Services at any stages of the writing process. Be sure to book your appointments early to be able to incorporate the feedback you receive before the assignment is due.
- [Download a citation software:](#) This will save you time and keep your references organized. Most software is FREE.
 - Examples: Zotero, Mendeley, EndNote
- [Tips for Working Effectively in Groups:](#) Your grant LOI and full proposal will be completed as a group. Check out these strategies for effective group work and managing conflict.
- [Student Wellness:](#) Being a graduate student can be a busy and stressful period. Taking care of yourself is vital for your health, wellbeing, and academic success.

REFERENCING GUIDE

All assignments in FRAN*6510 will use the referencing style Uniform Requirements style for references to align with the Canadian Foundation for Dietetic Research Full Proposal Guidelines.

Tips:

- References should be cited numerically in the text, numbered in square parentheses in order of citations.
 - For example: Canada's Food Guide recommends making half your plate fruits and vegetables [1].
- If there is more than one reference cited, separate the list using commas within the parentheses.
 - For example: [1-3, 5, 9]
- List all authors when there are six or fewer. When there are six or more, list only the first six and add "et al."
- Abbreviate journal titles according to the styles used in the Journal database created by the National Library of Medicine (NLM). If the title does not appear in the NLM, provide the complete title.
- If you are using reference citation software, choose "National Library of Medicine" as the output citation style. **Always double-check the output of reference citation software. These tools can assist you with citing sources, but they may not always be fully accurate.**

Please refer to the National Library of Medicine's Samples of Formatted References for guidance: https://www.nlm.nih.gov/bsd/uniform_requirements.html

Assessment Details

Individual Assignment Grant Review

Due: Friday, January 23rd by 11:59pm via CourseLink's Dropbox

% of Final Grade: 15%

Purpose:

1. To help you be a critical reviewer of grant proposals and to assist you in preparing your own proposal.

Description:

Individually, you will prepare a brief review (2 pages, single-space, 12-point Times New Roman font, all margins set at 1 inch) of a grant distributed in class. Your grant review should include:

- A brief description of the project (1 paragraph) that shows the applicant that you understood the proposed objectives and methods/research design.
- Review the key strengths and weaknesses of the proposal and provide suggestions for improvement based on the criteria outlined on page 6-7 of the CFDR grant submission outline (<https://cfdr.ca/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/2026-CFDR-ResearchProposalGuidelines-final.pdf>):
 - Interests and Objectives of CFDR
 - Present State of Knowledge
 - Objectives
 - Methodology
 - Expertise
 - Budget

Course Learning Outcomes Assessed: 5, 6, 7

Individual Assignment Grant Review Rubric (15%)

Text below is consistent with an outstanding assignment.

Project Description				
Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
The summary provides a clear, accurate, and concise overview of the grant proposal, capturing the project's purpose, objectives, target population, and overall approach. It demonstrates a strong understanding of the proposed work and communicates the key elements effectively without unnecessary details.				

Interests and Objectives of CFDR				
Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
The review provides a thoughtful and well-supported assessment of how effectively the grant aligns with the CFDR Research Priorities and broader objectives of CFDR. It clearly identifies key strengths and limitations and critically evaluates the proposal's potential contribution to the existing body of knowledge and its relevance to dietetics and nutrition practice.				

Present State of Knowledge				
Outstanding (10)	Strong (8)	Fair (6)	Needs improvement (4-1)	Unacceptable (0)
The review provides a clear, critical assessment of the grant proposal's presentation of the current state of knowledge. It identifies key strengths and weaknesses in the scope, relevance, and integration of the literature and assesses how effectively the existing evidence is used to justify the proposed research.				

Objectives				
Outstanding (10)	Strong (8)	Fair (6)	Needs improvement (4-1)	Unacceptable (0)
The review evaluates the clarity, specificity, and feasibility of the grant's objectives. It identifies strengths and weaknesses in how well the objectives are articulated, whether they are measurable and achievable, and whether the proposed timeframe is realistic.				

Methodology				
Outstanding (15)	Strong (12)	Fair (9)	Needs improvement (6-2)	Unacceptable (1-0)
The review clearly evaluates the methodological quality of the grant proposal. It identifies strengths and weaknesses in the research design, including sample size, data collection, and analysis methods, and overall feasibility. The review also assesses how well the proposal anticipates potential challenges, the adequacy of mitigation strategies and alternative approaches, and whether the proposed timeline supports successful completion of the project.				

Expertise				
Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
The review clearly evaluates the qualifications and expertise of the proposed research team. It identifies strengths and weaknesses in the team's ability to successfully carry out the project and assesses whether the proposed institutional infrastructure and support systems are adequate to ensure successful completion.				

Budget				
Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
The review clearly evaluates the proposed budget, identifying strengths and weaknesses in its appropriateness, justification, and adequacy to support the project objectives.				

Presentation & Writing				
Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
Well written and presented. Excellent spelling, grammar, sentence and paragraph structure. Consistent with assignment instructions.				

Paraphrasing & Citations				
Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
Excellent use of Uniform Requirement style referencing where necessary. Student has distinguished between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution.				
If citations are missing or in the incorrect format, a zero will be assigned for this section of the rubric.				

“Submission of materials completed by artificial intelligence, without permission of the instructor, constitutes an offence under the University’s academic misconduct policies, either as a form of plagiarism or the use of unauthorized aids.”

TOTAL: /65 /15%

Group Project Letter of Intent

Due: Wednesday, February 11th by 11:59pm via CourseLink's Dropbox.

% of Final Grade: 25%

Purpose:

1. The purpose of this assignment is to provide you grant writing experience to request funds for a community nutrition intervention.

Description:

In your working group of 4-5 individuals, you will create a letter of intent for the Canadian Foundation for Dietetic Research application using the following criteria:

1. Abstract (does not count toward your 3-page limit for the LOI)

- The text of the abstract including the title must not exceed 300 words.
- Content must include the title, hypothesis or research question, the objectives of the research, a brief discussion of the methodological approach and the value of the research to future dietetic practice.

2. Letter of Intent (LOI)

Format

- The Letter of Intent must not exceed three [3] pages and text must be 12-point, Times New Roman font and single spaced; pages must be formatted to have 1-inch margins at the top, bottom and sides.
- References (if applicable) must not exceed one [1] page.
- Pages must be numbered at top right corner and include a header in the format: last name of team members and title of project.
- *All information of major relevance to the project must be presented in the Letter of Intent. Any pages beyond the page limit will be eliminated without being read by the instructors.*

Content

The Letter of Intent must include:	The Scientific Review Committee's Assessment Criteria
I. Title of project	
II. Rationale for importance of project (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fits with CFDR Research Priorities; found here: https://cfdr.ca/grants/
III. Research project hypothesis/objectives (5%)	
IV. Description of approach/methodology for project (50%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Proposed research approach & methods
V. Significant/relevance of project findings to dietetic practice (25%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Potential for contributing to the field of dietetics
VI. Time required to complete the project, including timelines for different phases of the project (5%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adequacy, feasibility
VII. Budget projections (by year) including categories of expenses and amounts. Time allowed is 2 years max. Budget categories include: salary(ies); equipment; supplies	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adequacy, feasibility

<p>and services; fieldwork travel; and conference travel and dissemination (maximum \$1000). (5%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Salary expenditures must be justified, particularly in situations where a dietitian is employed on the project or where it is deemed necessary to pay participants. - Dietetic interns, graduate students and postdoctoral fellows will not be supported. 	
--	--

3. General Information Sheet (does not count toward your 3-page limit for the LOI)

The general information sheet must list the full names and contact information of the team members and the role of each member on the project.

Course Learning Outcomes Assessed: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7

Group Project Letter of Intent Rubric (25%)

Text below is consistent with an outstanding assignment.

Abstract				
Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
The abstract, including title, is within the 300-word limit and formatted correctly. It provides a clear and concise summary of the project, including the title, hypothesis or research question, objectives, brief methodological approach, and significance to dietetic practice.				

Letter of Intent

Title of Project				
Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
The title is clear, concise, and accurately reflects the focus and scope of the project, effectively conveying its purpose to the reader.				

Rationale/Importance				
Outstanding (10)	Strong (8)	Fair (6)	Needs improvement (4-1)	Unacceptable (0)
The Letter of Intent clearly demonstrates strong alignment with CFDR Research Priorities, and the rationale convincingly justifies the significance and relevance of the project to the field of dietetics and nutrition.				

Hypothesis/Objectives				
Outstanding (10)	Strong (8)	Fair (6)	Needs improvement (4-1)	Unacceptable (0)
The objectives or hypothesis are clearly articulated, specific, measurable, and achievable with a timeframe that is realistic and appropriate for the scope of the project.				

Approach/Methodology				
Outstanding (20)	Strong (16)	Fair (12)	Needs improvement (8-4)	Unacceptable (3-0)
Research design and methods are methodologically sound and clearly described. The sample size, data collection, analysis, timeline, and feasibility are well justified and overall feasible. Potential challenges are thoughtfully identified with effective mitigation strategies and alternative approaches presented.				

Significance/Relevance to Dietetic Practice				
Outstanding (15)	Strong (12)	Fair (9)	Needs improvement (6-2)	Unacceptable (0)
Letter of Intent clearly and convincingly articulates the potential contribution of the project to the field and its direct relevance and applicability to dietetic practice.				

Timeline				
Outstanding (10)	Strong (8)	Fair (6)	Needs improvement (4-1)	Unacceptable (0)
Timeline is realistic, well-organized, and aligned with the project objectives.				

Budget				
Outstanding (10)	Strong (8)	Fair (6)	Needs improvement (4-1)	Unacceptable (0)
The proposed budget is appropriate, well-justified, and supports project objectives. Salary and expenses are justified. Complies with funding rules.				

General Information Sheet				
Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
Lists all team members with full names, complete contact information, and clearly defined roles on the project.				

Presentation & Writing				
Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
Well written and presented. Excellent spelling, grammar, sentence and paragraph structure. Consistent with assignment instructions.				

Paraphrasing & Citations				
Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
Excellent use of Uniform Requirement style referencing where necessary. Student has distinguished between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution.				
If citations are missing or in the incorrect format, a zero will be assigned for this section of the rubric.				

“Submission of materials completed by artificial intelligence, without permission of the instructor, constitutes an offence under the University’s academic misconduct policies, either as a form of plagiarism or the use of unauthorized aids.”

TOTAL: /100 /25%

Peer Evaluation **Grant Review: Class Grants**

Due: Friday, March 20th by 11:59pm via CourseLink's Dropbox.

% of Final Grade: 15%

Purpose:

1. To help you be a critical reviewer of grant proposals, provide helpful feedback to classmates, and to assist you in preparing your own grant proposals.

Description:

Individually, you will prepare a brief review (2 pages, single-space, 12 point Times New Roman font, all margins set at 1 inch) of a grant distributed in class. Your grant review should include:

- A brief description of the project (1 paragraph) that shows the applicant that you understood the proposed objectives and methods/research design.
- Review the key strengths and weaknesses of the proposal and provide suggestions for improvement based on the criteria outlined on page 6-7 of the CFDR grant submission outline (<https://cfdr.ca/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/2026-CFDR-ResearchProposalGuidelines-final.pdf>):
 - Interests and Objectives of CFDR
 - Present State of Knowledge
 - Objectives
 - Methodology
 - Expertise
 - Budget

Course Learning Outcomes Assessed: 5, 6, 7

Individual Assignment – Peer Evaluation Grant Review Rubric (15%)

Text below is consistent with an outstanding assignment.

Project Description				
Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
The summary provides a clear, accurate, and concise overview of the grant proposal, capturing the project's purpose, objectives, target population, and overall approach. It demonstrates a strong understanding of the proposed work and communicates the key elements effectively without unnecessary details.				

Interests and Objectives of CFDR				
Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
The review provides a thoughtful and well-supported assessment of how effectively the grant aligns with the CFDR Research Priorities and broader objectives of CFDR. It clearly identifies key strengths and limitations and critically evaluates the proposal's potential contribution to the existing body of knowledge and its relevance to dietetics and nutrition practice.				

Present State of Knowledge				
Outstanding (10)	Strong (8)	Fair (6)	Needs improvement (4-1)	Unacceptable (0)
The review provides a clear, critical assessment of the grant proposal's presentation of the current state of knowledge. It identifies key strengths and weaknesses in the scope, relevance, and integration of the literature and assesses how effectively the existing evidence is used to justify the proposed research.				

Objectives				
Outstanding (10)	Strong (8)	Fair (6)	Needs improvement (4-1)	Unacceptable (0)
The review evaluates the clarity, specificity, and feasibility of the grant's objectives. It identifies strengths and weaknesses in how well the objectives are articulated, whether they are measurable and achievable, and whether the proposed timeframe is realistic.				

Methodology				
Outstanding (15)	Strong (12)	Fair (9)	Needs improvement (6-2)	Unacceptable (1-0)
The review clearly evaluates the methodological quality of the grant proposal. It identifies strengths and weaknesses in the research design, including sample size, data collection, and analysis methods, and overall feasibility. The review also assesses how well the proposal anticipates potential challenges, the adequacy of mitigation strategies and alternative approaches, and whether the proposed timeline supports successful completion of the project.				

Expertise				
Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
The review clearly evaluates the qualifications and expertise of the proposed research team. It identifies strengths and weaknesses in the team's ability to successfully carry out the project and assesses whether the proposed institutional infrastructure and support systems are adequate to ensure successful completion.				

Budget				
Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
The review clearly evaluates the proposed budget, identifying strengths and weaknesses in its appropriateness, justification, and adequacy to support the project objectives.				

Presentation & Writing				
Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
Well written and presented. Excellent spelling, grammar, sentence and paragraph structure. Consistent with assignment instructions.				

Paraphrasing & Citations				
Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
Excellent use of Uniform Requirement style referencing where necessary. Student has distinguished between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution.				
If citations are missing or in the incorrect format, a zero will be assigned for this section of the rubric.				
<u>“Submission of materials completed by artificial intelligence, without permission of the instructor, constitutes an offence under the University’s academic misconduct policies, either as a form of plagiarism or the use of unauthorized aids.”</u>				

TOTAL: /65 /15%

Group Project - Full Grant Application

Due: Wednesday, April 8th by 11:59pm submit via CourseLink's Dropbox.

% of Final Grade: 40%

Purpose: To give you experience in writing a grant proposal requesting funds for a community nutrition intervention.

- **Description:** In your working group, you will complete the Canadian Foundation for Dietetic Research application using the guidelines in the Proposal Submission Guide (<https://cfdr.ca/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/2026-CFDR-ResearchProposalGuidelines-final.pdf>):

Reference Style: CFDR requires the use of the reference style used in the Dietitians of Canada journal. Details about this reference style can be found here under Reference Style (<https://dcjournal.ca/authors/guidelines>).

Note: You DO NOT need to submit:

- Project Description
- Human Research Ethics Approval or Plan for Approval
- Photos and Photo Release Form
- Application Form
- Response to comments/suggestions from the LOI stage
- CVs of Principal Investigator/Co-Principal Investigator for the Grant Application

A full draft of the grant is due on **March 17**.

Course Learning Outcomes Assessed: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

Group Project – Full Grant Application Rubric (40%)

Text below is consistent with an outstanding assignment.

Interests and Objectives of CFDR

Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
-----------------	------------	----------	-------------------------	------------------

Grant proposal aligns within one of the CFDR Research Priorities and the broader objectives of the CFDR. The proposal adds significantly to the state of knowledge on the subject with direct application to the practice of dietetics and nutrition.

Present State of Knowledge

Outstanding (10)	Strong (8)	Fair (6)	Needs improvement (4-1)	Unacceptable (0)
------------------	------------	----------	-------------------------	------------------

The grant proposal includes a comprehensive and well-integrated literature review that demonstrates a strong understanding of the current state of knowledge relevant to the proposed area of investigation.

Objectives

Outstanding (10)	Strong (8)	Fair (6)	Needs improvement (4-1)	Unacceptable (0)
------------------	------------	----------	-------------------------	------------------

The objectives of the project are clearly articulated, measurable, and achievable and can be meaningfully evaluated within the proposed timeframe. When objectives are framed as hypotheses, the specified time is realistic and appropriate for the scope of the project.

Methodology

Outstanding (50)	Strong (40)	Fair (30)	Needs improvement (20-10)	Unacceptable (0)
------------------	-------------	-----------	---------------------------	------------------

The grant proposal includes methodologically sound research plan, including an appropriate sample size aligned with the project's objectives, and feasible, well-justified methods for data collection and analysis. The grant proposal thoughtfully identifies potential challenges and provides a comprehensive mitigation plan, including viable alternative approaches. The proposed timeline demonstrates that the project can be completed successfully within the stated timeframe.

Expertise

Outstanding (15)	Strong (12)	Fair (9)	Needs improvement (6-2)	Unacceptable (0)
------------------	-------------	----------	-------------------------	------------------

The grant proposal clearly describes a research team with the expertise required to successfully complete the project and identifies the institutional infrastructure and support systems that will enable its successful completion.

Budget

Outstanding (10)	Strong (8)	Fair (6)	Needs improvement (4-1)	Unacceptable (0)
------------------	------------	----------	-------------------------	------------------

The proposed budget is appropriate, well-justified, and sufficient to support the project objectives.

Presentation & Writing

Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
-----------------	------------	----------	-------------------------	------------------

Well written and presented. Excellent spelling, grammar, sentence and paragraph structure. Consistent with assignment instructions.

Paraphrasing & Citations

Outstanding (5)	Strong (4)	Fair (3)	Needs improvement (2-1)	Unacceptable (0)
-----------------	------------	----------	-------------------------	------------------

Excellent use of Uniform Requirement style referencing where necessary. Student has distinguished between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution.

If citations are missing or in the incorrect format, a zero will be assigned for this section of the rubric.

“Submission of materials completed by artificial intelligence, without permission of the instructor, constitutes an offence under the University’s academic misconduct policies, either as a form of plagiarism or the use of unauthorized aids.”

TOTAL: /110 /40%