Tier 1 Canada Research Chair Nomination Review Committee

Assessment Criteria and Rubric

The Canada Research Chair Nomination Review Committee assesses all applicants using the following criteria provided by the CRC Program:

1. quality of the nominee; and
2. the proposed research program.

To meet the criteria of the program, nominees must:

- be **outstanding** and **innovative world-class** researchers whose accomplishments have made a **major impact** in their fields;
- be **recognized internationally** as leaders in their fields;
- have **superior records of attracting and supervising graduate students and postdoctoral fellows** (taking into account different practices in the relevant field or discipline) and, as chairholders, be **expected to attract, develop and retain** excellent trainees, students and future researchers; and
- be proposing an **original**, **innovative** research program of the **highest quality**.

Applicants were invited to submit a 4-page narrative curriculum vitae that follows the [guidelines for narrative CVs for UWinnipeg CRC Applications](#) document and an academic curriculum vitae (no page limit), and a 6-page document detailing their proposed research program that follows the [Tier 1 CRC guidelines](#).

The committee members will use the following rubric to assess all applicants. Each main criterion (Quality of the Nominee, Proposed Research Program) is to be given a score out of 50 and 40, respectively, based on the scoring of each sub-criterion.

All members are required to provide written justifications for the scores they assign to each merit indicator. In addition, members are required to provide feedback that will be shared with the applicant.

Assessment Criteria and Merit Indicators for Tier 1 Canada Research Chair Nominations

The following table contains assessment criteria and their associated merit indicators.

Please note that candidates do not need to fulfill all items under each criterion to be ranked highly in that criterion.

Assessment Criteria	Merit Indicators	Scoring Rubric	Score and Justification
Quality of the Nominee (50) **Sub-Criterion: Research Excellence (10)**	The applicant's narrative and academic CV illustrates that the nominee is an outstanding and innovative world-class researcher whose accomplishments have made a major impact in their field. **Ways to Assess Research Excellence:** • Soundness of research • Quantity and type of peer-reviewed publications in relation to disciplinary norms[1] • Quality of peer-reviewed publications • Quantity/amounts of grants received • Quantity of conference presentations/keynotes given • Quantity of non-traditional outputs/knowledge mobilization • Quality of non-traditional outputs/knowledge mobilization • Quantity of trainees in relation to rank/timespan and type of research • Evidence of openness and transparency in research	**Rating of 1-2:** *Research Excellence* • Past research is not apparently sound • Has published very few peer-reviewed publications for their discipline • Quality of publications is not evident • Has not received any grants • Has given very few conference presentations/keynotes • Has produced very few or no non-traditional outputs/knowledge mobilization activities • Quality of non-traditional outputs/knowledge mobilization activities is not evident • Has trained very few trainees for their rank and type of research	**Research Excellence**

---

[1] Account for increased numbers due to self-citation or "salami slicing" or duplicate/redundant publications.

	- Evidence of appropriate and ethical community engagement (if applicable) - Evidence of sustained research collaborations/partnerships (if applicable)	- Has little to no openness and transparency in their research (e.g., open data, open access publications, etc.) - Has little to no evidence of appropriate and ethical community engagement (if applicable) - Has little to no evidence of sustained research collaborations/partnerships (if applicable) **Rating of 3-4:** *Research Excellence* - Past research is not very sound - Has published a below average number of peer-reviewed publications for their discipline - Quality of publications is below average - Has received a below average - number/total funding amount in grants - Has given a below average number of conference presentations/keynotes - Has produced few non-traditional outputs/knowledge mobilization activities - Quality of non-traditional - outputs/knowledge mobilization activities is below average - Has trained a below average number of trainees for their rank and type of research	

		• Has little openness and transparency in their research (e.g., open data, open access publications, etc.) • Has little evidence of appropriate and ethical community engagement (if applicable) • Has little evidence of sustained research collaborations/partnerships (if applicable) **Rating of 5-6** *Research Excellence* • Past research is somewhat sound • Has published an average number of peer-reviewed publications for their discipline • Quality of publications is average • Has received an average number/total funding amount in grants • Has given an average number of conference presentations/keynotes • Has produced some non-traditional outputs/knowledge mobilization activities • Quality of non-traditional • outputs/knowledge mobilization activities is average • Has trained an average number of trainees for their rank and type of research	

		• Has an average amount of openness and transparency in their research (e.g., open data, open access publications, etc.) • Has sufficient evidence of appropriate and ethical community engagement (if applicable) • Has sufficient evidence of sustained research collaborations/partnerships (if applicable) **Rating of 7-8** *Research Excellence* • Past research is very sound • Has published an above average number of peer-reviewed publications for their discipline • Quality of publications is above average • Has received an above average number/total funding amount in grants • Has given an above average number of conference presentations/keynotes • Has produced many non-traditional outputs/knowledge mobilization activities • Quality of non-traditional • outputs/knowledge mobilization activities is above average • Has trained an above average number of trainees for their rank and type of research	

		- Has an above average amount of openness and transparency in their research (e.g., open data, open access publications, etc.) - Has very good evidence of appropriate and ethical community engagement (if applicable) - Has very good evidence of sustained research collaborations/partnerships (if applicable) **Rating of 9-10** *Research Excellence* - Past research is exceptionally sound - Has published a significant number of peer-reviewed publications for their discipline - Quality of publications is significant - Has received a significant number of grants/significant amount of total funding - Has given a significant number of conference presentations/keynotes - Has produced a significant number of non-traditional outputs/knowledge mobilization activities - Quality of non-traditional - outputs/knowledge mobilization activities is significant	

Sub-Criterion: Research Innovation (10)	**Ways to Assess Research Innovation:** • New research methods being proposed or used • New research questions being proposed • New ways of addressing an existing research question • New knowledge being produced • New kinds of outputs being produced • New ways of mobilizing knowledge being used	• Has trained a significant number of trainees for their current rank and type of research • Has a significant level of openness and transparency in their research outputs (e.g., open data, open access publications, etc.) • Has significant evidence of appropriate and ethical community engagement (if applicable) • Has significant evidence of sustained research collaborations/partnerships (if applicable) **Rating of 1-2:** *Research Innovation* • No evidence that new research methods were used • No evidence that new research questions had been formulated • No evidence that new ways of addressing an existing research question were developed or used • No evidence that new knowledge or outputs were produced/mobilized **Rating of 3-4:** *Research Innovation* • Little evidence that new research methods were used • Little evidence that new research questions had been formulated	**Research Innovation**

| | | • Little evidence that new ways of addressing an existing research question were developed or used
• Little evidence that new knowledge or outputs were produced/mobilized

Rating of 5-6:
Research Innovation
• Some evidence that new research methods were used
• Some evidence that new research questions had been formulated
• Some evidence that new ways of addressing an existing research question were developed or used
• Some evidence that new knowledge or outputs were produced/mobilized

Rating of 7-8:
Research Innovation
• Strong evidence that new research methods were used
• Strong evidence that new research questions had been formulated
• Strong evidence that new ways of addressing an existing research question were developed or used
• Strong evidence that new knowledge or outputs were produced/mobilized

Rating of 9-10: | |

| Sub-Criterion: Research Impact (10) | Ways to Assess Research Impact:
• Relevance of research for intended audiences/users
• Utility of research for intended audiences/users
• Accessibility of research for intended audiences/users
• Evidence of engagement with research by intended audiences/users
• Quality of training/mentorship
• Quality of peer-reviewed publications
• Quantity/amounts of grants received
• Quantity of keynotes given
• Quality of non-traditional outputs/knowledge mobilization
• Evidence of appropriate and ethical community engagement (if applicable)
• Evidence of sustained research collaborations/partnerships (if applicable)
• Quality of impacts/influences on field/public discourse/societal problems or questions | *Research Innovation*
• Significant evidence that new research methods were used
• Significant evidence that new research questions had been formulated
• Significant evidence that new ways of addressing an existing research question were used
• Significant evidence that new knowledge or outputs were produced/mobilized

Rating of 1-2:
Research Impact
• Past research is not apparently sound
• Past research has little to no relevance for intended audiences/users
• Past research has little to no utility for intended audiences/users
• Past research has little to no accessibility for intended audiences/users
• No evidence of engagement with research by intended audiences/users
• little to no quality of impact/influence on the field/public discourse/societal problems or questions.

Rating of 3-4: | Research Impact |

		Research Impact - Past research has some relevance for intended audiences/users - Past research has some utility for intended audiences/users - Past research is somewhat accessible for intended audiences/users - Little evidence of engagement with research by intended audiences/users - Below average quality of impact/influence on the field/public discourse/societal problems or questions **Rating of 5-6:** *Research Impact* - Past research has relevance for intended audiences/users - Past research has utility for intended audiences/users - Past research is accessible for intended audiences/users - Some evidence of engagement with research by intended audiences/users - Average quality of impact/influence on the field/public discourse/societal problems or questions **Rating of 7-8:** *Research Impact* - Past research is very relevant for intended audiences/users	

| | | • Past research has high utility for intended audiences/users
• Past research is very accessible for intended audiences/users
• Evidence of engagement with research by intended audiences/users
• Above average quality of impact/influence on the field/public discourse/societal problems or questions

Rating of 9-10:
Research Impact
• Past research has high relevance for intended audiences/users
• Past research has significant utility for intended audiences/users
• Past research is significantly accessible for intended audiences/users
• Significant evidence of intended audiences/users engaging with their research
• Has significant evidence of appropriate and ethical community engagement
• Has significant evidence of sustained research collaborations/partnerships
• Above average number of international research collaborations/affiliations in relation to their current career point | |

| Sub-Criterion: International Recognition (10) | **Ways to Assess International Recognition:**
• Awards and prizes
• Nominations for awards and prizes
• Leadership roles and/or professional involvement in the field (e.g., in scholarly associations, conference organizing, etc.)
• Community-based recognition
• Number of international research collaborations/affiliations in relation to current career point | **Rating of 1-2:**
International Recognition
• No awards or prizes
• No nominations for awards or prizes
• Candidate has little to no professional involvement in the field
• No community-based recognition
• No international research collaborations/affiliations in relation to their current career point

Rating of 3-4:
International Recognition
• Below average number of awards and prizes
• Few nominations for awards or prizes
• Candidate has a below average level of professional involvement in the field
• Little community-based recognition
• Few international research collaborations/affiliations in relation to their current career point

Rating of 5-6:
International Recognition | **International Recognition** |

		- Average number of awards and prizes - Several nominations for awards and prizes - Candidate has an average level of professional involvement in the field - Some community-based recognition - Some international research collaborations/affiliations in relation to their current career point **Rating of 7-8:** *International Recognition* - Above average number of awards and prizes - Many nominations for awards and prizes - Candidate has above average number of leadership roles and/or above average professional involvement in their field - Above average community-based recognition - Above average number of international research collaborations/affiliations in relation to their current career point **Rating of 9-10:** *International Recognition*	

| Sub-Criterion: Training Record (10) | The applicant's narrative and academic CV demonstrates that they have a superior record of attracting and supervising graduate students and postdoctoral fellows (accounting for different practices in the relevant field or discipline).

Ways to Assess Record of Attracting and Supervising Graduate Students and Postdoctoral Fellows:
• Quantity of trainees in relation to rank/timespan and type of research
• Quality of the skills and training provided to students and postdoctoral fellows. | • Exceptional number of awards and prizes
• Exceptional number of nominations for awards and prizes
• Candidate holds multiple leadership roles and/or has significant professional involvement in the field
• Significant community-based recognition
• Significant number of international research collaborations/affiliations in relation to their current career point

Rating of 1-2:
Training Record
• Has trained and/or supervised very few students and postdoctoral fellows for their rank and type of research/discipline

Rating of 3-4:
Training Record
• Has trained and/or supervised a below average number of students and postdoctoral fellows for their rank and type of research/discipline

Rating of 5-6: | **Training Record** |

		Training Record • Has trained and/or supervised an average number of students and postdoctoral fellows for their rank and type of research/discipline **Rating of 7-8:** ***Training Record*** • Has trained and/or supervised an above average number of students and postdoctoral fellows for their rank and type of research/discipline **Rating of 9-10:** ***Training Record*** • Has trained and/or supervised a significant number of students and postdoctoral fellows for their current rank and type of research/discipline	
Quality of the Proposed Research Program (40) **Sub-Criterion: Originality (10)**	The proposed research program is original, innovative and of the highest quality. **Ways to Assess Originality:** • Novelty of research questions • Novel use/adaptation of existing theories • Novel use/adaptation of existing methods • Novelty of research methods	**Rating of 1–2:** ***Originality*** • Research questions are not novel • Research theories are not novel • AND/OR not being adapted in a novel way • Research methods are not novel	**Originality**

	• Novel integration of different disciplines/fields	• AND/OR not being adapted in a novel way • There is no indication that new knowledge will be produced through this program • There is no indication that new outputs will be produced through this program • Knowledge mobilization methods are not novel • There is no indication of new integrations of different disciplines/fields **Rating of 3-4:** *Originality* • Research questions are minimally novel • Research theories are minimally novel AND/OR novel in their adaptation • Research methods are minimally novel AND/OR novel in their adaptation • Minimally new knowledge will be produced through this program • Minimally new outputs will be produced through this program • Knowledge mobilization methods are minimally novel • There is minimally new integration of different disciplines/fields in a new way **Rating of 5-6:**	

			Originality • Research questions are novel • Research theories are novel AND/OR novel in their adaptation • Research methods are novel AND/OR novel in their adaptation • New knowledge will be produced through this program • New outputs will be produced through this program • Knowledge mobilization methods are novel • There is new integration of different disciplines/fields in a new way **Rating of 7-8:** *Originality* • Research questions are highly novel • Research theories are highly novel AND/OR highly novel in their adaptation • Research methods are highly novel AND/OR highly novel in their adaptation • Highly new knowledge will be produced through this program • Highly new outputs will be produced through this program • Knowledge mobilization methods are highly novel	

Sub-Criterion: Innovation (10)	Ways to Assess Innovation:		Innovation
		• There is a high amount of new integration of different disciplines/fields in a new way **Rating of 9-10:** *Originality* • Research questions are exceptionally novel • Research theories are exceptionally novel AND/OR highly novel in their adaptation • Research methods are exceptionally novel AND/OR highly novel in their adaptation • Significantly new knowledge will be produced through this program • Significantly new outputs will be produced through this program • Knowledge mobilization methods are exceptionally novel • There is significantly new integration of different disciplines/fields in a new way **Rating of 1-2:** *Innovation* • No evidence that new research methods are being proposed • No evidence that new research questions are being proposed • No evidence that a new way of addressing an existing research question is being proposed • No evidence that new knowledge will be produced	
	• New research methods being proposed • New research questions being proposed • New way of addressing an existing research question • New knowledge being produced • New kinds of outputs being proposed		

| | • New ways of mobilizing knowledge being proposed | • No evidence that new outputs will be produced
• No evidence that new ways of mobilizing knowledge will be used

Rating of 3-4:
Innovation
   • Little evidence that new research methods are being proposed
   • Little evidence that new research questions are being proposed
   • Little evidence that a new way of addressing an existing research question is being proposed
   • Little evidence that new knowledge will be produced
   • Little evidence that new outputs will be produced
   • Little evidence that new ways of mobilizing knowledge will be used

Rating of 5-6:
Innovation
   • Some evidence that new research methods are being proposed
   • Some evidence that new research questions are being proposed
   • Some evidence that a new way of addressing an existing research question is being proposed
   • Some evidence that new knowledge will be produced | |

		- Some evidence that new outputs will be produced - Some evidence that new ways of mobilizing knowledge will be used **Rating of 7-8:** *Innovation* - Strong evidence that new research methods are being proposed - Strong evidence that new research questions are being proposed - Strong evidence that a new way of addressing an existing research question is being proposed - Strong evidence that new knowledge will be produced - Strong evidence that new outputs will be produced - Strong evidence that new ways of mobilizing knowledge will be used **Rating of 9-10:** *Innovation* - Significant evidence that new research methods are being proposed - Significant evidence that new research questions are being proposed - Significant evidence that a new way of addressing an existing	

Sub-Criterion: Quality (10)	Ways to Assess Quality: • Soundness of research • Relevance of research for intended audiences/users • Utility of research for intended audiences/users • Accessibility of research for intended audiences/users • Breadth of research • Evidence of familiarity with current state of the field/discipline in which this research is proposed • Quality of proposed impacts/influences on field/public discourse/societal problems or questions • Evidence of appropriate and ethical community engagement (if applicable) • Evidence of existing research collaborations/partnerships to achieve proposed research program (if applicable)	research question is being proposed • Significant evidence that new knowledge will be produced • Significant evidence that new outputs will be produced • Significant evidence that new ways of mobilizing knowledge will be used **Rating of 1-2:** *Quality* • No evidence that the proposed research will be sound • No evidence that the proposed research will be relevant for intended audiences/users • No evidence that the proposed research will have utility for intended audiences/users • No evidence that the proposed research will be accessible for intended audiences/users • No evidence of breadth within the research proposal • No evidence of familiarity with current state of the field/discipline in which this research is proposed • No evidence of ethical engagement plan with affected communities (if applicable) • No evidence of existing research collaborations/partnerships to	**Quality**

| | | achieve proposed research program (if applicable)

Rating of 3-4:
Quality
Little evidence that the proposed research will be sound
Little evidence that the proposed research will be relevant for intended audiences/users
Little evidence that the proposed research will have utility for intended audiences/users
Little evidence that the proposed research will be accessible for intended audiences/users
Little evidence of breadth within the research proposal
Little evidence of familiarity with current state of the field/discipline in which this research is proposed
Little evidence of ethical engagement plan with affected communities (if applicable)
Little evidence of existing research collaborations/partnerships to achieve proposed research program (if applicable)
Rating of 5-6:
Quality
Some evidence that the proposed research will be sound | |

		• Some evidence that the proposed research will be relevant for intended audiences/users • Some evidence that the proposed research will have utility for intended audiences/users • Some evidence that the proposed research will be accessible for intended audiences/users • Some evidence of breadth within the research proposal • Some evidence of familiarity with current state of the field/discipline in which this research is proposed • Some evidence of ethical engagement plan with affected communities (if applicable) • Some evidence of existing research collaborations/partnerships to achieve proposed research program (if applicable) **Rating of 7-8:** *Quality* • Strong evidence that the proposed research will be sound • Strong evidence that the proposed research will be relevant for intended audiences/users • Strong evidence that the proposed research will have utility for intended audiences/users	

		• Strong evidence that the proposed research will be accessible for intended audiences/users • Strong evidence of breadth within the research proposal • Strong evidence of familiarity with current state of the field/discipline in which this research is proposed • Strong evidence of ethical engagement plan with affected communities (if applicable) • Strong evidence of existing research collaborations/partnerships to achieve proposed research program (if applicable) **Rating of 9-10:** *Quality* • Significant evidence that the proposed research will be sound • Significant evidence that the proposed research will be relevant for intended audiences/users • Significant evidence that the proposed research will have utility for intended audiences/users • Significant evidence that the proposed research will be accessible for intended audiences/users	

		• Significant evidence of breadth within the research proposal • Significant evidence of familiarity with current state of the field/discipline in which this research is proposed • Significant evidence of ethical engagement plan with affected communities (if applicable) • Significant evidence of existing research collaborations/partnerships to achieve proposed research program (if applicable)	
Sub-Criterion: Training Potential (10)	The applicant's proposed research program demonstrates potential to continue attracting, developing, and retaining excellent trainees, students, and future researchers. **Ways to Assess Potential to Attract, Retain, and Develop Trainees:** • Quantity and quality of skills to be offered • Inclusive, accessible, and equitable recruitment and training practices to be employed • Quality of research environment to be offered	**Rating of 1-2:** *Training Potential* • Few to no skills being offered • Little to no quality in the skills being offered • Does not have any inclusive, accessible, and equitable recruitment and training practices • No evidence of quality in the research environment being offered • No evidence that the candidate has the capacity and expertise to provide proposed skills **Rating of 3-4:** *Training Potential* • Very few skills being offered	**Training Potential**

	• Evidence that the candidate has the capacity and expertise to provide proposed skills	• Not much quality in the skills being offered • Has insufficiently explained their inclusive, accessible, and equitable recruitment and training practices • Little evidence of quality in the research environment being offered • Little evidence that the candidate has the capacity and expertise to provide proposed skills **Rating of 5-6:** *Training Potential* • Some skills being offered • Some quality in the skills being offered • Has sufficiently explained their inclusive, accessible, and equitable recruitment and training practices • Some evidence of quality in the research environment being offered • Some evidence that the candidate has the capacity and expertise to provide proposed skills **Rating of 7-8:** *Training Potential* • Many skills being offered • Very good quality of skills being offered	

		- Has explained their inclusive, accessible, and equitable recruitment and training practices well - Strong evidence of quality in the research environment being offered - Strong evidence that the candidate has the capacity and expertise to provide proposed skills **Rating 9-10:** *Training Potential* - A significant number of skills being offered - Significant quality of skills being offered - Has thoroughly explained their inclusive, accessible, and equitable recruitment and practices - Significant evidence of quality in the research environment being offered - Significant evidence that the candidate has the capacity and expertise to provide proposed skills	