

Tier 2 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 **excellent** emerging **world-class** researchers who have demonstrated particular **research creativity**;
- ◁ have demonstrated the **potential to achieve international recognition** in their fields in the next five to ten years;
- ◁ as chairholders, have the **potential to attract, develop and retain excellent trainees, students and future researchers**; and
- ◁ be proposing an **original, innovative** research program of **high quality**.

Applicants were invited to submit a 4-page narrative curriculum vitae that follows the [guidance for Narrative CVs for Canada Research Chair Applications](#) document and an academic curriculum vitae (no page limit), and a 6-page document detailing their proposed research program that follows the [Tier 2 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 30 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 2 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 (30) Sub-Criterion: Research Excellence (10)	<p>The applicant’s narrative and academic CV illustrates that the nominee is an excellent emerging world-class researcher who has demonstrated particular research creativity.</p> <p>Ways to Assess Research Excellence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Soundness of research ◁ 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 impacts/influences on field/public discourse/societal problems or questions ◁ Quantity and type of peer-reviewed publications in relation to disciplinary norms¹ 	<p>Rating of 1-2: <i>Research Excellence</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ 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 evidence of impact/influence on the field/public discourse/societal problems or questions ◁ Has published very few peer-reviewed publications for their discipline ◁ Quality of publications is not evident 	<p>Research Excellence</p>

¹ Account for increased numbers due to self-

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < 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 < Quality of training/mentorship < Evidence of openness and transparency in research < Evidence of appropriate and ethical community engagement (if applicable) < Evidence of sustained research collaborations/partnerships (if applicable) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < 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 < Little to no evidence of quality in training/mentorship activities < Has little to no openness and transparency in their research (e.g., open data, open access publications, etc.) < No evidence of appropriate and ethical community engagement (if applicable) < No evidence of sustained research collaborations/partnerships (if applicable) <p>Rating of 3-4: Research Excellence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < Past research is not very sound < 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

Research Excellence

- < Past research is somewhat sound
- < Past research has relevance for

Ways to Assess Research

Creativity:

- ◁ Past research activities, methods, and outputs that have been novel in the field and/or in the context
- ◁ Past research activities, methods, and outputs that have been risk-taking

Rating of 1

Rating of [REDACTED]
Research [REDACTED]

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 project
- < New outputs will be produced
through this project
- < Knowledge mobilization methods
are novel
- < There is new integration of different
disciplines/fields in a new way

Rating of 7-8:

**Sub-Criterion:
Innovation (10)**

Ways to Assess Innovation:
<

		<p>Rating of 3-4: <i>Innovation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">< 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 <p>Rating of 5-6: <i>Innovation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">< 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 <p>Rating of 7-8: <i>Innovation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">< Strong evidence that new research methods are being proposed	
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < 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) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < 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 achieve proposed research program (if applicable) <p>Rating of 3-4: <i>Quality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < 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 	
--	--	--	--

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

**Sub-Criterion: Training
Potential (10)**

The applicant's proposed research program demonstrates potential to attract, develop, and retain excellent trainees, students, and future researchers.

- ◁ Inclusive, accessible, and equitable recruitment and training practices to be employed
- ◁ Quality of research environment to be offered
- ◁ Evidence that the candidate has the capacity and expertise to provide proposed skills

- ◁ Little to no quality in the skills being offered
- ◁ Does not have any inclusive, accessible, and equitable recruitment and training practices
- ◁ ~~h~~

-
- < 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