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

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

¶

¶ Has little openness and transparency in their research (e.g., open data, open accf1 0 0 1 4

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 tra 11.04o-2(d)t-4(t)-4

		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:** ¶ 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	¶ 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	**Innovation**

¶ New ways of mobilizing knowledge being proposed

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

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)

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
- ¶

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

Sub-Criterion: Training
Potential (10)

- Evidence that the candidate has the capacity and expertise to provide proposed skills

- 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 signTf1te5G( )]TJETQq9.8