2025 Chancellor's Emerging Research Award
Review Considerations

Mandate
The Chancellor's Emerging Research Award is intended to sustain and support high levels of scholarly output and to retain faculty who have made, and will continue to make, exceptional contributions to research in their field. Candidates for the Chancellor's Emerging Research Award must be recognized scholars in their field of study with a record of research excellence and should reflect: demonstrated research creativity and excellence within their field; demonstrated potential to achieve and/or expand international recognition in their field within the next five years; and have attracted and developed trainees and students.

Inclusion Criteria
Faculty members within 10 years of completing their PhD* are invited to submit proposals for The University of Winnipeg's Chancellor's Emerging Research Award.
timeline can be extended to accommodate any leaves undertaken during this period

General Guidelines
Review, score, and rank the applications to reach a consensus on a candidate to whom a research grant of $10,000 will be awarded over a non-renewable term of one year. Applications are comprised of a two-page proposal outlining a research project to be undertaken or continued, a Tri-Agency CV, and two letters of support (one internal and one external). Nominations and self-nominations will be accepted for consideration.

Application Components
1. The Primary Investigator's Tri-Agency CV and two support letters should:
    - Illustrate research productivity that is both creative and of high-quality research
    - Showcase strong evidence of research contribution and potential to achieve and/or expand international recognition in their field within the next five years

2. Research proposals should:
    - Demonstrate potential to attract, develop and retain trainees, students and future researchers
    - Propose a research project to be undertaken or continued during the award that is original, innovative, and of high quality
    - Be feasible and showcase the inclusion of highly qualified personnel (HQP)

Assessment Criteria and Merit Indicators for the Chancellor's Emerging Research Award

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 Criterion	Merit Indicators	Scoring Rubric (please use decimals if needed)
Research Productivity (10)	The Primary Investigator's Tri-Agency CV and support letters illustrate research productivity that is both creative and of high-quality research. Ways to Assess Productivity: • 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 • Evidence of appropriate and ethical community engagement (if applicable) • Evidence of sustained research collaborations/partnerships (if applicable) Ways to Assess 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 Ways to Assess High Quality/Excellence:	**Rating of 1-2:** *Productivity* • 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 • 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)

---

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

	• 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 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)	*Creativity* • Past research activities, methods, and outputs have not been novel • Past research activities, methods, and outputs have not taken any risks *High Quality/Excellence* • 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 **Rating of 3-4:** *Productivity* • 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) *Creativity* • Past research activities, methods, and outputs have been rarely novel • Past research activities, methods, and outputs have taken little risk *High Quality/Excellence* • 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 **Rating of 5-6:** *Productivity* • 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) *Creativity* Past research activities, methods, and outputs have been novel Past research activities, methods, and outputs have taken risks *High Quality/Excellence* Past research is somewhat sound 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 |

		Rating of 7-8: *Productivity* • 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) *Creativity* • Past research activities, methods, and outputs have been highly novel • Past research activities, methods, and outputs have taken many risks

		High Quality/Excellence
		• Past research is very sound
		• Past research has 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
		Rating of 9-10:
		Productivity
		• 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
		• 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) *Creativity* • Past research activities, methods, and outputs have been significantly novel • Past research activities, methods, and outputs have taken significant risks *High Quality/Excellence* • Past research is exceptionally sound • 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
Research Contribution and Recognition (10)	The Primary Investigator's Tri-Agency-CV and support letters showcase strong evidence of research contribution and potential to achieve and/or expand international recognition in their field within the next five years. Ways to Assess Contributions: • Quality of research processes • Quality of research outcomes	**Rating of 1-2:** *Contributions* • Little to no quality in past research processes • Little to no quality in past research outcomes • Little to no quality of impact/influence on the field/public discourse/societal

	• Quality of impacts/influences on field/public discourse/societal problems or questions Ways to Assess 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	problems or questions *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:** *Contributions* • Below average quality in past research processes • Below average quality in past research outcomes • Below average quality of impact/influence on the field/public discourse/societal problems or questions *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:** *Contributions*

- Average quality in past research processes
- Average quality in past research outcomes
- Average quality of impact/influence on the field/public discourse/societal problems or questions

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:
Contributions
- Above average quality in past research processes
- Above average quality in past research outcomes
- Above average quality of impact/influence on the field/public discourse/societal problems or questions

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:** *Contributions* • Significant quality in past research processes • Significant quality in past research outcomes • Significant impact on their field/public discourse/societal problems or questions *Recognition* • 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
Mentorship and Retention (5)	The research proposal demonstrates the potential to attract, develop and retain 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:** • Little 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

		Rating of 2:
		- Very few skills being offered - 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
		Rating of 3:
		- 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
		Rating of 4:
		- Many skills being offered - Very good quality of skills being offered - Has explained their inclusive, accessible, and equitable recruitment and training practices well - Much evidence of quality in the research environment being offered
		Rating of 5:
		- A significant number of skills being offered - Significant quality of skills being offered - Has thoroughly explained their inclusive, accessible, and equitable recruitment and training practices - Significant evidence of quality in the

		research environment being offered
Originality and Innovation (5)	The research proposal demonstrates that research contributions and activities to be carried out during the award are original, innovative, and of high 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 • Novel integration of different disciplines/fields Ways to Assess Innovation: • New research methods being proposed • New research questions being proposed • New knowledge being produced • New kinds of outputs being proposed • New ways of mobilizing knowledge being proposed • New way of addressing an existing research question	**Rating of 1:** • Research questions are not novel • Research theories are not novel AND/OR not being adapted in a novel way • Research methods are not novel AND/OR not being adapted in a novel way • There is no indication that new knowledge will be produced through this project • There is no indication that new outputs will be produced through this project • Knowledge mobilization methods are not novel • There is no indication of new integrations of different disciplines/fields **Rating of 2:** • 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 project • Minimally new outputs will be produced through this project • Knowledge mobilization methods are minimally novel • There is minimally new integration of different disciplines/fields in a new way **Rating of 3:** • 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 4:** • 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 project • Highly new outputs will be produced through this project • Knowledge mobilization methods are highly novel • There is a high amount of new integration of different disciplines/fields in a new way **Rating of 5:** • 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 project • Significantly new outputs will be produced through this project • Knowledge mobilization methods are exceptionally novel • There is significantly new integration of different disciplines/fields in a new way
Feasibility (5)	The research proposal is feasible. Ways to Assess Feasibility: • Reasonable timeline with milestones/outputs within the funding limits (i.e., $10,000) (if exceeding funding limits, plan for finding more funding) • Past experience running such a project • Past training experience • Appropriate number and level of trainees for the amount and nature of research work • Appropriate partners/collaborators (if applicable) • Access to appropriate equipment/resources at The University of Winnipeg	**Rating of 1:** • Timeline and milestones/outputs are not suitable within the funding limits, and there is no plan for finding additional funding • No evidence of past experience in running a project of this kind • No evidence of past training experience • No trainees proposed • No appropriate partners/collaborators (if applicable) • No access to necessary equipment/resources at The University of Winnipeg for their research **Rating of 2:** • Timeline and milestones/outputs may be difficult to achieve within the funding limits • Little evidence of past experience in running a project of this kind • Little evidence of past training experience • Too few/many trainees proposed for the

		nature of the work
		• Too few or inappropriate partners/collaborators (if applicable)
		• Insufficient access to necessary equipment/resources at The University of Winnipeg for their research
		Rating of 3:
		• Timeline and milestones/outputs are suitable within the funding limits
		• Evidence of past experience in running a project of this kind
		• Evidence of past training experience
		• Sufficient number of trainees proposed for the nature of the work
		• Appropriate number and type of partners/collaborators (if applicable)
		• Sufficient access to necessary equipment/resources at The University of Winnipeg for their research
		Rating of 4:
		• Timeline and milestones/outputs are highly likely to be achieved within the funding limits
		• Strong evidence of past experience in running a project of this kind
		• Strong evidence of past training experience
		• The number and level of trainees are well-suited to the amount and nature of the work
		• Highly appropriate number and type of partners/collaborators (if applicable)
		• High level of access to necessary equipment/resources at The University of

		Winnipeg for their research
		Rating of 5: • Timeline and milestones/outputs are certain to be achieved within the funding limits • Significant evidence of past experience in running a project of this kind • Significant evidence of past training experience • The number and level of trainees are highly suited to the amount and nature of the work • Exceptionally appropriate number and type of partners/collaborators (if applicable) • Exceptional access to necessary equipment/resources at The University of Winnipeg for their research