

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
<p>Quality of the Nominee (30)</p> <p>Sub-Criterion: Research Excellence (10)</p>	<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-citation or “salami slicing” or duplicate/redundant publications.

	<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: <i>Research Excellence</i></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 	
--	---	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Below average quality of impact/influence on the field/public discourse/societal problems or questions• 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• Little evidence of quality in training/mentorship activities• Little openness and transparency in their research (e.g., open data, open access publications, etc.)• Little evidence of appropriate and ethical community engagement (if applicable)• Little evidence of sustained research collaborations/partnerships (if applicable) <p>Rating of 5-6:</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p><i>Research Excellence</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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• Average quality of impact/influence on the field/public discourse/societal problems or questions• 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• Some evidence of quality in training/mentorship activities• Has an average amount of openness and transparency in their research	
--	--	---	--

		<p>(e.g., open data, open access publications, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Has sufficient evidence of appropriate and ethical community engagement (if applicable)• Has sufficient evidence of sustained research collaborations/partnerships (if applicable) <p>Rating of 7-8: <i>Research Excellence</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Past research is very sound• 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• 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	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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• Strong evidence of quality in training/mentorship activities• 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) <p>Rating of 9-10: <i>Research Excellence</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	
--	--	--	--

<p>Sub-Criterion: Research Creativity (10)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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• Significant evidence of quality in training/mentorship activities• 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)	
---	--	---	--

	<p>Ways to Assess Research Creativity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>Rating of 1-2: <i>Research Creativity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence that past research activities have been novel in the field and/or context • No evidence that past research methods have been novel in the field and/or context • No evidence that past research outputs have been novel in the field and/or context • No evidence that past research activities have been risk-taking • No evidence that past research methods have been risk-taking • No evidence that past research outputs have been risk-taking <p>Rating of 3-4: <i>Research Creativity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little evidence that past research activities have been novel in the field and/or context • Little evidence that past research methods have been novel in the field and/or context • Little evidence that past research outputs have been novel in the field and/or context • Little evidence that past research activities have been risk-taking • Little evidence that past research methods have been risk-taking • Little evidence that past research outputs have been risk-taking 	<p>Research Creativity</p>
--	---	---	-----------------------------------

		<p>Rating of 5-6: <i>Research Creativity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some evidence that past research activities have been novel in the field and/or context• Some evidence that past research methods have been novel in the field and/or context• Some evidence that past research outputs have been novel in the field and/or context• Some evidence that past research activities have been risk-taking• Some evidence that past research methods have been risk-taking• Some evidence that past research outputs have been risk-taking <p>Rating of 7-8: <i>Research Creativity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strong evidence that past research activities have been novel in the field and/or context• Strong evidence that past research methods have been novel in the field and/or context• Strong evidence that past research outputs have been novel in the field and/or context• Strong evidence that past research activities have been risk-taking• Strong evidence that past research methods have been risk-taking• Strong evidence that past research outputs have been risk-taking	
--	--	---	--

<p>Sub-Criterion: Potential for International Recognition (10)</p>	<p>The applicant’s narrative and academic CV has demonstrated the potential for the applicant to achieve international recognition in their fields in the next five to ten years.</p> <p>Ways to Assess Potential for International Recognition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awards and prizes • Nominations for awards and prizes • Leadership roles and/or professional involvement in 	<p>Rating of 9-10: <i>Research Creativity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant evidence that past research activities have been novel in the field and/or context • Significant evidence that past research methods have been novel in the field and/or context • Significant evidence that past research outputs have been novel in the field and/or context • Significant evidence that past research activities have been risk-taking • Significant evidence that past research methods have been risk-taking • Significant evidence that past research outputs have been risk-taking <p>Rating of 1-2: <i>Potential for International Recognition</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>Potential for International Recognition</p>
---	---	---	---

	<p>the field (e.g., in scholarly associations, conference organizing, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community-based recognition • Number of international research collaborations/affiliations in relation to current career point 	<p>Rating of 3-4: <i>Potential for International Recognition</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>Rating 5–6: <i>Potential for International Recognition</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>Rating 7-8: <i>Potential for International Recognition</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above average number of awards and prizes • Many nominations for awards and prizes • Candidate has above average number of leadership roles AND/OR above 	
--	---	---	--

		<p>average professional involvement in their field</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above average community-based recognition • Above average number of international research collaborations/affiliations in relation to their current career point <p>Rating of 9-10: <i>Potential for International Recognition</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	
<p>Quality of the Proposed Research Program (40)</p> <p>Sub-Criterion: Originality (10)</p>	<p>The proposed research program will be original, innovative, and of the highest quality.</p> <p>Ways to Assess Originality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Novelty of research questions • Novel use/adaptation of existing theories • Novel use/adaptation of existing methods • Novelty of research methods 	<p>Rating of 1–2: <i>Originality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research questions are not novel • Research theories are not novel 	<p>Originality</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Novel integration of different disciplines/fields 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>Rating of 3-4: <i>Originality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	
--	---	---	--

		<p>Rating of 5-6: <i>Originality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 <p>Rating of 7-8: <i>Originality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	
--	--	--	--

<p>Sub-Criterion: Innovation (10)</p>	<p>Ways to Assess Innovation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>Rating 9-10: Originality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>Rating of 1-2: Innovation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • No evidence that new outputs will be produced • No evidence that new ways of mobilizing knowledge will be used 	<p>Innovation</p>
--	--	--	--------------------------

		<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	
--	--	---	--

<p>Sub-Criterion: Quality (10)</p>	<p>Ways to Assess Quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soundness of research • Relevance of research for intended audiences/users 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>Rating of 9-10: <i>Innovation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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 <p>Rating of 1-2: <i>Quality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence that the proposed research will be sound 	<p>Quality</p>
---	---	--	-----------------------

	<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 	
--	---	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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) <p>Rating of 5-6: <i>Quality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	
--	--	--	--

		<p>achieve proposed research program (if applicable)</p> <p>Rating of 7-8: <i>Quality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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) <p>Rating of 9-10: <i>Quality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Significant evidence that the proposed research will be sound• Significant evidence that the proposed research will be relevant for intended audiences/users	
--	--	--	--

<p>Sub-Criterion: Training Potential (10)</p>	<p>The applicant's proposed research program demonstrates potential to attract, develop, and retain excellent trainees, students, and future researchers.</p> <p>Ways to Assess Potential to Attract, Retain, and Develop Trainees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantity and quality of skills to be offered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) <p>Rating of 1-2: Training Potential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few to no skills being offered 	<p>Training Potential</p>
--	---	--	----------------------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>Rating of 3-4: <i>Training Potential</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • Little evidence that the candidate has the capacity and expertise to provide proposed skills <p>Rating of 5-6: <i>Training Potential</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some skills being offered • Some quality in the skills being offered • Has sufficiently explained their inclusive, accessible, and equitable recruitment and training practices 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some evidence of quality in the research environment being offered• Some evidence that the candidate has the capacity and expertise to provide proposed skills <p>Rating of 7-8: <i>Training Potential</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 <p>Rating 9-10: <i>Training Potential</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	
--	--	---	--