

## Appendix 5 – Discovery Grants Rating Form

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Applicant status:</b>		
<b>University:</b>			
<b>Title of proposal:</b>			
<b>Selection criteria</b> (See <a href="#">DG Peer Review Manual</a> for complete details)			
<b>Excellence of the researcher</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Exceptional</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Outstanding</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Very Strong</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strong</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Moderate</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Insufficient</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge, expertise, and experience of the researcher in the NSE</li> <li>Quality and impact of contributions to the proposed research and/or other areas of research in the NSE</li> <li>Importance of contributions to, and use by, other research and end-users</li> </ul>	<b>Rationale for rating:</b>  		
	<b>Message from the Evaluation Group</b> (please highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the application):  		
<b>Merit of the proposal</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Exceptional</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Outstanding</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Very Strong</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strong</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Moderate</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Insufficient</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Originality and innovation</li> <li>Significance and expected contributions to NSE research; potential for policy- and/or technology-related impact</li> <li>Clarity and scope of objectives</li> <li>Clarity and appropriateness of methodology</li> <li>Feasibility</li> <li>Extent to which the scope of the proposal addresses all relevant issues</li> <li>Equity, diversity and inclusion considerations in the research process (e.g. the research questions, design of the study, methodology, analysis, interpretation, and dissemination of results), are integrated where relevant.</li> <li>Consideration of interdisciplinary methods or practices in research</li> <li>Appropriateness of, and justification for, the budget</li> <li>Demonstration that the DG proposal is entirely distinct (conceptually and financially) from research supported (or submitted for support) through CIHR and/or SSHRC</li> </ul>	<b>Rationale for rating:</b>  		
	<b>Message from the Evaluation Group</b> (please highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the application):  		

Contributions to the training of highly qualified personnel	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional	<input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Strong
	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderate	<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality and impact of past training               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training environment</li> <li>• HQP awards and research contributions</li> <li>• Outcomes and skills gained by HQP</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Quality, suitability, and clarity of the planned training               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training philosophy                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mentorship approach and enhancement of the research and training environment</li> <li>• Challenges or barriers to inclusion and advancement of under-represented groups</li> <li>• Planned approach to promote participation of a diverse group of HQP</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Research training plan for individual HQP</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>Rationale for rating:</b>		
	<b>Message from the Evaluation Group</b> (please highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the application):		
<b>Other comments</b> (e.g., eligible delays that were considered, quality of samples of contributions provided, etc.):			
<b>Comments from external reviewer</b> (please highlight any comments that would be deemed inappropriate for the members to have considered in their discussions, undisclosed COI, reports to be disregarded, etc.):			
<b>Notes from Deliberations (during competition):</b>			
<p>This form is provided by NSERC as an aid to members for reviewing applications. Once completed, the form contains personal information, and like all other review material, must be stored in a secure manner to prevent unauthorized access (refer to Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Agreement for Review Committee Members, External Reviewers, and Observers).</p> <p>The rating sheet focuses on the selection criteria and integrates, where appropriate, external reviewer comments and any other relevant information, e.g., delays in research. Using the rating sheet will help to ensure that you take all selection criteria into account when formulating your preliminary ratings (refer to the Peer Review Manual for details). Note that NSERC does not collect these forms, and they should be destroyed in a secure manner after the peer review meetings.</p>			

(2024 version)