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- Make their job easier through:
  - Clarity
  - Context
  - Formatting
  - Writing to the metrics
### Appendix 4 – Discovery Grants Rating Form

**Applicant:**

**Department/University:**

**Applicant status:**

---

**Title of proposal:**

**Selection criteria (See Instructions for complete details)**

#### Excellence of the researcher

- Knowledge, expertise, and experience of the researcher in the NSE
- Quality and impact of contributions to the proposed research and/or other areas of research in the NSE
- Importance of contributions to and use by other research and end-users

**Rationale for rating:**

- Exceptional
- Outstanding
- Very Strong
- Strong
- Moderate
- Insufficient

#### Merit of the proposal

- Originality and innovation
- Significance and expected contributions to NSE research, potential for policy and/or technology-related impact
- Clarity and scope of objectives
- Clarity and appropriateness of methodology
- Feasibility
- Consideration of sex, gender and diversity in the research design, if applicable
- Extent to which the scope of the proposal addresses all relevant issues
- Appropriateness of and justification for the budget
- Demonstration that the Discovery Grant proposal is distinct conceptually from research supported (or submitted for support) through CIHR and/or SSHRC
- Clear explanation why Discovery Grant funding is essential to carry out the research proposed in the DG application (for applicants who hold or have applied for a CIHR Foundation Grant)

**Rationale for rating:**

- Exceptional
- Outstanding
- Very Strong
- Strong
- Moderate
- Insufficient

---

**Rationale for rating:**

- Past contributions to the training of HQP
- Training environment
- HQP awards and research contributions
- Outcomes and skills gained by HQP
- Training plan
- Training philosophy
- HQP research training plan

**Relative cost of research (cost of the proposed research program relative to the normal costs in the discipline)**

- Normal
- High

**Rationale for Cost of Research:**

**Other comments (e.g., duration should be less than norm, special circumstances, quality of samples of contributions provided, environmental impact, ethical concerns):**

**Comments from external referees (please also highlight any comments that would be deemed inappropriate for the members to have considered in their discussions):**

**Message to the applicant:**

**Discovery Accelerator Supplement (DAS)**

- Yes
- No

**Rationale for DAS recommendation:**
2. Don’t neglect these sections

- HQP Training
  - Outcomes as important as counts
  - Consider all HQP (UGs though PDs)
  - Record is half/plan is half
    - What makes your training context unique?
2. Don’t neglect these sections

- CCV (ugh)
  - Make sure it is complete
  - It’s disorganized and terrible
  - Use “additional information on contributions” section to:
    - Describe your context
    - Summarize
    - Highlight (e.g., first-authored HQP publications)
  - Be careful with overselling/underselling
3. Write to the merit indicators