

Rating Form - Discovery Grants Application

Applicant		Department/University		
Applicant Status:				
Title of proposal				
Evaluation criteria (See Instructions for complete details)				
Excellence of researcher		<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"> Knowledge, expertise and experience Past or potential contributions to, and impact on, the proposed and other areas of research Importance of contributions (For group applications) Complementarity of expertise between members and synergy 		Rationale for rating:		
Merit of the proposal		<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"> Originality and innovation Anticipated significance Clarity and scope of objectives Methodology and feasibility Discussion of relevant issues Relationship to other sources of funds 		Rationale for rating:		
Contributions to 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"> Quality and extent of past contributions Appropriateness of the proposal for the training of HQP Training in collaborative and interdisciplinary environment (if applicable) 		Rationale for rating:		
Cost of research (relative cost of the proposed research program as compared to the norms for the field)		Low <input type="checkbox"/>	Normal <input type="checkbox"/>	High <input type="checkbox"/>
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. Your Program Officer should be notified accordingly):

Comments from external referees & formal consultations (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)

- Regular DAS: Yes____ No____
- DAS in Targeted Areas : Yes____ No____

Rationale for DAS Recommendation:

This form is provided by NSERC as an aid to members for reviewing applications. The form contains personal information, and like all other review material, should be stored in a secure manner to prevent unauthorized access (please refer to Section 5 of the Peer Review Manual and to the text of your Confidentiality and Non-disclosure Declaration for more details on the Privacy Act.)

The rating sheet focuses on the evaluation 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 recommendation (see Section 6 of 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 competition. (2009 version)