

**DISCOVERY GRANTS MERIT INDICATORS<sup>1</sup>**

	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>	<b>Very Strong</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Insufficient</b>
<b>Excellence of the Researcher</b>	Acknowledged as a <b>leader</b> who has continued to make, over the last six years, <b>influential accomplishments</b> at the highest level of quality, impact and/or importance to a <b>broad community</b> .	The accomplishments presented in the application were deemed to be <b>far superior</b> in quality, impact and/or importance to a <b>broad community</b> .	The accomplishments presented in the application were deemed to be of <b>superior</b> quality, impact and/or importance.	The accomplishments presented in the application were deemed to be <b>solid</b> in their quality, impact and/or importance.	The accomplishments presented in the application were deemed to be of <b>reasonable</b> quality, impact and/or importance.	The accomplishments presented in the application were deemed to be <b>below an acceptable level</b> of quality, impact and/or importance.
<b>Merit of the Proposal</b>	Proposed research program is clearly presented, is <b>extremely original and innovative</b> and is <b>likely to have impact by leading to groundbreaking advances</b> in the area and/or <b>leading to a technology or policy</b> that addresses socio-economic or environmental needs. <b>Long-term vision</b> and <b>short-term objectives</b> are <b>clearly defined</b> . The methodology is <b>clearly defined and appropriate</b> . The proposal and budget <b>clearly demonstrate</b> how the research activities to be supported are distinct from and complement those funded by other sources.	Proposed research program is clearly presented, is <b>highly original and innovative</b> and is <b>likely to have impact by contributing to groundbreaking advances</b> in the area, and/or <b>leading to a technology or policy</b> that addresses socio-economic or environmental needs. <b>Long-term goals</b> are <b>clearly defined</b> and <b>short-term objectives</b> are <b>well planned</b> . The methodology is <b>clearly described and appropriate</b> . The proposal and budget <b>clearly demonstrate</b> how the research activities to be supported are distinct from and complement those funded by other sources.	Proposed research program is clearly presented, is <b>original and innovative</b> and is <b>likely to have impact by leading to advancements</b> and/or addressing socio-economic or environmental needs. <b>Long-term goals</b> are <b>defined</b> and <b>short-term objectives</b> are <b>planned</b> . The methodology is <b>clearly described and appropriate</b> . The proposal and budget <b>demonstrate</b> how the research activities to be supported are distinct from and complement those funded by other sources.	Proposed research program is clearly presented, is <b>original and innovative</b> and is <b>likely to have impact</b> and/or address socio-economic or environmental needs. <b>Long-term goals</b> and <b>short-term objectives</b> are <b>clearly described</b> . The methodology is <b>described and appropriate</b> . The proposal and budget <b>demonstrate</b> how the research activities to be supported are distinct from and complement those funded by other sources.	Proposed research program is clearly presented, has <b>original and innovative aspects</b> and <b>may have impact</b> and/or address socio-economic or environmental needs. <b>Long-term and short-term objectives</b> are <b>described</b> . The methodology is <b>partially described and/or appropriate</b> . The proposal and budget somewhat <b>demonstrate</b> how the research activities to be supported are distinct from and complement those funded by other sources.	Proposed research program, as presented <b>lacks clarity</b> , and/or is of <b>limited originality and innovation</b> . <b>Objectives</b> are <b>not clearly described</b> and/or likely not attainable. Methodology is <b>not clearly described and/or appropriate</b> . The proposal and budget <b>do not clearly demonstrate</b> how the research activities to be supported are distinct from and complement those funded by other sources.
<b>Training of HQP</b>	Training record is <b>at the highest level</b> , with HQP contributing to <b>top quality research</b> . <b>Most</b> HQP move on to positions that require <b>highly desired skills</b> , obtained through training received. Research plans for trainees are <b>appropriate and clearly defined</b> . HQP success <b>highly likely</b> .	Training record is <b>far superior</b> to other applicants, with HQP contributing to <b>high-quality research</b> . <b>Most</b> HQP move on to positions that require <b>highly desired skills</b> , obtained through training received. Research plans for trainees are <b>appropriate and clearly defined</b> . HQP success <b>highly likely</b> .	Training record is <b>superior</b> to other applicants, with HQP contributing to <b>quality, original research</b> . <b>Many</b> HQP move on to appropriate positions that require <b>desired skills</b> , obtained through training received. Research plans for trainees are <b>appropriate and clearly described</b> . HQP success is <b>likely</b> .	Training record compares <b>favourably</b> with other applicants. HQP <b>generally</b> move on to positions that require <b>desired skills</b> , obtained through training received. Research plans for trainees are <b>appropriate and described</b> . HQP success is <b>likely</b> .	Training record is acceptable but may be modest relative to other applicants. <b>Some</b> HQP move on to programs or positions that require <b>desired skills</b> , obtained through training received. Plans for trainees are <b>described</b> and <b>should contribute to HQP success</b> .	Training record is <b>below an acceptable level</b> relative to other applicants. HQP do not, in general, move on to positions that require skills obtained through training received. Plans for trainees are <b>not appropriate</b> or are <b>not described</b> with enough <b>information to predict likelihood of HQP success</b> .

<sup>1</sup>The Discovery Grants Merit Indicators should be used in conjunction with the Peer Review Manual (Chapter 6) which outlines how reviewers arrive at a rating.

Cost of research	<b>High</b>	<b>Normal</b>	<b>Low</b>
	Majority of justified expenses represent costs <b>higher than the norm</b> for the research area.	Majority of justified expenses are within the <b>norm</b> for the research area.	Majority of justified expenses are <b>lower than the norm</b> for the research area.

<sup>2</sup> Possible examples include: Cost of training of HQP; Equipment intensive research and/or high users fees; particularly expensive or frequent consumables; Travel (for collaborations, field work, access to facilities, conferences, ...)