



## REVIEWER REPORT FORM

### Nomination Information

University: \_\_\_\_\_ File #: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Nominee: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

### Instructions to Reviewers - Confidentiality, Use and Disclosure of Information

The documentation given to you by the Canada Research Chairs Secretariat contains personal and confidential information. To prevent unauthorized access, it must be stored and handled in a secure manner at all times. When you no longer require the material, please destroy it in a secure manner (e.g., by deleting electronic files, shredding or burning paper or returning it to the Chairs Secretariat).

Material entrusted to you must be used only for the purposes of review and assessment, and may not be used for other purposes. Applications and reviews must be treated as strictly confidential and must not be discussed or disclosed to anyone without prior approval from the Secretariat. You must not contact a nominating institution or any Nominee for more information about the proposal. If you need any additional information, please contact the Chairs Secretariat.

#### IMPORTANT NOTICE

To safeguard your anonymity, please ensure that you **do not identify yourself** through your comments or indicate your name within the text of your review. Once the peer review of the nomination is complete, the text of your appraisal will be sent to the institution and the nominee exactly as submitted by you (i.e. without any changes or edits).

### Conflict of Interest

Reviewers are in a conflict of interest if they:

- are affiliated with the nominating institution (including hospitals and research institutes);
- have a personal relationship with the nominee (includes close friend, relative, former PhD or postdoctoral supervisor, mentor, a student previously under the nominee's supervision);
- have collaborated (i.e. have published, have been a co-researcher) with the nominee in the last five years;
- are involved in the proposed program of research;
- are in a position to gain or lose financially/materially from the outcome of the nomination.

If you are uncertain as to whether a conflict of interest exists, you must contact the Chairs Secretariat.

### Reviewer's Declaration

I have read Instructions to Reviewer - Confidentiality, Use and Disclosure of Information and agree to comply with its terms.

I confirm that, I do not have a conflict of interest with the Nominee, within the terms and rules of the Canada Research Chairs Program described above.

Name (please print): \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: [Electronic Submission]

Affiliation: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_



## REVIEWER REPORT FORM

### Nomination Information

University: \_\_\_\_\_

File # : \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Nominee \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer : \_\_\_\_\_

### Chair Nomination

#### Quality of the Nominee and the Proposed Research Program

##### Assessment

Overall, compared to researchers at the same stage of their career both in Canada and internationally, the nominee's research accomplishments and training record are: (Check the most appropriate box.)

- A. Outstanding (top 10th percentile);
- B. Excellent (between top 10th and 20th percentiles);
- C. Very good (between top 20th and 30th percentiles);
- D. Below the top 30th percentile.

Rate the Proposed Research Program: (Check the most appropriate box.)

- A. Outstanding (top 10th percentile);
- B. Excellent (between top 10th and 20th percentiles);
- C. Very good (between top 20th and 30th percentiles);
- D. Below the top 30th percentile.

##### Global Assessment

Please check the most appropriate box to indicate funding support:

- Support
- Support with reservations
- Do not support

##### Comments:

Please provide comments on the following:

##### Quality of the Nominee

- breadth, depth, and impact of the nominee's contributions (potential impact in the case of Tier 2 nominees);
- international stature of the nominee (Tier 1) or his/her potential to become an international leader in a broad area or discipline (Tier 2); and
- nominee's track record in training, supervision, and the development of future researchers taking into account the practices of the field (potential to attract in the case of Tier 2 nominees).

##### Quality of the Proposed Research Program

- innovative aspects and originality of the proposed research program;
- potential impact of the proposed research program; and
- likelihood of attracting excellent trainees and students and participating in the development of future researchers.



## REVIEWER REPORT FORM

### Nomination Information

University: \_\_\_\_\_

File # :

Name of Nominee \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer :

### Chair Nomination

#### Quality of the Nominee and the Proposed Research Program

#### Comments



## REVIEWER REPORT FORM

### Nomination Information

University: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Nominee \_\_\_\_\_

File # : \_\_\_\_\_  
Reviewer : \_\_\_\_\_

### Chair Nomination

#### Quality of the Institutional Environment, the Institutional Commitment and Fit of the Proposed Chair with the University's Strategic Research Plan

##### Assessment

Please assess the institutional environment, the institutional commitment, and the fit of the proposed Chair with the university's Strategic Research Plan, then provide a global assessment of support based on these factors.

**Institutional Environment** (check the most appropriate box):

- Excellent  
 Adequate  
 Inadequate

**Institutional Commitment** (check the most appropriate box):

- Excellent  
 Adequate  
 Inadequate

**Fit with the Strategic Research Plan** (check the most appropriate box):

- Excellent  
 Adequate  
 Inadequate

##### Global Assessment

Please check the most appropriate box to indicate funding support:

- Support  
 Support with Reservations  
 Do not support

##### Comments

Please provide comments on the following:

- Institutional environment;
- Institutional commitment; and
- Fit of the proposed Chair with the university's Strategic Research Plan.



## REVIEWER REPORT FORM

### Nomination Information

University: \_\_\_\_\_

File # : \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Nominee \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer : \_\_\_\_\_

### Chair Nomination

#### Quality of the Institutional Environment, the Institutional Commitment and Fit of the Proposed Chair with the University's Strategic Research Plan

Comments