

2025

**Emerging Research Award
Review Considerations**

Mandate

The Chancellor's Emerging Research Award is intended to sustain and support high levels of scholarly output and t

Soundness of research
Relevance of research for intended audiences/users
Utility of research for intended audiences/users
Accessibility of research for intended audiences/users
Evidence of engagement with research by intended audiences/users
Quality of training/mentorship
Quality of peer-reviewed publications
Quantity/amounts of grants received
Quantity of keynotes given
Quality of non-traditional outputs/knowledge mobilization
Evidence of appropriate and ethical community engagement (if applicable)
Evidence of sustained research collaborations/partnerships (if applicable)

Creativity

Past research activities, methods, and outputs have not been novel
Past research activities, methods, and outputs have not taken any risks

High Quality/Excellence

Past research is not apparently sound
Past research has little to no relevance for intended audiences/users
Past research has little to no utility for intended audiences/users
Past research has little to no accessibility for intended audiences/users
No evidence of engagement with research by intended audiences/users

Rating of 3-4:

Productivity

Has published a below average number of peer-reviewed publications for their discipline
Quality of publications is below average
Has received a below average number/total funding amount in grants
Has given a below average number of conference presentations/keynotes

		<p>Has little openness and transparency in their research (e.g., open data, open access publications, etc.)</p> <p>Has little evidence of appropriate and ethical community engagement (if applicable)</p> <p>Has little evidence of sustained research collaborations/partnerships (if applicable)</p> <p><i>Creativity</i></p> <p>Past research activities, methods, and outputs have been rarely novel</p> <p>Past research activities, methods, and outputs have taken little risk</p> <p><i>High Quality/Excellence</i></p> <p>Past research is not very sound</p> <p>Past research has some relevance for intended audiences/users</p> <p>Past research has some utility for intended audiences/users</p> <p>Past research is somewhat accessible for intended audiences/users</p> <p>Little evidence of engagement with research by intended audiences/users</p> <p>Rating of 5-6:</p> <p><i>Productivity</i></p> <p>Has published an average number of peer-reviewed publications for their discipline</p> <p>Quality of publications is average</p> <p>Has received an average number/total funding amount in grants</p> <p>Has given an average number of</p>
--	--	---

Rating of 7-8:

Productivity

Has published an above average number of peer-reviewed publications for their discipline

Quality of publications is above average

Has received an above average number/total funding amount in grants

Has given an above average number of conference presentations/keynotes

Has produced many non-traditional outputs/knowledge mobilization activities

Quality of non-traditional outputs/knowledge mobilization activities is above average

Has trained an above average number of trainees for their rank and type of research

Has an above average amount of openness and transparency in their research (e.g., open data, open access publications, etc.)

Has very good evidence of appropriate and ethical community engagement (if applicable)

Has very good evidence of sustained research collaborations/partnerships (if applicable)

Creativity

	<p>Quality of impacts/influences on field/public discourse/societal problems or questions</p> <p>Ways to Assess Recognition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awards and prizes Nominations for awards and prizes Leadership roles and/or professional involvement in the field (e.g., in scholarly associations, conference organizing, etc.) Community-based recognition Number of international research collaborations/affiliations in relation to current career point 	<p>problems or questions</p> <p>Recognition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No awards or prizes No nominations for awards or prizes Candidate has little to no professional involvement in the field No community-based recognition No international research collaborations/affiliations in relation to their current career point <p>Rating of 3-4:</p> <p>Contributions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Below average quality in past research processes Below average quality in past research outcomes Below average quality of impact/influence on the field/public discourse/societal problems or questions <p>Recognition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Below average number of awards and prizes Few nominations for awards or prizes Candidate has a below average level of professional involvement in the field Little community-based recognition Few international research collaborations/affiliations in relation to their current career point <p>Rating of 5-6:</p> <p>Contributions</p>
--	--	--

Average quality in past research processes

Average quality in past research outcomes

Average quality of impact/influence on the field/public discourse/societal problems or questions

Recognition

Average number of awards and prizes

Several nominations for awards and prizes

Candidate has an average level of professional involvement in the field

Some community-based recognition

Some international research

collaborations/affiliations in relation to their current career point

Rating of 7-8:

Contributions

Above average quality in past research processes

Above average quality in past research outcomes

Above average quality of impact/influence on the field/public discourse/societal problems or questions

Recognition

Above average number of awards and prizes

		<p>Above average community-based recognition</p> <p>Above average number of international research collaborations/affiliations in relation to their current career point</p> <p>Rating of 9-10:</p> <p>Contributions</p> <p>Significant quality in past research processes</p> <p>Significant quality in past research outcomes</p> <p>Significant impact on their field/public discourse/societal problems or questions</p> <p>Recognition</p> <p>Exceptional number of awards and prizes</p> <p>Exceptional number of nominations for awards and prizes</p> <p>Candidate holds multiple leadership roles and/or has significant professional involvement in the field</p> <p>Significant community-based recognition</p> <p>Significant number of international research collaborations/affiliations in relation to their current career point</p>
Mentorship and Retention (5)	<p>The research proposal demonstrates the potential to attract, develop and retain trainees, students and future researchers.</p> <p>Ways to Assess Potential to Attract, Retain, and Develop Trainees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantity and quality of skills to be offered Inclusive, accessible, and equitable recruitment and training practices to be employed Quality of research environment to be offered 	<p>Rating of 1:</p> <p>Little to no skills being offered</p> <p>Little to no quality in the skills being offered</p> <p>Does not have any inclusive, accessible, and equitable recruitment and training practices</p> <p>No evidence of quality in the research environment being offered</p>

Rating of 2:

		research environment being offered
<p>Originality and Innovation (5)</p>	<p>The research proposal demonstrates that research contributions and activities to be carried out during the award are original, innovative, and of high quality.</p> <p>Ways to Assess Originality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Novelty of research questions Novel use/adaptation of existing theories Novel use/adaptation of existing methods Novelty of research methods Novel integration of different disciplines/fields <p>Ways to Assess Innovation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New research methods being proposed New research questions being proposed New knowledge being produced New kinds of outputs being proposed New ways of mobilizing knowledge being proposed New way of addressing an existing research question 	<p>Rating of 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research questions are not novel Research theories are not novel AND/OR not being adapted in a novel way Research methods are not novel AND/OR not being adapted in a novel way There is no indication that new knowledge will be produced through this project There is no indication that new outputs will be produced through this project Knowledge mobilization methods are not novel There is no indication of new integrations of different disciplines/fields <p>Rating of 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research questions are minimally novel Research theories are minimally novel AND/OR novel in their adaptation Research methods are minimally novel AND/OR novel in their adaptation Minimally new knowledge will be produced through this project Minimally new outputs will be produced through this project Knowledge mobilization methods are minimally novel There is minimally new integration of different disciplines/fields in a new way <p>Rating of 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research questions are novel

Research theories are novel AND/OR novel in their adaptation
Research methods are novel AND/OR novel in their adaptation
New knowledge will be produced through this project
New outputs will be produced through this project
Knowledge mobilization methods are novel
There is new integration of different disciplines/fields in a new way

Rating of 4:

Research questions are highly novel
Research theories are highly novel AND/OR highly novel in their adaptation

		<p>adaptation Research methods are exceptionally novel AND/OR highly novel in their adaptation Significantly new knowledge will be produced through this project Significantly new outputs will be produced through this project Knowledge mobilization methods are exceptionally novel There is significantly new integration of different disciplines/fields in a new way</p>
<p>Feasibility (5)</p>	<p>The research proposal is feasible.</p> <p>Ways to Assess Feasibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonable timeline with milestones/outputs within the funding limits (i.e., \$10,000) (if exceeding funding limits, plan for finding more funding) Past experience running such a project Past training experience Appropriate number and level of trainees for the amount and nature of research work Appropriate partners/collaborators (if applicable) Access to appropriate equipment/resources at The University of Winnipeg 	<p>Rating of 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timeline and milestones/outputs are not suitable within the funding limits, and there is no plan for finding additional funding No evidence of past experience in running a project of this kind No evidence of past training experience No trainees proposed No appropriate partners/collaborators (if applicable) No access to necessary equipment/resources at The University of Winnipeg for their research <p>Rating of 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timeline and milestones/outputs may be difficult to achieve within the funding limits Little evidence of past experience in running a project of this kind Little evidence of past training experience Too few/many trainees proposed for the

		<p>nature of the work Too few or inappropriate partners/collaborators (if applicable) Insufficient access to necessary equipment/resources at The University of Winnipeg for their research</p> <p>Rating of 3: Timeline and milestones/outputs are suitable within the funding limits Evidence of past experience in running a project of this kind Evidence of past training experience Sufficient number of trainees proposed for the nature of the work Appropriate number and type of partners/collaborators (if applicable) Sufficient access to necessary equipment/resources at The University of Winnipeg for their research</p> <p>Rating of 4: Timeline and milestones/outputs are highly likely to be achieved within the funding limits Strong evidence of past experience in running a project of this kind Strong evidence of past training experience The number and level of trainees are well-suited to the amount and nature of the work Highly appropriate number and type of partners/collaborators (if applicable) High level of access to necessary equipment/resources at The University of</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Winnipeg for their research</p> <p>Rating of 5:</p> <p>Timeline and milestones/outputs are certain to be achieved within the funding limits</p> <p>Significant evidence of past experience in running a project of this kind</p> <p>Significant evidence of past training experience</p> <p>The number and level of trainees are highly suited to the amount and nature of the work</p> <p>Exceptionally appropriate number and type of partners/collaborators (if applicable)</p> <p>Exceptional access to necessary equipment/resources at The University of Winnipeg for their research</p>
--	--	--

