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Discovery Grants Overview
Life Cycle of a Discovery Grant Application

- **August**: Submission of NOI (due Aug. 3)
- **September**: Internal assignment to EG and selection of external reviewers
- **October**: Preliminary joint review discussions
- **November**: Submission of grant application with CCV (due Nov. 1)
- **December**: Members receive applications and begin reviewing
- **January**: Members review applications and external reviewer reports are received
- **February**: Grants competition
- **March/April**: Announcement of results
The Conference Model

- Evaluation structure consists of 12 Evaluation Groups
- Similar to a scientific conference, several sessions occur in parallel streams
- Members are assigned to various applications on the basis of the match between their expertise and application subject matter.
  - Members may participate in reviews in several Evaluation Groups.
- Flexibility allows applications at the interface between committees to be reviewed by a combination of members with pertinent expertise from relevant groups.
Discovery Grants Evaluation Criteria

- Each application is assessed by 5 reviewers in the conference model setting, ensuring the best possible review.

- Merit assessment uses six-point scale to evaluate:
  - Excellence of Researcher
  - Merit of Proposal
  - Training of Highly Qualified Personnel (HQP)
  - Cost of research (High, Normal, Low where applicable)
# Discovery Grants Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCOVERY GRANTS MERIT INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exceptional</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exellence of the Recipient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit of the Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of HQP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The Discovery Grants Merit Indicators should be used in conjunction with the Peer Review Manual (Chapter 8) which outlines how reviewers arrive at a rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost of research</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority of justified expenses represent costs higher than the norm for the research area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Possible examples include: Cost of training of HQP; Equipment intensive research and/or high user fees; particularly expensive or frequent consumables; Travel (for collaborations, field work, access to facilities, conferences,...)
Two-Step Review Process

**Step 1 - Merit assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very Strong</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellence of the researcher</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit of the proposal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the training of HQP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 2 – Funding Recommendation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Bin</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>...$</td>
<td>...$</td>
<td>...$</td>
<td>...$</td>
<td>...$</td>
<td>...$</td>
<td>...$</td>
<td>...$</td>
<td>...$</td>
<td>...$</td>
<td>...$</td>
<td>...$</td>
<td>...$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outstanding – Very Strong – Very Strong
Evaluation of Discovery Grants
Excellence of Researcher

- Assessment based on achievements demonstrated over past six years.
  - “Most significant contributions” section of resume may include earlier work if they still have a significant impact (e.g., exploitation of patents).
- Knowledge, expertise and experience.
- Contributions to, and impact on, proposed and other areas of research.
  - Focus on Natural Sciences and Engineering
- Assessment based on the quality and impact of contributions.
- Describe up to five most significant research contributions (now in application) and highlight quality & impact
- Explain your role in collaborative research activities
- Explain delays in research activity (See Peer Review Manual)
Where to find the information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Application Grant Proposal</th>
<th>CCV Researcher Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellence of the Researcher (EoR)</strong></td>
<td>Sections</td>
<td>Sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Most Significant Contributions</td>
<td>- Contributions (publications, books, patents, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Additional Information on Contributions (choices of venues, order of authors)</td>
<td>- Recognitions (honours, prizes and awards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Samples of Research Contributions (max of 4)</td>
<td>- Activities (international collaborations, event administration, editorial activities, organizational review, knowledge and technology transfers, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Membership (service on committees)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Merit of the Proposal

- Originality and innovation
  - show you have the expertise to carry out the program

- Significance and expected contributions to research; potential for impact
  - Must describe a program of research that will advance knowledge in the Natural Sciences and Engineering
  - Position the research within the field and state-of-the-art

- Clarity and scope of objectives (short- and long-term)
- Clarity and appropriateness of methodology
- Feasibility of program
- Extent to which the scope of the proposal addresses all relevant issues
- Appropriateness of budget
  - Relationship to other sources of funds must be clearly explained
Merit of the Proposal

- Write summary in plain language
- Keep in mind that two audiences read the application: expert and non-expert
- Can provide a progress report on related research
- Position the research within the field and state-of-the-art
- Clearly articulate short- and long-term objectives
- Provide a detailed methodology and realistic budget
- Consider comments/recommendations may have received for previous applications
## Where to find the information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Application Grant Proposal</th>
<th>CCV Researcher Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merit of the Proposal (MoP)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sections</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Proposal</td>
<td>- Research Funding History (to assess possible conceptual or budgetary overlap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Proposed Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Relationship to Other Research Support Explanation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- List of References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Budget Justification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Standalone attachment</strong> (when applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Other Support Sources (mainly for CIHR &amp; SSHRC grants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contributions to the Training of HQP

- The assessment of contributions to training of HQP is based on both the record of training (in the past) and the plans for training (in the future).

- Contributions to quality research training for all levels and types of HQP are valued
  - Ex. undergraduate students involved in research and graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, technicians, research associates, interns, junior staff, etc.…
  - Must be involved in the applicant’s research
Contributions to the Training of HQP

Past contributions to training

- Quality and impact of past contributions to training during the last six years (2010-2016)
  - HQP collaboration in the applicant’s research contributions
    • Use an asterisk (*) to identify HQP in listed contributions
  - HQP pursuing further NSE-related studies/careers
  - Enhancement of the training environment
    • Science outreach activities, interdisciplinary research, and/or interaction with the private and public sectors

- Past HQP training in non-NSE domains (e.g., health, social sciences) may be considered as part of the demonstrated commitment of the applicant to training and the quality of the training environment
Contributions to the Training of HQP

Past contributions to training

- The level, content, and involvement of supervision or co-supervision in the training must be described
  - Clearly define role and contributions as co-supervisor
  - Explain any delays that might have affected ability to train HQP (ex. delays taken by HQP)
  - Do not select “Academic Advisor” in CCV

- ECRs will not be rated as *Insufficient* solely due to the lack of training record; the review will focus on the plan for future training.
Contributions to the Training of HQP

Training Plan

- Appropriateness and quality of proposed training in the Natural Sciences and Engineering.

- Suitability and clarity of the HQP training plan
  - capacity of the researcher to supervise the proposed number and type of HQP
  - Appropriate level and mix of HQP for the proposed program (i.e. are projects suitable for UG, PDF, etc..)
  - intellectual involvement of HQP in the research program
  - anticipated outcomes (future contribution to knowledge and the training value)
Contributions to the Training of HQP

Training Plan

- Enhancement of training environment
  - quality and extent of interactions with collaborators (what is the impact on HQP?)
  - involvement in interdisciplinary research
  - opportunities for interaction with the private and public sectors
  - promoting participation of HQP in science outreach activities, professional development workshops
  - development of new skills or knowledge for technicians and others who are in long-term positions

- Discuss the training philosophy
  - Tip: be specific and detailed
Where to find the information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Application Grant Proposal</th>
<th>CCV Researcher Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to the Training of Highly Qualified Personnel (HQP)</td>
<td><strong>Sections</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sections</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- HQP Training Plan (students’ role, knowledge and skills acquired)</td>
<td>- Supervisory Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Past Contributions to HQP Training</td>
<td>- Contributions (co-authors who are trained HQP are to be identified by an asterisk *)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Application Grant Proposal</th>
<th>CCV Researcher Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Excellence of the Researcher (EoR)** | • Most Significant Contributions  
• Additional Info on Contributions and Samples of Contributions | • Recognitions  
• Contributions  
• Activities, Membership |
| **Merit of the Proposal (MoP)** | • Proposed Expenditures  
• Relationship to Other Research Support  
• Budget Justification  
• Proposal  
• List of References  
• Other Support Sources | • Research Funding History (to assess possible conceptual or budgetary overlap) |
| **Training of Highly Qualified Personnel (HQP)** | • HQP Training Plan  
• Past Contributions to HQP Training | • Activities (Supervisory)  
• Contributions (co-authors who are trained HQP to be identified by an *) |
Eligibility of Subject Matter

- **Discovery Grants Programs support:**
  - Research programs in the natural sciences and engineering (NSE); and
  - Interdisciplinary research that is predominantly in the NSE
    - Significance, impact, advancement of knowledge or practical applications in NSE

- The same proposal cannot be submitted to two federal granting agencies

- Applications not appropriate for NSERC mandate will be rejected
NSERC News – New Discovery Grants Supplement
DND/NSERC Discovery Grant Supplement

- Supporting discovery-based research
- 20 supplements at $40K/yr for 3 years
- New module in DG Application on Research Portal
- Eligibility
  - Researchers applying to current competition
  - Proposed research must fit with DND defence and security target areas
- Internal DND committee will select the recipients
- Contact: dndsuppmdn@nserc-crsng.gc.ca
Creating an application in the Research Portal
Create an Application
Choose your existing NOI to pre-populate your Application
NOTE: You must complete your eligibility profile before proceeding with the creation of your application.
Demonstration

- How to get started
- Overview of sections in the application module
- How to update your NSERC_Researcher CCV and attach it to your application
Resources

- Program description
- Peer Review Manual
- Instructions for Completing an Application
- Resource videos (Research Portal)
- Instructions for the CCV
- Selecting the appropriate federal granting agency
- Addendum to the guidelines for the eligibility of applications related to health
- Your research office
Remember: Your Research Offices
Deadlines
Questions?
## NSERC Contacts

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSERC Web site</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca">www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Discovery Grants Program** (including eligibility) | E-mail: [resgrant@nserc-crsng.gc.ca](mailto:resgrant@nserc-crsng.gc.ca)  
Tel.: 613-995-5829 |
| **Use of Grant Funds** | E-mail: [awdad@nserc-crsng.gc.ca](mailto:awdad@nserc-crsng.gc.ca) |
| **On-line Services Helpdesk** | E-mail: [webapp@nserc-crsng.gc.ca](mailto:webapp@nserc-crsng.gc.ca)  
Tel: 995-4273 |
| **DND Contact**        | E-mail: [dndsuppmdn@nserc-crsng.gc.ca](mailto:dndsuppmdn@nserc-crsng.gc.ca) |