

Overview

There are five types of Western Research Chairs, but only two have the option for renewal:

- Strategic Focus
- Leadership

Holders of a Western Research Chair - Strategic Focus or a Western Research Chair - Leadership should connect with their Dean and Associate Dean Research to determine whether a second term will be pursued. The academic unit must then conduct an assessment, and the Dean will make a recommendation to the VPR and WRC Steering Committee via the [online submission portal](#).

If a second term is granted, any existing unspent funding from the first term will remain in the accounts to be utilized in full over the second term. Any remaining funding at the end of the second term will be returned to source.

Process

1. The academic unit must **conduct an assessment** of the research performance of the Chairholder based on:
 - productivity including research leadership activities and scientific achievements during the first term;
 - a research plan for the second term which also identifies how equity, diversity, and inclusion will be achieved within the research program; and how the proposed research and research leadership activities will advance the goals outlined in the University's Strategic Research Plan.

The assessment must take into account any special considerations that are relevant to the assessment of productivity and impact including leaves/personal circumstances, publication conventions by discipline, collaborative and interdisciplinary endeavours and other factors that the Chairholder deems relevant.

2. The Dean must **make a recommendation** to the VPR and WRC Steering Committee by submission of the renewal package through the [online submission portal](#).

The academic unit(s) and chairholder are required to demonstrate:

- the performance justified the investment;
- funds have been used appropriately and in accordance with the original application; and
- the academic unit(s) and chairholder have delivered on their commitments.

Required Documents

It is at the Faculty's discretion as to what they submit for review as long as it addresses the criteria as outlined above. Links to [CRC Renewal](#) information included on the next page are for reference and can be followed for the WRC submission.

Renewal packages must be submitted by the Dean or their designate/research officer via the [online submission portal](#) a minimum of three (3) months prior to the expiry date of the first WRC term.

Recommendations for renewal should include:

1. A 2-page letter signed by the Faculty Dean which outlines: the Faculty assessment process including committee members (if applicable), fit with academic plan and Western's strategic research plan, scientific achievement and performance as a leader, impact of chair in the Faculty and at Western, and the financial commitment being requested for the second term, if any.
2. A 3-page [Performance Report](#) for the first term from the Chairholder.
3. A 2-page [Proposed Research Program](#) for second term from the Chairholder.
4. Chairholder current CV.

Contact

The competition is administered by the Office of Research Services, Western Research. For specific questions about this process, please contact intgrant@uwo.ca.

Evaluation Rubric

Criterion	Indicators	Range	Score
Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter of Support • Performance Report • CV 	Clear, strong evidence that all original WRC objectives were fully achieved; demonstrates high standards of excellence; clearly articulates specific benefits and added value of the WRC to the research program.	40-50	
	Most or all WRC objectives achieved with some supporting evidence; benefits of the WRC are present but not fully articulated.	25-39	
	Partial or unclear evidence of meeting WRC excellence standards; limited demonstration that original research objectives were achieved.	11-24	
	Little or no evidence that original research objectives were achieved; does not demonstrate expected WRC excellence.	0-10	
Proposal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Research • Letter of Support • CV 	Highly original, innovative, Tier-appropriate program; clear objectives and strong scholarly context; rigorous and feasible methods; strong user engagement & dissemination plans; excellent training strategy; clear alignment with institutional priorities.	40-50	
	Solid program with clear objectives and some innovation; adequate context; generally appropriate and feasible methods; engagement & training plans present but less detailed; alignment with priorities somewhat articulated.	25-39	
	Some originality but limited clarity or significance; context incomplete; methods underdeveloped; vague engagement and training plans; weak alignment with priorities.	11-24	
	Lacks clear objectives, originality, or significance; insufficient context; unclear or unfeasible methods; engagement & training plans absent or weak; no meaningful alignment with priorities.	0-10	
Total		/100	/100