



## POLAR Research Support Request - Assessment Criteria

POLAR's Research Support Committee (RSC) reviews and evaluates research support requests that are submitted to POLAR by the deadline date (see below) with all supporting documentation supplied. The review process is based on this rubric, which includes four criteria: Quality of Application; Project Contribution And Relevance; Community Engagement and Knowledge Exchange; and Feasibility of Field Logistics (if applicable).

For more information regarding POLAR's review process, please email Research Support:  
[Researchsupport-soutienalarecherche@polar-polaire.gc.ca](mailto:Researchsupport-soutienalarecherche@polar-polaire.gc.ca)

	0	1	2	3	4
<b>Quality of Application</b>					
<b>Overall</b>	Cannot be sufficiently understood, not enough information provided	Difficult to understand and has substantial information gaps	Somewhat difficult to understand with some information gaps	Intelligible and organized with few information gaps	Well-written, organized and comprehensive with no information gaps
<b>Project summary</b>	Not included or provides no useful information	Unclear and difficult to understand	Somewhat unclear and moderately difficult to understand	Mostly clear and well-described	Very well-described and succinct
<b>Project description</b>	Not included or provides no useful information	Unclear and disorganized with very few elements included	Reasonably clear with some elements included	Clearly described with several elements included	Very clearly described and easy to understand with all elements included
<b>Project Contribution And Relevance</b>					
<b>Contribution to POLAR's mandate</b>	Not included or does not contribute	Contributes minimally, is not adequately explained	Contributes adequately, sufficiently explained	Contributes significantly, well-explained	Contributes considerably and meaningfully, is very clearly and succinctly explained



	0	1	2	3	4
<b>Relevance to northerners</b>	Not included or is not relevant	Minimal, poorly explained	Sufficient, adequately explained	Significant, well explained	Considerable and meaningful, clearly outlined
<b>Contribution to field of research</b>	Not included or does not contribute	Minimal, poorly explained	Sufficient, adequately explained	Significant, well explained	Considerable and meaningful, clearly outlined
<b>Community Engagement and Knowledge Exchange</b>					
<b>Engagement plan</b>	No engagement	Limited engagement	Sufficient engagement	Meaningful engagement	A high level of engagement
<b>Knowledge exchange</b>	No knowledge exchange	Limited knowledge exchange	Sufficient exchange	Moderately effective knowledge exchange	Highly effective knowledge exchange
<b>Feasibility of Field Logistics (if applicable)</b>					
<b>Field planning (day-to-day activities)</b>	No field planning included or fully inadequate	not well-contemplated, has significant information gaps	reasonably thought-out, but contain information gaps	Moderately clear and contain minimal information gaps	clearly outlined with all information necessary
<b>Field Safety Plan</b>	Field team has insufficient training/experience in Arctic field work or plan is inadequate	Several deficiencies must be addressed in order for project to be feasible	Some deficiencies must be addressed in order for project to be feasible	Few deficiencies must be addressed in order for project to be feasible	Field team well-trained and experienced in Arctic field work, no deficiencies must be addressed



Polar Knowledge  
Canada

Savoir polaire  
Canada

Revised: 11/10/2019

## Assessment Weighting

<b>%</b>	<b>Quality of Application</b>	<b>Project Contribution and Relevance</b>	<b>Community Engagement and Knowledge Transfer</b>	<b>Feasibility of Field Logistics</b>
<b>Field Work</b>	25	30	25	20
<b>No Field Work</b>	30	40	30	N/A