



Polar Continental Shelf Program Project Review Committee Scoring Guide – 2021

		0	10	20	30
Quality of application Weight: 15		- Difficult to understand and disorganized with substantial information gaps - Proposed research project description and research objectives are unclear	- Somewhat difficult to understand and disorganized with information gaps - Proposed research project description is adequately described and research objectives are reasonably clear	- Intelligible and organized with few information gaps - Proposed research project description and research objectives are clearly described	- Well-written, organized and comprehensive - Proposed research project description is well-described and research objectives are clear and strong
Feasibility of requested field logistics Weight: 40	Health and safety (10)	- Field team has insufficient training/experience in Arctic fieldwork	- Health and safety deficiencies must be addressed in order for project to be feasible	- Health and safety deficiencies must be addressed in order for project to be feasible	- Field team well trained and experienced in Arctic fieldwork.
	Location and logistics sharing (10)	- Study area not feasible (i.e., aircraft not available or aircraft cost too high) - No option of sharing aircraft is available	- Study area has limited aircraft resources and limited sharing abilities with other groups or - Project is feasible only with aircraft sharing	- Study area has aircraft resources available - Aircraft sharing opportunities are available	- Fieldwork is based at the PCSP Resolute facility and aircraft resources are available - Good aircraft sharing opportunities
	Field planning (10)	- Field plans are not well-contemplated, not detailed, have significant information gaps, or are not provided - Field methodology is poorly described	- Field plans are reasonably thought-out and somewhat - Field methodology is adequately described	- Field plan requirements are clear and quite detailed and contain minimal information gaps - Field methodology is clearly described	- Field plan requirements are well-thought-out, detailed, and very clear - Field methodology is clearly described
	Budget (10)	- Budget not well-contemplated, contains no or unrealistic cost estimates and/or has substantial information gaps	- Budget not well-contemplated, includes some unrealistic cost estimates, and/or has some information gaps	- Budget well-contemplated, most costs estimates are realistic, and no information gaps exist	- Comprehensive and well-contemplated budget with realistic cost estimates
Scientific recognition and impact Weight: 45	Awards and grants (10)	- Awards/ grants are not from a competitive process that evaluates scientific excellence or - No awards/grants secured	- Some awards/grants are from a competitive process that evaluates scientific excellence - Number of awards/grants and/or their monetary value and/or prestige is low - Key awards/grants are pending	- Some awards/grants are from a competitive process that evaluates scientific excellence - Number of awards/grants and/or their monetary value and/or their prestige is moderate - Some key awards/grants are secured	- Many awards/grants are from a competitive process that evaluates scientific excellence - Number of awards/grants and/or their monetary value and/or their prestige is high - Most or all key awards/grants are secured
	Publications record (10)	- Publications are very limited for the discipline or the publications are not relevant to the proposed research project	- Publications are limited for the discipline and the papers listed are in low impact journals - Most publications are not relevant to the proposed research project	- Publications are reasonable for the discipline and some of the papers listed are in higher impact journals. - Most publications are relevant to the proposed research project	- Publications are extensive for the discipline and include many papers in high-impact journals. - Publications are relevant to the proposed research project
	Student involvement (10)	- No student involvement or - No explanation provided for lack of student involvement	- Only one student involved in a somewhat meaningful way - Research plans for the student (if applicable) are described adequately or - Acceptable explanation provided for the limited student involvement	- Students are meaningfully involved - Research plans for students (if applicable) are clearly described or - Good explanation provided for limited student involvement	- High level of meaningful student involvement - Research plans for students (if applicable) are clearly described
	Indigenous and local involvement and engagement (10)	- No Indigenous or local involvement in the project - No demonstrated or planned Indigenous engagement and/or community consultation or - No explanation provided for lack of Indigenous or local involvement or engagement	- Only one Indigenous or local person involved in a somewhat meaningful way - Limited Indigenous engagement and/or community consultation activities undertaken or - Acceptable explanation provided for limited Indigenous or local involvement or engagement activities	- Indigenous and/or local people are meaningfully involved - Meaningful Indigenous engagement and/or community consultation activities undertaken or - Good explanation provided for limited Indigenous or local involvement or engagement activities	- High level of meaningful Indigenous and/or local involvement - High level of meaningful Indigenous engagement and/or community consultation undertaken
	Equity, diversity and inclusion (5)	- No explanation for how equity, diversity and inclusion was considered in the research design	- Limited explanation for how equity, diversity and inclusion was considered in the research design	- Good explanation for how equity, diversity and inclusion was considered in the research design	- Comprehensive explanation of how equity, diversity and inclusion was considered in the research design