

Notice of Intent to Nominate a York Research Chair

Nominee Information

Name: _____

Position: _____

Faculty: _____

Department: _____

Email: _____

Faculty Contact (normally Research Director or Research Officer)

Name: _____

Email: _____

Chair Information

Title:	York Research Chair in: _____		
Tier:	Tier 1 <input type="radio"/>	“Regular” Tier 2 <input type="radio"/>	Early-Career Tier 2 <input type="radio"/>
Type:	Centrally Supported <input type="radio"/>	Faculty-Based <input type="radio"/>	Connected Minds * <input type="radio"/>
Nominee’s Primary Funding Council:	CIHR <input type="radio"/>	NSERC <input type="radio"/>	SSHRC <input type="radio"/>
Adjudication Stream:	Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) <input type="radio"/> Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts (SSHA) <input type="radio"/>		
The nomination file will be submitted in:	English <input type="radio"/>	French <input type="radio"/>	

*Requires endorsement letter from the Connected Minds Leadership Committee

The Tier of the Chair and the Adjudication Stream cannot be changed once the NOI is submitted.

Faculty-based nominations require the Provost’s signature prior to submission of NOI:

_____ Date: ____/____/____
Provost’s Signature Day Month Year

Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Considerations

An equitable, diverse and inclusive environment is a key consideration of the York Research Chair program, and strongly aligns with York's core values. Self-identification is central to ensuring a diverse range of nominees for consideration and self-identification information will be used in adjudication to advance equity.

Nominees who wish to update their self-identification information may do so by completing the employment equity self-identification survey found at

<https://hr1.apps01.yorku.ca/machform/view.php?id=1> (Login to York Passport required).

Research Accomplishments

Provide a 200-word summary, written in lay language, of research accomplishments of the nominee.

Key Words

Please list up to five key words that will be used to help identify appropriate external reviewers in addition to those suggested below. Separate key words by a semi-colon.

Suggested External Reviewers

On the following pages please list four potential external reviewers who are widely respected within their field and **not in a conflict of interest** (see definition below).

- Tier 1 nominees **must** suggest at least 2 international reviewers.
- External reviewers, who may be from Canada or abroad, should be able to evaluate the nomination in the language in which it is written.
- Note that external reviewers **must not** be contacted by Faculties.
- VPRI may request the names of additional reviewers if required and reserves the right to make the final selection of external reviewers for any nomination.

Conflict of Interest

A conflict of interest is a conflict between a person's duties and responsibilities with regard to the review process, and that person's private, professional, business or public interests. There may be a real, perceived or potential conflict of interest when the external reviewer:

- would receive professional or personal benefit resulting from the nomination being reviewed;
- has a professional or personal relationship with the nominee or the nominee's institution; or
- has a direct or indirect financial interest in the nomination being reviewed.

External reviewers are in a conflict of interest if they:

- are a relative or close friend, or have a personal relationship with the nominee;
- are in a position to gain or lose financially/materially from the funding of the nomination;
- have had long-standing scientific or personal differences with the nominee;
- are currently affiliated with the nominee's primary institution, organization or company — including research hospitals and research institutes;
- were the nominee's PhD supervisor;
- are closely professionally affiliated with the nominee, as a result of having **in the last six years**:
 - frequent and regular interactions with the nominee in the course of their duties at their department, institution, organization or company;
 - been a supervisor or a trainee of the nominee;
 - collaborated, published or shared funding with the nominee, or have plans to do so in the immediate future;
 - been employed by the nominating institution; and/or
 - feel for any reason unable to provide an impartial review of the nomination.

External Reviewer 1

Name:	
Position:	
Institution:	
Address:	
City:	
Country:	
Email:	
Telephone:	
Area(s) of Expertise:	

External Reviewer 2

Name:	
Position:	
Institution:	
Address:	
City:	
Country:	
Email:	
Telephone:	
Area(s) of Expertise:	

External Reviewer 3

Name:	
Position:	
Institution:	
Address:	
City:	
Country:	
Email:	
Telephone:	
Area(s) of Expertise:	

External Reviewer 4

Name:	
Position:	
Institution:	
Address:	
City:	
Country:	
Email:	
Telephone:	
Area(s) of Expertise:	

Exclusion of External Reviewers

Nominees may identify external reviewers who, in their opinion, would be unlikely to provide an impartial review. They must also provide a justification for excluding these external reviewers (e.g., experts with whom you or members of your research team have had serious disputes). While not bound by this information, it will be taken into consideration by VPRI in the selection of external reviewers.

Note that this information will not be provided to external reviewers or members of the adjudication committee. The information will be used only to inform the selection of external reviewers for the current nomination.

Signatures

The undersigned understand and agree that the guidelines relating to the York Research Chairs program, as well as the applicable University policies, govern this nomination. They also each confirm that they have read and understand the information above, particularly in relation to the equity, diversity, and inclusion considerations. Specifically, the nominee understands that, by signing this NOI, they agree to allow VPRI, SPORT and the Research Chair Advisory Committee access to their self-identification data for the purpose of the competition adjudication.

The Faculty represents that the Nominee has been provided all documentation in relation to his/her York Research Chair nomination prior to its submission and the Faculty and the Nominee represents to York University that said documentation is accurate and complete.

Dean's Signature

_____/_____/_____
Day Month Year

Nominee's Signature

_____/_____/_____
Day Month Year