



**The McDonald Institute Experimental Postdoctoral Fellow Award
in Astroparticle Physics (MI-EPDF) Application Form**

Section A:

Supervisors (Applicant)

<i>Supervisor Name:</i>	
<i>Supervisor Position Title:</i>	
<i>Co-Applicant(s):</i>	
<i>Institution(s):</i>	

Position Details

<i>Anticipated Total Annual Salary (pre-benefits):</i>	
--	--

<i>Expected Sources of Funding (e.g., NSERC funds, Startup funds, etc.):</i> Part of the funding for the position will be provided by members of the host institution. Briefly describe the expected source(s) of these funds.

<i>Annual Funds Requested from the McDonald Institute (pre-benefits):</i>	
---	--

<i>Length of Position (max 24 months):</i>	
--	--

<i>Anticipated Start Date (should be around or before Sept 2026)</i>	
--	--

<i>Experimental Position Focus (select the most appropriate McDonald Institute thematic area):</i>
☐ Astrophysics ☐ Cosmology ☐ Dark Matter Physics ☐ Detector Development ☐ Low-Background Techniques ☐ Multi-Messenger Physics ☐ Neutrino Physics ☐ Underground Engineering

Section B: You may change the formatting of this section; however, it must stay within **2-page limit** (size 12 Times New Roman font, single-spaced) and organized into the bolded headers in the order presented below. **Any applications longer than 2-pages will not be considered.**

1. Nature of the postdoctoral position and its opportunities

- a) Explain the nature of the envisioned postdoctoral position, outlining the scope of responsibilities, anticipated research activities, and the overall purpose of the role.
- b) Explain how the position will support and advance the postdoctoral researcher's academic career aspirations and trajectory.
- c) Describe the opportunities for leadership and professional development that will be made available to the postdoc.

2. Scientific case for your research program

- a) Explain how the postdoctoral position will further your scientific goals and affect the scientific progress of the McDonald Institute research areas (i.e., describe what kind of research would be enabled by the postdoc at your institute).
- b) Describe how the proposed position is well aligned with the research goals of the McDonald Institute (see [Alignment with McDonald Institute Research Strategy](#)).

3. Research group

Explain how the postdoctoral position would enhance your research group (e.g. which members of your group would they collaborate/mentor/train/complete research with). Include details on the size and focus of your current group. *Do not catalogue your research members beyond academic programs (e.g. do not include demographic descriptors, rather use current academic level).*

4. Promoting equitable hiring process

- a) What equitable hiring practices will you exercise when recruiting and selecting a postdoctoral candidate(s) for this role? Examples may include, but are not limited to:
 - How job postings and recruitment strategies are designed to reduce bias and reach a diverse pool of candidates (e.g., through broad and targeted outreach, inclusive language, and accessible formats).
 - The use of structured interviews, rubrics, or equity guidelines during the selection process.
 - Lab-level practices that ensure fair onboarding and integration of new personnel.
 - Any use of host institution equity tools, such as DEAP Tool for Researchers, host institution hiring best practices, or other established hiring protocols to inform or evaluate hiring practices.

- How accountability and feedback mechanisms (e.g., anonymous surveys, regular equity check-ins) are built into research group operations.
- b) Describe how your research group operationalizes EDII principles on an ongoing basis. Your response may include, but is not limited to:
- Examples of inclusive training practices for HQP (Highly Qualified Personnel), including accessibility and flexibility in learning formats.
 - Mentorship approaches that recognize the diverse needs and goals of HQP.
 - Any specific supports for Indigenous scholars, persons with disabilities, and other equity-deserving groups.
 - Sustainability strategies to maintain inclusive practices over time (e.g., lab handbooks, peer mentorship networks, shared leadership models).
 - Efforts to decolonize your research approaches or integrate Indigenous knowledge systems where appropriate.

Checklist:

- ☐ Full Application Form (this document)
- ☐ 2-page response to Section B

Submission:

Please send completed application forms as a combined PDF to: admin@mcdonaldinstitute.ca with the subject line: “MI-EPDF Awards R1 - {Supervisor Last Name}”

Adjudication: Applications will be adjudicated by the Scientific Review Committee according to the following criteria:

Criteria	Score	Weight	Notes
The focus area of the position is relevant to the McDonald Institute and fills a gap in the available expertise. Refer to Alignment with McDonald Institute Research Strategy .	[0-2]	3	Only applications with alignment (score >0) will be considered.
Measure of the scientific merit and feasibility of the proposed position and its goals.	[0-5]	3	
Clear opportunities for career development while advancing science in a meaningful way.	[0-5]	2	
The position is needed to enhance the capability and capacity of the research group.	[0-5]	2	
The position will offer unique training/mentorship opportunities for the incumbent.	[0-5]	1	
The applicant describes how the incumbent will be linked to the McDonald Institute community to share results and link their findings to the McDonald Institute.	[0-5]	1	
Measure of Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Indigenization considerations, possibly via the applicant's efforts in creating an equitable environment, plans to attract diverse candidates, training opportunities for all, and accommodations.	[0-5]	1	Pass/Fail (0 = Fail), otherwise only used for tie-breaking.
Total Weighted Score		/51+5	

Alignment score [0-2]

- 0 – No alignment
- 1 – Some alignment
- 2 – Clear alignment

General scoring [0-5]

- 0 – Did not address the criteria
- 1 – Insufficient answer
- 2 – Partly answers, lacks evidence
- 3 – Moderately answers, lacks evidence
- 4 – Sufficient answer, insufficient evidence
- 5 – Evidence-backed, highest-quality answer

1. The budget requested is appropriate and aligns with current market values: (yes/no)

2. The applicant stayed within the page limit: (yes/no)

EDII scoring (pass fail + used to break ties):

- 0 – Does not address the criteria: No relevant information provided.
- 1 – Minimal response with weak justification: Provides limited information, lacking detail or a compelling case.
- 2 – Adequate response with weak justification: Addresses the criteria but does not effectively demonstrate impact or commitment.
- 3 – Partial response with strong justification: Some aspects are well-developed, and the rationale is strong, but key details are missing.
- 4 – Adequate response with strong justification: Clearly addresses all aspects, demonstrating a solid commitment with well-supported reasoning.
- 5 – Comprehensive response with excellent justification: Provides a thorough, well-articulated case with clear evidence of impact, commitment, & wise practices.